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The use of ICT in schools in Europe has increased greatly in recent years and its impact has been significant. However, it seems that for every step forward new challenges are revealed on the road towards ‘e-maturity’, for example digital literacy, new learning environments, institutional change and professional development. Yet there are examples of educational systems, schools and education professionals finding solutions to these challenges. If only it were possible to share such knowledge efficiently, avoid much reinvention of wheels and repetition of history. For seven years European Schoolnet has been attempting to do this, by exploring the potential of learning from each other, through peer learning projects funded by the European Commission.

This book describes recent work, notably in the P2V project (Peer to Peer networking for Valorisation), co-funded under the eLearning Programme of DG Education and Culture, bringing together head teachers, teachers, inspectors and policy-makers in structured exchanges to address common issues. It describes successes and lessons learnt as ministries of education, schools and inspectorates bring about change in teaching and learning.

European Schoolnet wishes to thank all partners involved in the peer learning projects: students, teachers, school leaders, inspectors, academics, teacher educators and policymakers from many countries. Their reviews, reflections, discussions, guidelines and many reports are brought together in this book. It is thanks to them that the project final review commended P2V, stating that it “must be considered as an exemplum of good practice. The partners' contribution to the state of the art is significant and deep.” We wish to thank particularly Claus Berg from UNI-C in Denmark (School strand), Alan McCluskey, University of Fribourg, Switzerland (Policy strand) and Bert Jaap van Oel from the Dutch Inspectorate (Inspectorate strand), whose valuable contributions have made possible this publication.
We hope the contents of this book will be inspirational for those wanting to explore peer learning – a concept at the heart of European Schoolnet’s mission – by providing methodologies, recommendations, snapshots of visits, frameworks and tools for successful peer learning activities.

Marc Durando
Executive Director
European Schoolnet
May 2009
LEARNING FROM EACH OTHER

Two recent projects, P2P and P2V, demonstrated the value of peer learning, particularly in the context of policy-making, inspection and school practice.

**P2P (Peer Reviews and Observatory on Policy and Practice in ICT)** was a project from 2004 to 2006 in the of the European Commission eLearning programme. It aimed to aggregate and expand existing activities related to identifying, sharing and transferring excellence in e-learning policy and practice in school systems. The project was led by European Schoolnet.

**P2V (Peer to Peer networking for Valorisation)** was a two-year project in 2007-8 supported by the European Commission Directorate General for Education and Culture. It aimed to valorise results of peer learning projects and help teachers, inspectors and policy makers discover methods, pedagogies and inspection schemes using peer learning focussing on three topics significant in widening the uptake of e-learning in schools: Digital resources, Digital literacy and New learning environments. The project was also led by European Schoolnet.

The starting point of peer learning in these projects is that solutions to challenges lie within the system, in the experience and expertise of actors in the system. Peer learning is a means to bring such solutions to the surface, 'learning from each other', bringing together experts in a field (educators, policy-makers and inspectors) to exchange, discuss and assess each other's practices in the light of their national, regional or local context. The encounters were intended to be non-judgmental, appreciative and constructive. P2P defined peer learning as
“non-judgmental mutual learning experience emphasising trust and openness and providing education professionals at all levels with practical insights and structured feedback”.

The P2V project applied a number of essential conditions for peer learning to succeed. In a previous EUN publication, Professor Bob McCormick highlighted findings in a study by Cordingley, Bell, Thomason & Firth showing that collaborative continuing professional development had more positive effects than individual CPD, provided that:

› External expertise is linked to institution-based activity;
› There is observation and reflection (the latter often based on observation);
› Peer support is emphasised, acknowledging individual starting points and factoring in processes to encourage, extend and structure professional dialogue;
› Scope for teacher participants to identify their own focus.

In the following sections the outcomes of the P2V project peer learning activities are described: the frameworks and three sets of visits.

In the P2V project peer learning principles were applied to the overarching issue of bringing about change in school systems that enable technology to have maximum impact on outcomes. An important element was therefore to elaborate frameworks to describe the components of change in the system and to serve as a self- and peer-assessment tool to establish where schools are in terms of change, i.e. how far they are towards ‘e-maturity’. Policy-makers, educators and inspectors then used the frameworks in peer learning visits. Three such frameworks are described in this section: SIPTEC, ICT Quality Framework and the Self-Review Framework.

**SIPTEC: ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK FOR CHANGE IN SCHOOL SYSTEMS**

This framework derives from validation work undertaken by European Schoolnet since 2000 with schools in six large-scale EC-funded projects. There are six components in the framework: Systemic, Institutional, Pedagogical, Technological, Economic and Cultural; hence the acronym SIPTEC. SIPTEC offers a three tier view of change in schools: meta (system), mesa (school) and micro (the learning event). Enablers and inhibitors of change can exist at any of the levels and therefore it is important to consider all the dimensions of the framework in planning and managing change.
Systemic

This dimension concerns aspects of the national schooling system that are largely the domain of ministries of education and policy-making, and so are outside the control of the individual school, but which affect what happens in schools, for example education policy, the legal context, the curriculum, external examinations, teacher education, workforce supply and employment conditions, the educational content market, and how funding is allocated between schools, region and state.

Institutional

In this dimension we look at the school as a whole, for example, the timetable, buildings, physical spaces, leadership, teacher recruitment, and management. There are a variety of approaches to assess whether schools are e-mature as institutions. In P2V we looked at frameworks such as the Common Framework for Assessing ICT in education developed as part of the Inspection strand of the P2V project and BECTA's Self-Review Framework in the UK (see below).

Pedagogical

This aspect covers the micro-level of teaching and learning, at the individual teacher, student, lesson and class level, including how ICT impacts teaching and learning, use of (digital) resources by teachers and learners, new media/ICT skills for both teachers and learners. This area looks at what defines e-mature teachers which develop pupils' ICT capabilities, use of ICT to enhance teaching and demonstrate competence and confidence in using ICT devices. E-mature learners demonstrate competences such as development/improvement of ICT skills, enhancement of learning such as teamwork and knowledge sharing with a wider learning community both in and outside of the school.

Technological

This component is about the technology used in the school and its performance in real situations, e.g. the user interface, training and support requirements, installation and
integration with legacy provision. This includes how ICT works in practice, implication of using ICT in the school (support) and adaptability to needs of the school

Economic

This component brings together financial issues related to ICT in schools, e.g. equipment, tools, services and connectivity, set-up and usage costs, total cost of implementation and whether scalability is affordable. The economic aspects include costs for schools and municipalities (purchase and leasing, maintenance, integration, training, support) and costs for government (scalability).

Cultural

This is an important but often neglected aspect. It covers issues related to different political and educational cultures across European countries and specific linguistic concerns. This includes aspects such as intercultural issues (what aspects of national or local educational culture does ICT support well or not well?), aspects linked to transnational collaboration (does ICT facilitate exchanges), cultural aspects (does innovation align with cultural values and beliefs of the school?). This last aspect in peer learning echoes issues linked to transferability of innovative practices. Finally the issue of language and localisation can also be a crucial element in supporting adoption of innovation.
THE ICT QUALITY FRAMEWORK

As part of the peer learning project led by European Schoolnet, a common framework for assessing the quality of ICT in schools was designed. The P2V ICT quality framework covers three of the SIPTEC headings: institutional, pedagogical and technological.

This framework was initially developed as part of the P2P project inspectorates strand, bringing together standards and indicators used by several education inspectorates throughout Europe, revising and reordering these criteria to present them as one shared model.

As part of the P2V project, the Standing International Conference of Inspectorates (SICI) network valorised the ICT assessment framework developed by inspectorates in the P2P project, testing and using it in different countries. The inspection strand also looked into the possibilities of adapting it for use as an audit tool for self-evaluation and as a roadmap for institutional change towards the e-confident school.

The framework was developed by Inspectorate of Education in Scotland, Sweden, France, Catalonia, Lithuania and The Netherlands in P2V, based on earlier work in the P2P project in England, Sweden, Scotland, Ireland, France and The Netherlands. Although the framework is developed by the inspectorates involved, its application is not limited to those inspectorates, nor to inspecting authorities only. It can also be used by individual schools to self-assess their ICT use and by groups of schools for peer evaluations.

The ICT quality framework is both a checklist for external inspectors and a framework for schools to self-and peer-assess their progress towards e-maturity. In the project, a comparison was made between this framework, and, from the UK, Becta’s self-review tool for schools, and either one or the other was used for school peer learning visits. Inspectorates used the ICT quality framework.
The framework consists of three main themes: Conditions, Use, Outcomes. Quality areas have been defined within each theme, eight in total. Quality indicators (QIs) with corresponding evidence pointers are identified within each quality area. The inspectors used scores (1-4) for each indicator, enabling schools to see where they were on the road towards e-maturity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme 1: Conditions:</th>
<th>Quality area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1. Leadership,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2. Infrastructure and access,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3. Curriculum planning,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4. Quality assurance and improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme 2: Use:</th>
<th>Quality area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U1. Pupil use,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U2. The teaching process,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U3. Administrative use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme 3: Outcomes:</th>
<th>Quality area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O1. Impact on learning and standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From this framework, an online tool to assess school eMaturity was developed. The 'Toolkit for Investigating School eMaturity' 'TIES' is currently in a prototype phase and uses the ICT quality framework to help triads of schools peer review each other. The toolkit is available at [http://peerlearning.eun.org](http://peerlearning.eun.org).
The P2V ICT quality framework is one of the keystone of the methodology and tools developed in P2V, it can be downloaded (with guidelines on how to use it effectively) at [http://peerlearning.eun.org](http://peerlearning.eun.org).

### Theme 1 › Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>C1.</strong> Leadership</th>
<th>Quality area</th>
<th>This area is concerned with the extent to which leadership can be identified at all levels in the school to develop and realise a vision for ICT.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>C2.</strong> Infrastructure and access</td>
<td>This area is concerned with infrastructure and resources to support learning, teaching and administration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C3.</strong> Curriculum planning</td>
<td>This area is concerned with how schools and colleges plan for the use of ICT by their pupils as they progress.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C4.</strong> Quality assurance and improvement</td>
<td>This area is concerned with the cyclical process that schools implement to review, plan and revise the use of ICT in learning, in teaching and in administration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Theme 2 › Use

| **U1.** Pupil use | Quality area | This indicator allows the evaluation of the use of ICT by pupils. In lessons observed there is evidence that pupils are acquiring ICT skills, and of the use of ICT across the curriculum to enhance learning. |
| **U2.** The teaching process | This area is concerned with how teaching staff support pupils in developing their capabilities in the use of ICT and how effectively teachers use ICT in delivering the curriculum. |
| **U3.** Administrative use | This area is concerned with how schools and other educational establishments use ICT for administration, with particular reference to processes contributing to effective learning and teaching. |

### Theme 3 › Outcomes

| **O1.** Impact on learning and standards | Quality area | This area looks at the impact of ICT on learning and teaching across the curriculum. Its focus is on the outcomes of teachers' and pupils' use of ICT in the curriculum. |

The P2V ICT quality framework is one of the keystone of the methodology and tools developed in P2V, it can be downloaded (with guidelines on how to use it effectively) at [http://peerlearning.eun.org](http://peerlearning.eun.org).
Schools participating in peer review activities also valorised Becta’s self-review framework, already in use in Northern Ireland and Norway.

The self-review framework is an online tool which enables schools to assess and benchmark their use of ICT across all their activities. Following external validation schools are awarded the ICT Mark. It enables schools to identify and publicise their e-maturity, and shows next steps to improve ICT use to benefit the organisation. It complements work schools undertake for the Self Evaluation Framework used by the inspection organisation OFSTED.

The self-review framework comprises eight elements; these elements cover the whole development of ICT across the school and enable the organisation to assess itself against the following elements.

- Leadership and Management
- Learning & Teaching
- Professional Development
- Resources
- Curriculum
- Assessment
- Extending Opportunities for Learning
- Impact on Pupil Outcomes
COMPARING THE P2V QUALITY FRAMEWORK AND THE SELF-REVIEW FRAMEWORKS

The P2V quality framework and the Self-Review Framework are quite similar although their starting-points are different (inspection and school management respectively). Both list a set of elements that comprise good practice in the use of ICT in a school and the fact that the list is similar gives grounds for believing that they are strong indicators of a school's success in using ICT. The following table shows how closely the two frameworks overlap.
**Becta Self-Review Framework**

1. **Leadership and management**
   *Supports and challenges schools to:*
   - develop and communicate a shared vision for ICT
   - plan a sustainable ICT strategy across the whole school including:
     - manage, co-ordinate, monitor and review the implementation of their ICT strategy
     - promote the effective use of ICT by improving organisational effectiveness and efficiency.

2. **Curriculum**
   *Supports and challenges schools in:*
   - planning and leading a broad and balanced ICT curriculum to enable pupils to apply and develop their ICT capability across all subjects
   - reviewing and updating the whole curriculum in the light of developments in technology and professional practice
   - ensuring pupils’ ICT experiences are coherent, balanced and consistent across year groups, and progressive over time.

3. **Learning and teaching**
   *Supports and challenges schools in:*
   - ensure teaching is enhanced through informed planning, resulting in high quality use of ICT for learning and teaching
   - meet pupils' expectations for the use of ICT, including developing digital literacy
   - encourage teachers to work collaboratively in identifying and evaluating the impact of ICT on learning and teaching.

**ICT Quality Framework**

**Condition 1. Leadership**
*The extent to which leadership can be identified at all levels in the school:*
- develop a clear vision for ICT (with stakeholders)
- have a strategy (with implementation responsibilities) to realise that vision

**Condition 3. Curriculum planning**
*How schools and colleges plan for the use of ICT by their pupils as they progress:*
- meeting local, regional and national curriculum requirements
- coherence, balance and consistency (ICT skills, ICT curriculum, ICT applications and context)
- improvements in light of new developments in ICT, business practice and pedagogy

**Use 1. Learner use**
*The evaluation of the use of ICT by pupils. In lessons observed there is evidence that pupils are acquiring ICT skills, and of the use of ICT across the curriculum to enhance learning:*
- development of ICT skills
- enhancement of learning

**Use 2. The teaching process (first part)**
*How teaching staff support pupils in developing their capabilities in the use of ICT:*
- developing pupils' ICT capabilities
- use of ICT to enhance teaching

---

3 [http://tinyurl.com/krzoy](http://tinyurl.com/krzoy)
4 Assessment
Supports and challenges schools to:
› the assessment of ICT capability to support pupils’ learning
› the use of assessment evidence and data in planning learning and teaching across the whole curriculum.

5 Professional development
Supports and challenges schools in:
› identifying and addressing the ICT training needs of the school and individual staff
› providing quality support and training activities for all staff in the use of ICT
› sharing effective practice
› reviewing, monitoring and evaluating professional development as an integral part of the development of the school.

6 Extending opportunities for learning
Supports and challenges schools in:
› understanding the needs of pupils and the community in their extended use of ICT
› ensuring provision is enhanced through informed planning, resulting in high quality use of ICT within and beyond the school
› reviewing, monitoring and evaluating opportunities to extend learning within and beyond the school.

Use 3. Administrative use (1st bullet)
How schools and other educational establishments use ICT for administration, with particular reference to processes contributing to effective learning and teaching.
› identifying issues (including assessment) impacting learning and teaching

Use 2. The teaching process (remainder)
...how effectively teachers use ICT in delivering the curriculum.
› teaching staff competence and confidence

Condition 4.
Quality assurance and improvement
The processes that schools and other educational establishments implement to evaluate the effectiveness of ICT in learning, in teaching and in administration:
› review and self-evaluation
› action-planning and implementation
› monitoring and revision

Use 3. Administrative use (2nd bullet)
How schools and other educational establishments use ICT for administration, with particular reference to processes contributing to effective learning and teaching.
› communication (with others) is supported.
7 Resources
Supports and challenges schools in:
› ensuring learning and teaching environments exist where ICT can be used effectively and in line with strategic needs
› purchasing, deploying and reviewing appropriate ICT resources that reflect the school improvement strategy
› managing technical support effectively for the benefit of pupils and staff.

8 Impact on pupil outcomes
Supports and challenges schools by:
› demonstrating how pupils can make good progress in their ability to use ICT effectively
› increasing their awareness of how the use of ICT can have a positive impact on pupils' progress more widely
› encouraging them to review pupils' attitudes and behaviour, and how the use of ICT can have a positive impact on pupils' achievement.

Condition 2 Infrastructure and Resources
The infrastructure and resources to support learning, teaching and administration.
› the available resources reflect the needs and vision of the school
› the deployment of ICT resources supports effective learning
› Support systems optimise the use of ICT

Outcomes 1. Impact on learning and standards
The impact of ICT on learning and teaching across the curriculum. Its focus is on the outcomes of teachers' and pupils' use of ICT in the curriculum.
› gains in broad learner achievement
› effect of ICT use on pupil attainment
PEER REVIEWING BETWEEN SCHOOLS

Peer learning is a powerful means to spread innovation and share good practice among professionals in a non-judgmental way, providing a mutual learning experience based on trust, openness, practical insights and structured feedback. A methodology was developed in the P2P and P2V projects for peer learning reviews between schools in countries with different education systems. Following recommendations from the P2P project where schools worked in pairs, in P2V there were groups of three where possible. Introducing a third peer enriched the reviewing and professional exchange process considerably.

METHODOLOGY FOR SCHOOL PEER REVIEWING

The peer learning process consists of working in groups of three schools (‘triads’), self evaluation, structured visits, and evaluations. The process can take place over a few weeks but is more enriching if the visits are spread over one year. Teachers from each school visit two others, and host a reciprocal visit from the two other schools.

One of the lessons from the P2P project was that to conduct successful peer learning activities it is necessary to have a detailed methodology and in the context of school peer learning to give participants all the necessary tools, templates and guidelines. In the P2V project partners from Northern Ireland and Denmark (in particular John Anderson, Byron Evans and Claus Berg) developed and valorised the P2P methodology and guidelines, and the Inspection strand provided additional guidance for school visits. The support materials are available at http://peerlearning.eun.org and some are reproduced in the following pages.
0: Selection of schools and formation of triads
In forming triads, schools:
› Should have something in common
› Be already engaged in self review of their ICT activities
› Be willing to engage in discussing and sharing their experiences
› Know in advance what is involved in the peer review process
› Have a mutually shared language with peer schools
› Be represented by the same three people. Participants should include: head teacher, ICT coordinator, chosen subject teachers, interpreters (if necessary).

1: Tasks before the visit
› Preparatory conversation with the school to agree on visiting dates, teams and any practical details to make the visit a success
› Set up of communication channels between the various partners such as mailing lists, blogs, wiki, use of web 2.0 tools is encouraged.
› Schools fill in self evaluation questionnaires and send it out to peer schools at least two weeks before the visit as visitors not only have to read the material but also prepare questions. Schools analyse self evaluation questionnaire received from peer schools.
› Additional documents are prepared by the project coordinator (in the case of P2V, European Schoolnet) and each partner schools as background for the visit. Documents include an overview of the country’s the education system and ICT in schools. This should be sent one week before the visit.
› The host schools draws up the agenda for at least two days spent in the school and sets the curriculum subject/topic focus for the visit, within the overall project topics of digital resources; digital literacy of teachers and learners and new learning environments.

2: During the visit
› The visit should be of at least two working days in the host school.
› The agenda should relate to an issue identified from the school’s own ICT self evaluation activity for example foreign language teaching or other subject/topic based activity in the school involving ICT.
› Scheduled activities can include tours of the host school, Lesson observation, meeting with leadership/ICT coordinator, Interviews of pupils, teachers and administrators
› During the visit the two visiting schools use a set of headings common to both the Becta ICT Mark and the P2V self-review to record their impressions.
› Feedback session at the end of the day, including preliminary conclusions

3: Tasks after the visit
› Draft written report using the self-review framework with the help of the local adviser, national co-ordinator. Final conclusion are reviewed by the peer school (until approval, the report is tagged as 'draft') to allow schools to comment or make factual corrections.
› Submit final written report. The peer reviews remain confidential to the three schools, However, following agreement of partners’ schools, a public report highlighting key issues, challenges and outcomes can be published.
› A follow-up questionnaire can be used to measure of the impact of the visit.
In the P2V project groups of schools were created between schools in Austria, Catalonia, Denmark, Northern Ireland, Norway and the Netherlands. There were four triads and two pairs:

- **Triad 1** Ashfield Girls' High School, Belfast, Northern Ireland (visit Feb 2008); Skeiene, Sandes, Rogaland, Norway (visit May 2008)
- **Triad 2** St Columb's College, Derry, Northern Ireland (visit 6-7 Mar 2008); Skovvangsakolen, Allerod Denmark (visit 28-30 May 2008); Centre Educatiu Jacint Verdaguer, Catalonia (visit 1-3 Oct 2008)
- **Triad 3** St Pius X High School, Magherafelt, Co Derry (visit 24-25 Apr 2008); Bjerregrav, Denmark (visit 28-29 Jan 2008); Charlottenlund Lower Secondary, Trondheim, Norway (visit 18-19 Sep 2008)
- **Triad 4** St Patrick’s Primary School, Dungannon and St Patrick’s Grammar School, Armagh (visit 28-29 Feb 2008); no other visits
- **Pair 5** Cals College, Cals College Nieuwegein & IJsselstein, Netherlands 1-2 December 2008; IES Salvador Espriu Catalonia 15-16 December 2008
- **Pair 6** IES Marina, Barcelona, Catalonia (visit 22-25 October 2008); AT HTL Dornbirn Austria 28-31 May 2008

**REPORTING**

An important element of the peer learning process is the post-visit report, of which there were 16 in the P2V project, written by the hosts and visitors, in most cases as a joint exercise, itself a valuable part of the peer learning process.

**Guidance for the school visit report writing process**

This is guidance; schools can agree to vary their approach to suit circumstances.

1. This guidance should be read by all participants in the school visit programme.
2. The visit and the peer review report focuses on the use of digital resources and learning environments in support of education.

3. The peer review report is structured by the 8 elements\(^5\) of the Becta Self-Review Framework (SRF). Reports are published on the [http://p2v.eun.org website](http://p2v.eun.org).

4. The host school may wish to set three questions on which they wish the visitors to advise or comment. The three questions relate to the Becta SRF.

5. In discussion in the school during the visit it is not expected that teams can cover all eight elements of the Becta SRF.

6. In order to focus the discussion 2 or 3 elements should be selected. The most important 2 elements are Impact and Leadership.

7. The two visiting teams produce a single peer review report about the host school.

8. The report begins with an introduction stating brief details of the dates of the visit, the names of the visiting schools, the members of the visiting teams and a short description of the host school.

9. The visit programme is included as an annex in the report.

10. The two visiting teams do not compromise where they have different views.

11. Where the visitors have different comments to make the relevant paragraphs in the report should be preceded by the country abbreviation, e.g.: NI: In our experience…; DK: This is a matter of……

12. The visiting teams work together on the final afternoon to start a draft and agree a timescale to complete the report.

13. The peer review report summarises, at the end of report, the recommendations made by the visitors.

14. The peer review report includes the questions asked by the host and the commentary/answers from the visitors.

15. The host school has an opportunity to
   - correct factual errors in the draft report
   - add a commentary responding to the peer review to the report
   - state how it plans to respond to the recommendations
   - agree that the report may be published - where they do not agree to publication, the host school’s name may be removed

---

\(^5\) The 8 Becta SRF elements are: Impact on pupil outcomes; leadership and management; teaching and learning; assessment; curriculum; professional development; extending opportunities for learning; resources.
16. Any photographs included in the report or project website conform to the host school’s Acceptable Use policy: the permission of adults and the parents of the pupils are sought and provided.

17. Once completed, and agreed by all parties, the report is published by EUN.

These tools and templates are available at [http://peerlearning.eun.org](http://peerlearning.eun.org) for those who would like to know more about this system or try it themselves. Additionally, – as one of the hindrances of this model of peer reviewing between schools is the cost of travel – an online tool prototype has been developed to support school peer reviewing: the Toolkit for Investigating eMaturity in Schools (TIES).

**SOME COMMENTS REPORTED BY VISITING TEACHERS**

All school peer review reports used a common reporting format with eight headings:

- Leadership and management
- Curriculum
- Learning and teaching
- Assessment
- Professional development
- Extended opportunities for learning
- Resources and technical support
- Impact on pupil outcomes.

There follow some comments taken from the report to give a flavour of the perceptions, recommendations and insights of participants. The full reports can be downloaded from the peer learning site ([http://peerlearning.eun.org](http://peerlearning.eun.org)).

**LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT**

*Among the main points raised by participants in the peer visits concerning leadership and management is the crucial role of the head teacher to drive change at the school level, also mentioned is the need for the ICT vision to be shared not only at the management level but throughout the school community (whole school approach). Parents also have a crucial role to play in supporting the management of the school but also ensure that at home pupils have the opportunities for extended learning.*
“The main task now is to articulate a school vision for the development of ICT. A crucial element will be to allow the whole school community (staff, students, governors, parents etc) an opportunity to play a part in the development of the vision and achieve ownership.

The development of ICT in the school will depend on the full sponsorship, support and enthusiasm, especially the principal. In Austrian schools the "Schulpartnerschaft" plays an important part in decision-making. This means that a group of elected parents, students and teachers must come together in order to agree jointly on school development and the school programme. Accordingly, decision-making takes some time.

The principal is not in the position to choose teachers who fulfil the needs or correspond to the objectives of a certain school.

The schools in Northern Ireland have been given liberty to manage the funding that the schools receive. The schools' budgets are based on pupils' numbers. This gives the schools the opportunity to recruit teachers and other staff in line with the schools' vision.

The principal and staff have a distinct vision of the school’s future development. There is a clear strategy for further improvement in ICT by setting targets, benchmarking, monitoring progress and evaluating strategies and methods. A Specialist Schools Committee comprising the Principal, Vice-principal and Specialist Schools Manager meet monthly to review targets and progress.

The main goals at institutional level are to make technology available at all levels of management and to remove technology as an educational "issue" by making it trusted, secure and reliable, accessible anywhere at any time and expandable.

The culture of the school was very clear from the first moment of arrival. There are no fences, walls or other structures to separate the school from its surroundings; children call the teachers by their first name and the dress of both teachers and students is extremely casual.
A great variety of activities involving the use of ICT was observed. It is evident that the use of ICT is embedded in all subjects and for all students. ICT is not a subject or an activity that comes in addition to the ordinary curriculum, but an integrated tool to improve teaching and learning.

**CURRICULUM**

*One of the key elements in this section was in the comparison between the different cultures/education systems and how closely defined national curricula may be at the school level.*

- “Norway has embarked on the development of a national curriculum which is largely skills based and is developing ICT as one among five cross-curricular skills
- During our final discussion with the school staff and the management we discussed the dilemma between a highly organised timetable and the spontaneity which may bring new perspective to a subject. One must always attempt to find the right balance that provides room for both.
- There is a language lab for new immigrants without language knowledge; one teacher teaches two pupils and makes use of special software for language acquisition.”

**LEARNING AND TEACHING**

*The observations of the peers focussed on autonomy of learners, and their ability to use new technologies in a coherent and sensible way (such as making use of critical thinking and using ICT not only as a tool, but also to promote active learning). Another point was the use of the interactive whiteboards which raised mixed reactions.*

- The school is based on the principles of “cooperative learning”. From the age of four, pupils participate in at least four projects a year, each of approximately one month. The themes of these projects are decided by the pupils, but are designed and organized by the teachers, who then put together the working groups and organize desktops for the pupils on their laptops so that students only have access to relevant websites. The most striking feature of the school seems to be the principles of “cooperative learning”, thus
ICT is subordinated to these principles and is integrated to promote this specific pedagogical goal. This seems to be done consistently and purposively.

- All the pupils had the same data and websites which left little room for independent research and learning. The purpose of the lesson seemed somewhat vague and it was difficult to see what the learning outcomes were to be or what pupils were to produce which demonstrated that they had understood what they were expected to learn. We were deeply impressed by the use of Digital Story Telling. The way it was used showed a new and interesting way of combining storytelling and the use of ICT.

- In our opinion, the use of ICT should be directed towards improving the pupils’ learning in different subjects. Generally speaking, there is often a tendency towards using ICT for the sake of ICT - that is learning ICT instead of learning a subject.

- In several classes we experienced a connection between the digital and analogue media, which did not work as it should. Focus in the classes was the thinking and the discussions in relation with the interactive whiteboards, but quite a long time was used to copy out the written exercise from the white board. The question is how you can optimize time so that the pupils’ discussions and activity rises in relation to the time in inactivity. Is it possible for the school to use laptops which could activate and make a focus for several pupils at one time?

- Clearly, the presence of Interactive Whiteboards in all classrooms and wireless laptops indicates a vision but it was difficult to determine if or how teachers have contributed to the way in which ICT is applied to support teaching and learning. In the lessons we observed it appeared that teachers had collaborated on the use of the Interactive Whiteboard and, to some extent, the use of the wireless laptops but we remained unaware of how fully the wider school community had engaged in determining how ICT would be applied to impact on learning and teaching. There appeared to be little structure or progression to the pupils’ ICT experiences.

- When used in the classroom, ICT seemed to be more of a teaching aid than a tool for the students’ active learning. The students participated eagerly in the lessons, but the interaction was mainly between teacher and student rather than between students.
We would suggest an even stronger emphasis on the students’ level of activity. The use of ICT should contribute to put focus on the learner, rather than the teacher. The students have probably some ICT-skills gained from using computers at their leisure, and these skills may very well be brought into school. These skills should be combined with the skills learned at school and tasks that give the student an opportunity to create and demonstrate his competence.

Curriculum planning

- New ICT board
- ICT Curriculum ensures a wide range of applications and contents
- Basic skills classes
- Teacher participation in ICT board.
- Peer observation to know what other colleagues are doing.
- Regarding basic skills classes: checking prior knowledge and extension activities / differenciated activities.
- Are “basic skills” classes necessary, or could these skills be adressed cross-curriculary?
ASSESSMENT

Several learning management and e-portofolio solutions were available in the schools participating in the peer visits, these solutions were studied and commented upon. Learning management systems were heralded as a great way to keep track of student progress, help them take charge of their own learning process, but also to connect schools with parents eager to follow how their kids perform and are assessed.

› “We would recommend the implementation of an electronic learning platform with a Learning Management System (LMS) to collect, assess and administer pupils work.
› From an Austrian point of view the fact that students do not have to achieve a certain pass level in order to pass the school year is very striking and allows such assessment techniques as mentioned above. As a result, the focus of teaching and assessment is on the student’s individual progress rather than on achieving a common minimum level.
› We would like to emphasise the importance of the e-portfolio which is required from every student. This school year all classes will have an e-portfolio in at least one subject, next year all the teachers will ask for an e-portfolio in every subject. Using e-portfolios also supports the student’s individual progress and use of ICT skills inside and outside school.
› Students’ work is stored via an e-portfolio system readily accessible by staff as well as parents. The school has worked hard to ensure that parents have access to information regarding their child’s learning. This is accessible via the learning platform that is used by staff and pupils. Parents that have limited access to computers and/or broadband may use “thin client” machines set up in various locations around the school.
› There was little evidence of pupils’ work in ICT on display. It would be useful if the subject work and the related ICT outcomes which pupils achieve could be displayed to promote ICT and to recognise the achievement of pupils.
› DIANA was presented to us by two students, and they were both quite happy with the way this system helped them see their progress within each discipline (e.g. algebra, fractions, etc. in mathematics) and made them aware of where they needed to put in an extra effort. As such it gave the impression of being a tool that empowered the students in making them able to take responsibility for their own learning processes.
It was clear to us that Northern Ireland education statutes demand very meticulous record keeping, not only of pupils' results, but of staff activities as well. During our visit, we were introduced to some of the tools used by the school to assess and register the pupils' achievements. These tools are used by the school to report to local authorities and parents on the school's results.

Assessment, except for some exercises and tests on the platform ILIAS, continue along the lines of classic written examination, as we saw in interviews with students.

In the classroom there was an immediate evaluation and positive feedback on the students' performances given through encouraging comments in the learning process. This makes the students aware of how they are assessed and in turn increases their ability to learn and participate actively in the evaluation of their own learning. One school had also created systems where the students reported how much they understood of the teaching by using a sign to show if they understood fully or needed more explanation.

There was an atmosphere of immediate and encouraging evaluation in the classroom. The evaluation was not always given by the teacher. We could also observe the students giving each other marks on a presentation. In addition to giving the mark, they had to give reasons for the result. This develops their skills in self assessment and is a good means to increase their ability of learning. By using a digital tool – a clicker – the students could report on how much they understood of the teaching and the teacher could read the results to decide how to work further with the topic."

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Developing teacher skills lifelong and encouraging teacher professional development was an element looked at by peers, particularly in the area of IT skills development to get them up to speed with an ‘e-skilled’ generation of pupils.

“There seems to be no formal process of, or for, Continued Professional Development (CPD) within the school system. CPD should be addressed at a much higher level in the Austrian educational system in order to improve the quality of teaching and learning. ICT CPD must be seen as part of this to improve teaching and learning - not simply the integration of ICT.
Each year the school has 10 working days without pupils. A number of these days are used to educate the staff in pedagogy and ICT.

The college has few newcomers. For this reason, the development of the ICT thinking about the students with more difficulties is scarce or almost non-existent.

All teachers have a personal laptop provided by the school. This is an important element in the development of personal ICT skills for teachers and of collaboration through the school network and email. We did not hear of any courses for teachers within the area of ICT.

Let the school librarian play an important part in the research skills training of the students, where he/she might perhaps offer short courses in critical use of sources, correct citations, laws concerning plagiarism, etc.

The school uses Moodle as learning platform, has file zones for pupils on their server, uses the Google groups and Google calendar, in some projects contacts pupils via web / SMS and has been offering special trainings for teachers since 2000. This training partly takes place in the summer holidays, when there is one week of intensive ICT training."

EXTENDED OPPORTUNITIES FOR LEARNING

Peers looked in this heading at how learning resources were used and accessed in class and outside the class. Learning management systems proved in certain cases to be an essential tool to facilitate opportunities for extended learning and support students’ motivation when completing tasks from home. For this purpose several schools benefited from infrastructure investments.

“In the English class the students were set the task of watching and analysing a video online at home and to respond to questions. In discussion with students we found that the notebook class regularly met together outside class times to compare and compile notes from their various subjects, a level of intrinsic motivation the school could develop to increase pupil engagement.
The availability of the existing LMS (Learning Management System) portal (Bildungsserver Burgenland) provides great potential for good pupil and teacher access to resources inside and also outside the school. Teachers and pupils can organise class activities and courses [...] or get their homework assignments via LMS. A further advantage of LMS is that teachers who cannot attend the lesson because they are on a seminar or on a school excursion or school trip set tasks on LMS.

The school’s "A different day" project whereby pupils learn by practical experiences in a number of subjects has been very successful and motivating for students. A slightly different slant on this by adopting an ICT/Online day could be introduced for collaboration with the school’s international partners.

The learning centre has been designed so that children can borrow resources easily by scanning the items themselves; as a result they are able to borrow digital equipment such as cameras which they can use outside school beyond the formal school day.

Pupils do not have access to the school network from outside of the school and there is no online learning platform available to support and extend learning beyond the school premises. The school had an Intranet which was regularly used to publish tasks in all subjects. However, this intranet may not be accessed from outside the school. The system was very actively used as a communication channel between the teacher and individual pupils.

The school has desktops serviced through a centralised system. The school has also invested in more advanced equipment ranging from Apple computers in the art department to CADCAM. We did not notice any laptops for the pupils to use. Most of the desktops are located in dedicated rooms close to ordinary classrooms although a high percentage of the computers are located in ordinary classrooms. The use of ICT in a learning context appears widespread in all subjects and at all levels.

We believe that the school might gain a greater output from its future investments if it invests in laptop computers and wireless networking. Another interesting area would be mobile computing - mobile phones, handheld computers, subnotebooks, etc.

During our visit we saw that students use computers in the classroom and during break time. For them, the incorporation of ICT in the studies has become an additional element of motivation.
RESOURCES AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT

In this section peers looked at the level of infrastructure in the visited schools and the level of technical supports offered either by managed services (Northern Ireland) or from within the schools themselves. The use of Interactive Whiteboard was also looked at – and sometimes questioned – by peers.

› “We are not aware of any ICT technical support, except interested teachers, at present in the school, but we see it as a vital cog in the development of ICT
› To make 24/7 learning possible, the Managed Service C2K provides a distributed LAN for the school, a wide range of packaged software, Secure Private Broadband Network, Internet services and an integrated learning environment.
› We noticed certain limitations to the use of mobile notebooks. In fact, the first 5 to 10 minutes of each lesson were dedicated to setting up the equipment and getting ready for work. This seems to be a common phenomenon in classes using ICT.
› Whiteboard technology has not been embraced because its functionality and effectiveness are doubted by the school and its teachers.
› Every room is equipped with an Interactive Whiteboard to support whole class teaching though they are also used by pupils as an extra computer. Each Interactive Whiteboard is supported by a desktop computer located alongside which is cable-connected to the school network. All of the desktop computers have a wireless keyboard while none has a separate monitor; presumably the Interactive Whiteboard is considered as a monitor replacement.
› The school network is maintained by a technical support service provided across the six schools in the area. A technician is onsite at the school.
› The school has very specific computers and machines for handicapped students, such as wheelchairs, big keyboards or Braille keyboards, with an specific software for them.
› Our experience is that it often is necessary to remove the old blackboards from the classroom. If the blackboard remain in the classroom many teachers feel it is easier to use this.
› Publishing houses have developed teaching material for use on the interactive whiteboards. We have a feeling that this to a certain extent can make passive a teachers own possibilities and desire to be critical in relation to the chosen teaching material.

› Resources were achieved through the cooperation of computer companies and factories in the area which traditionally feed themselves on the students who are trained in the school.

› One of the initiatives that positively surprised us was how the college builds on the fact that students own their own laptop. Quite a few of them took their computer everywhere as a working tool, replacing the traditional notebook. The school offers students a variety of laptops at attractive prices to facilitate their acquisition, and even the parents’ association contributes by covering a portion of the amount in cases of families in need. The fact that students bring their laptop to class requires an additional implication that the school has managed quite successfully. On the one hand, with security measures: the lockers for the laptops are in a separate enclosure inside the school controlled by security cameras. In this way, students can avoid the trouble of taking their laptop home each day (much of the student population resides in nearby towns and comes by train or bus every day). In addition, the school has a specific insurance coverage and offers a maintenance system in the event of failure. Also, when a student forgets his laptop or has it in repair, the school offers a system of loan laptops so that the student can use it during school hours.

**IMPACT ON PUPIL OUTCOMES**

*One of the comments from peers regarding impact of ICT use on pupils was that the format of the visits, which lasted only a few days, did not allow peers to have sufficient information for a clear assessment of impact.*

› “The lack of familiarity with the language and the relatively short nature of each visit mean that it is difficult to come to a fully informed opinion as to the impact of ICT on pupil outcomes
It is difficult on a short visit to determine how well a school is achieving in this element. There is a clear visual impact with regard to the technology; Interactive Whiteboards in every room will impact on teaching and the ready accessibility of wireless laptops for pupils has the potential to facilitate a range of ICT skills development and the application of skills of support research and learning.

To achieve in this element the school need to demonstrate that pupils are developing their ICT capability and independence of use progressively year on year. The absence of a defined ICT curriculum and of assessment of pupils' ICT achievements means that there is little evidence available to assess this strand of the element.

Pupils do not routinely retain samples of work for evaluation and there is no display of the outcomes of their work in ICT from which range and progression could be determined. Hence it was difficult to see how ICT was impacting on pupils' creativity in the wide range of contexts which ICT readily supports.

From our observations the acquisition of ICT skills seems to be on an ad hoc basis with no formal ICT classes. ICT is not a formally taught subject at the school. We feel there is a need for a more formal base-lining on the pupils' entry to the school and a developmental programme to remediate any shortfalls in pupils' skills within the system. This could be achieved through a discretely taught ICT programme or by mapping the ICT skills development across the range of subjects. These shortfalls could be addressed through online resources made available on the VLE for individual pupil use, if curriculum time is not available.

Teaching on the interactive whiteboards had small impact on some of the students in the classroom. There seems to be a very positive impact when ICT is used to drill different skills or to create and document competence and knowledge. It also seems to heighten the focus in the teaching process for most students and stimulate more senses than traditional teaching.

To us it seems as if the student's level of responsibility follows the shape of an hourglass. At the lowest levels the students are very active learners and make choices in the learning situations. They are made responsible for their own progress. The higher levels of primary are more characterized by teaching, drill and tuned input. This continues in the first years of secondary school, before the more developed learner to a larger extent obtains control of his own learning.
The Dutch schools’ inspectorate has been the driving force of the inspection strand in both P2P and P2V as well as the coordinator of the series of school portraits in the ERNIST project. Building on this experience, partners in the inspection strand built a comprehensive transnational framework for the evaluation of ICT in education.

In P2V, this framework was further developed and was also used in the school strand for school self and peer reviews (see chapter 2 above). The aim of the framework is to serve as an audit tool for self-evaluation and as a roadmap for institutional change towards the e-confident school. It also forms the backbone of the online tool 'TIES' the Toolkit for Investigating E-maturity in Schools.

The framework is accompanied by support materials, the production of which was co-ordinated by Bert Jaap van Oel, to help users gather and present information and evidence:

- A comprehensive user guide that helps the users of this framework (inspectors or schools) in achieving an accurate evaluation
- A self-assessment questionnaire. This questionnaire is filled out by the school that is to be evaluated prior to the actual school visit. It helps the evaluator in focusing on the actual school visit and it saves time as much information is already available and can be analysed in preparation to the visit.
- A lesson observation form. This observation form can be used during the observations of lesson/learning opportunities to describe what was observed. The evaluator can use this form as an aide memoire during the day.
- Interview guidance to be used during the interviews with management, teaching staff and pupils
The framework consists of three main themes: Conditions, Use and Outcomes. Quality areas have been defined within each theme, eight in total. Quality indicators (QI) with corresponding evidence pointers are identified within each quality area. Inspectorates from France, Catalonia, Scotland, Sweden and Lithuania (P2V) and England, Scotland, Ireland (P2P) participated in this work. In P2V, SICI, the Standing International Conference of Inspectorate, was also part of this work package to valorise the ICT assessment framework, testing and using it in different countries.

**METHODOLOGY FOR INSPECTION PEER REVIEWING**

**ORGANISING A SCHOOL VISIT**

The first step in the process is the organisation of a school visit. In P2V each country selects two primary and two secondary schools. It is not advised to use the framework in schools who have made no investments in ICT whatsoever. Opportunity to learn is maximised when schools are visited that have made some progress with ICT, but who also want to identify areas for improvement. Also schools who deem themselves to be at the forefront of ICT could benefit from an evaluation as it helps them in identifying areas for improvement.

It helps if the local evaluator has good general knowledge of the school, e.g. based on a recent inspection or school visit (at most two years ago). This helps in making the school visit more focussed (as a number of questions can be answered prior to the visit or only need relatively little updating) and in making it easier to generalise from the observations during the ICT evaluation to general statements about the school.

When a selection of schools is made, the schools can be contacted by the local evaluator to start planning the visit. It has to be clear that the visit has to contain only things that are normal school practice. This does not imply that parts of the visit cannot be pre-arranged. As the visit tries to evaluate the place and quality of ICT use in a school, there is room for the school to organise lessons, presentations or ICT use that the school thinks to be representative of everyday use. It is the job of the evaluator to verify whether this indeed represents normal school practice. Based on the programme, the observations, the interviews and document review, the evaluator is responsible for making generalisations about the width and breadth of ICT use, or to come to the conclusion that not enough evidence could be found to support a score for that Quality Indicator.
(see also the sections on information gathering and scoring). The school is asked to build a visit programme that contains all the elements of a school visit. The evaluator has to check this programme and sees to it that it contains enough opportunity to gather the needed evidence.

The evaluator sends the school the self-assessment questionnaire at possibly two weeks before the visit. This questionnaire should be returned and disseminated to all the members of the evaluation team leaving them enough time to prepare and analyse. As part of the self-assessment questionnaire, ICT policy plans, school guides, budgets etcetera should also be provided by the school prior to the visit.

**GATHERING EVIDENCE**

The gathering of information starts well before the school visit. During the preparation phase, the evaluator tries to get a picture of what to expect during the school visit: where is the school now, what does it want to achieve, what place does ICT have in general school policy, what do we expect to see in lessons etc. The school website, the self-evaluation questionnaire, ICT policy plans and school guides are analysed. This phase leads to a number of assumptions and expectations that can be tested during the school visit. These assumptions can be drawn up based on the categories in the evaluation framework, e.g. Leadership, Pupils Use, Outcomes etc. E.g. in a school that prides itself in independent student work, one would expect ICT to make a contribution to this independent learning. Besides, some elements (mainly evidence pointers) of the evaluation framework can already be assessed in advance. Of course previous inspection reports and other relevant inspection data about the school should also be consulted.

**During the school visit** there are a number of means to gather evidence. There are enumerated below:

› Guided, planned interviews (with members of staff and pupils. Interview guidance is available for school management, for teachers and for learners)
› Unguided, unplanned interviews (during the visit there is usually opportunity to informally talk to staff and pupils. This is a great opportunity to test out any provisional conclusions and to test questions by others)
› Observations, planned and unplanned (as part of the programme a number of lessons and learning opportunities are arranged. With help of the observation form the observations
are documented. But also when walking through the school, the evaluators can observe what happens in the school. The evaluator that way also gets an idea of how well ICT is integrated in everyday school life, giving him/her an indication of how representative the planned observations are for normal use of ICT in the school.

- Presentations (staff and pupils can present their views, products, experiences etc to the evaluators)
- Document review (also during the school visit, the evaluators can review documents that they come across)
- Review of learning outcomes/products (during the school visit, the evaluators can assess the quality of products that teachers and learners have made)
- Review of learning materials/software etc (it is useful to also take the time to get an overview of the software used in the school and how ICT is integrated into learning materials)

The visit agenda should allow time for these activities, although not all activities will be necessary in every visit. During the visit, the evaluators usually meet twice to discuss their findings: one time halfway the day and once before the final feedback at the end of the visit. When visits take longer then one day, there is a meeting at the end of day one.

**After the school visit** the evaluator takes time to re-assess the evidence in light of the overall picture that has emerged. That means re-reading some of the plans etc. It is not unusual that after the school visit, the policy plans of the school and other documentation such as the self-evaluation questionnaire get new meaning or. The evaluation framework gives hints per quality indicator (QI) as to what sources can be used to gather evidence for the QI.

**USING THE FRAMEWORK**

The framework consists of three main themes: Conditions, Use and Outcomes. There are a number of quality areas (eight in total) within each theme. Quality indicators with corresponding evidence pointers are identified within each quality area.
### Conditions:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1.</td>
<td>Leadership,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3.</td>
<td>Curriculum planning,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2.</td>
<td>Infrastructure and access,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4.</td>
<td>Quality assurance and improvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Use:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U1.</td>
<td>Pupil use,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U3.</td>
<td>Administrative use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U2.</td>
<td>The teaching process,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Outcomes:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O1.</td>
<td>Impact on learning and standards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SCORING

The framework uses a four point scale with 1 being the lowest and 4 being the highest score. The evaluator can also assign a 0 when no observations were made. There is of course a clear distinction between making no observations and assigning a zero and finding no evidence and assigning a 1. The following descriptions can be given of the scores:

- **0. No assessment**: No observations made or not relevant.
- **1. Poor**: There is hardly any positive evidence for a particular indicator.
- **2. Insufficient**: There is not enough positive evidence for a particular indicator.
- **3. Sufficient**: There is enough positive evidence for a particular indicator but improvement is possible.
- **4. Good**: Most or all evidence for a particular indicator is positive.

It should be stressed that the split between insufficient and sufficient is between 2 and 3. When in doubt, the evaluators should discuss among them what score to assign and should seek further evidence, e.g. by discussing the matter with stakeholders or doing more document research. At the moment there is no overall score for the school or for a Quality Area. Only the Quality Indicators are scored. It is worthwhile to experiment with the assigning of an overall score for Quality Areas during the course of the project.

The evaluator can describe specifics for each quality area which led them to assign a certain score under the header “additional remarks”. The final report provides the opportunity to elaborate on the scores and to describe in terms of evidence why a score was assigned.
**SOURCES**
For each QI there are suggestions which sources can be used to evaluate this QI. The following sources are suggested:

- **M** = interview with school management/ICT leaders/coordinators
- **T** = interview with teaching staff
- **L** = interview with learners/pupils/students
- **O** = observations of lessons/learning activities
- **D** = document review; review of self-evaluation questionnaire, policy papers, student products

**EVIDENCE POINTERS**
When using the framework, evaluators can indicate which evidence they found by checking the appropriate boxes and can accordingly assign a score to each Quality Indicator. The more evidence found, the higher the score. Evaluators can also indicate that they found evidence that was not listed here.

**DOCUMENTING EVIDENCE**
During the school visit, it is essential to document evidence found. This can be done in the following ways:

› Filling out the lesson observation forms that are part of the evaluation toolbox
› Taking pictures when appropriate (please assure there is approval of the school to do this. In some cases, when pupils cannot be photographed, please do make pictures of the building, the lay out of classrooms, teachers at work etc)
› Making notes of each interview on the appropriate form
› Making copies of products, documents, learning outcomes, schedules etc
› Writing down remarks and to tick boxes for evidence found (there is room for this in the evaluation framework)
› Keeping all the notes for your reference until after the final school report has been agreed on by the team and the school.

During the visit the aim is to paint a realistic picture of what is happening in the school. A number of measures can help in getting a reliable picture within the relatively short time that the visit takes:
› Prepare the visit well, read the documents, go to the website
› Exchange ideas and hypotheses with your fellow evaluators before the visit.
› Use the evaluation framework already in advance to think about how these questions are applicable to this school
› Have team meetings during the day to exchange and update views and to indentify blind spots for which more information needs to be gathered
› Use different sources, different observers and different types of data gathering to strengthen the picture. For example: talk to leadership about professional development, look at evidence of professional development plans, talk to teachers about their skills and how they mastered them and observe teachers at work with ICT

Use informal time well. When walking around, look at other classrooms, talk to pupils who are busy etc. Try to find out how representative the day is by talking to pupils and by observing their reactions well.

THE EVALUATION TEAM
Each team has one lead-inspector. He/she is in charge of the visit and responsible for the time-keeping and for the evidence gathering. It is advised to have two local team members taking part in the visit. At least one of them should be able to translate what is happening into English. It is useful to, whenever possible split up the team when lesson observations are made. That way, in a relatively short time there is still opportunity to observe a larger number of lessons. One local inspector with the visiting inspector visits for example the lower years, and the other local inspector visits the upper years. The team can of course be larger, but too large a team can disturb the natural flow of the school and is therefore discouraged. Especially in primary schools, a large team can be too overwhelming.

One of the evaluators is the rapporteur. Sometimes this is also the local lead inspector. It can also be that the visiting inspector writes the report in close cooperation with the local inspector. This will be decided upon during the preparation of the school visits with the team members.

WRITING THE REPORT
The rapporteur writes the first draft report based on the notes of observations and
interviews. He or she sends it to the team of evaluators for revision. Based on their notes they can make adjustments and alterations and send it back to the author.

A template report is provided to the evaluation team. Each report has the following format:

**Front page** General information of the school visit

1. **Introduction** › Provide the reader with specifics of this visit. Mentioning the documents that were used

2. **Characteristics of the school** › Describe characteristics that are not part of the evaluation but that help the reader in placing the school in context, such as governance, size, staff and community

3. **The ICT Quality Profile** › Here the scores on the QIs are given (without the evidence pointers)

4. **Reflection on the quality profile** › The evaluators can reflect on the evidence they found for each Quality Area. The evidence pointers can help the author in describing what was observed. Strengths and weaknesses are discussed. The headers of this chapter are: Abstract, Conditions, Use, Outcomes.

5. **Perspective** › Here the evaluators write about what they feel is a good perspective for the school, based on their characteristics, strengths and weaknesses. This discussion should leave room for the school to make their own choices and should not be too prescriptive.

**SNAPSHOTS OF VISITS AND LESSONS LEARNED**

Visits took place to valorise the methodology in Lithuania (four schools), Catalonia (four schools), France (four schools), the Netherlands (two schools) and Sweden6 (four schools). The following report of a school in Sweden is typical of the other 17 in terms of approach and tone.

6 In the actual report the school is named
1. INTRODUCTION

Report Evaluation of the Quality of ICT in Education: XXX School, Sweden
Level: Compulsory school (grades 7-9 pupils 12-16 years old)
Evaluation team: Sven Borgh, Helena Plantin, Hester Visser
Date school visit: March 27, 2008
Report date: June 10, 2008

Documents available in preparation to the visit: › Self-evaluation form.
› Internet homepage.

The overall question of this investigation is: What is the quality of provision and usage of ICT in the school? The inspection framework (Conditions, Use Impact) and its eight indicators were used in assessing this question. Every aspect is built upon a number of indicators and evidence. The school knew the complete most recent version of the framework. As a result of the visit the framework has been adjusted with respect to the description of the evidence at a meeting of the partners on September 19, 2007. The indicators have remained unchanged.

The investigation of the Quality of ICT in Education consists of the following activities:
I. Analysis of the self-evaluation questionnaire and school documents
II. School visit:
   a. meetings with management and ICT-coordinator
   b. meetings with teachers
   c. meetings with students
   d. observations of the use of ICT

In chapter 2 the school will be briefly characterised. The assessment of the different aspects and indicators provides us a Quality Profile of the school (chapter 3). In chapter 4 an examination of the ICT quality is given. Finally there is a short description of the future perspective.

2. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SCHOOL

The school is a municipally run compulsory school. It has 407 pupils between the ages of 12-16 and 40 teachers work in four different teams educating the pupils. The policymakers in the municipality have since December 2004 put up the goal that the schools in the town will be
among the best in the country. In order to achieve that they have presented a plan for developing schools that is followed-up and revised every year. The starting point for the developing plan is always the national curriculum and syllabuses but they don’t specify the use of ICT more than that modern technology and equipment should be used. The school has two principals, one working full time having the juridical responsibility for everything and one working half time being responsible for grade 7. There are 130 computers all connected to Internet, which gives a ratio of 1 computer per 3 pupils for teaching and learning at the school. Most of the computers are placed in classrooms but approximately 33 of them are placed in an open learning resources centre (the Mediatec) where pupils and teachers can get help with ICT use. Some of the old computers are placed in a cafeteria where the pupils who want to play games can do so outside of lesson time. The school also has 7 digital whiteboards, 3 data-projectors, 4 digital video cameras, 5 digital photo cameras and one DAISY-player for recorded textbooks and teaching aids that are especially useful for pupils with some disabilities. The school has one ICT-coordinator who is responsible for the Mediatec and he also suggests what implementations are most prioritized in the yearly budget. Together with the principal he has made a draft towards an ICT-vision and strategy (Appendix A) but the teachers and pupils do not yet know it. The principal tells us that the school has visions and that the personnel know how they work. The first digital whiteboards were bought two years ago and today the seven whiteboards are frequently used by approximately 25 % of the teachers and they are building a bank with digital lessons that is spread at the school. The school has a system with internal TV for fast messages and an Intranet with First Class that can be accessed from home by approximately 90 % of the pupils who have an Internet access and a computer at home. All the pupils have got a mail account and most of the communication between teachers and pupils regarding lessons and homework is done via e-mail. The school has some administrative software for scheduling and grading etc. which the teachers can reach from home.

3. THE ICT QUALITY PROFILE ON MARCH 27, 2008
The ICT Quality is assessed on 8 aspects with 20 indicators in total. The assessment is shown below.
The assessment values are defined as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No assessment No observations made or not relevant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Poor There is hardly any positive evidence for a particular indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Insufficient There is not enough positive evidence for a particular indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sufficient There is enough positive evidence for a particular indicator but improvement is possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Good Most or all evidence for a particular indicator is positive.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure and access</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C2.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum planning</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C3.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality assurance and improvement</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C4.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pupil use</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U1.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The teaching process</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U2.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U2.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U2.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative use</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U3.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U3.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact on learning and standards</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O1.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. REFLECTION ON THE QUALITY PROFILE

In this chapter the evaluators reflect on the quality of the use of ICT in the school.

4.1 Abstract

The school has an ICT infrastructure with 130-networked computers but about 60 % of them are older than 3 years. They also have a variety of other kinds of ICT equipments where the digital whiteboards are the most appreciated among teachers and students. The school has no decided clear vision or strategy for the use of ICT but the school management has formulated a proposal to a vision and strategy that probably will be implemented in the future. About 25 % of the teachers take an active interest in using ICT to enhance both their teaching and the pupils learning and they are building up a bank of digital whiteboard lessons as a resource for the different teacher teams. The Swedish national curriculum only mentions that modern technology and equipment should be used in schools but there are no detailed demands in syllabuses on the use of ICT. Therefore the schools ICT use cannot be evaluated in respect to this but there is a clear ambition in the school to create a local curriculum that takes the use of ICT into account.

4.2 Conditions

The school has acceptable conditions concerning the amount of computers and the network with a high-speed connection to Internet seems to be very good. The Mediatec is a very good resource for both teachers and pupils and it is always possible to get support from the staff when needed. The pupils say that it is much better now, when they have new computers in the Mediatec, and there is never a problem to get a computer when you have to do schoolwork. The students who prefer to play games can use the computers in the cafeteria when they don’t have lessons of course. Approximately 75 % of the teachers
believe that ICT can enhance teaching and learning. The pupils that have missed a lesson where the smart board was used or want to repeat what happened during the lesson can connect via First Class from home and study the notes from the saved smartboard lesson. The principal is very aware of the ICT situation and the need for an implementation plan to raise the competence and enthusiasm among all teachers to use ICT as a tool to improve teaching and learning. The teachers knowledge and skills to communicate with the pupils is however more important than ICT tools.

4.3 Use
The visit shows that the ICT is widely used by the students and that it enhances their learning in many ways. The use of computers in the actual teaching varies between teachers and subjects. The computers are most frequently used in language lessons (especially Spanish) where there is a lot of good exercises but also in other subjects such as science and social studies. In the subject arts - textile- and woodcrafts, digital pictures are sometime published on the web in order to document the work of the pupils. In home economics the students have to use the computer to compose a healthy meal and give the teacher a list of the ingredients needed in preparing the meal. All students use e-mail, Word or PowerPoint to present their work to the teachers. The DAISY equipment is frequently used in language education and in other subjects for pupils with special needs. The teachers' say that professional development is mainly due to the teacher's own initiative and is not a result of a clear school strategy. ICT could be used much more for enhancing the teaching and learning at the school.

4.4 Outcomes
The school has no methods for evaluating the actual outcomes of the ICT use in the school. Even if this evaluation is not made, the school has some informal knowledge of the actual outcomes. Especially the experience from the open learning centre and the digital whiteboards lessons are very positive. The students seem to be satisfied with the possibility of using ICT although they hope that every classroom should have a digital whiteboard and that there were more modern computers available. The pupils feel that
the notes from the whiteboards' lessons are a very good help for better understanding and learning. The school would probably get an even better outcome from ICT use if the implementation and competence enhancement was better planned and followed up.

5 PERSPECTIVES
Inspectors observed a stimulating learning environment, and ICT is integrated in many of the subjects at the school. By broadening the use of ICT to more teachers and subjects the school could find ways to use ICT for enhancing the teaching all over the school. In order to achieve this it is necessary for the school to develop local plans and strategies for the use of ICT. The future perspective for the school leaders is that in 2009 the school will have a new building on the schoolyard with a total of 500 students. The organisation plan of the school is to create four domiciles with classrooms to decrease the crowding and increase the comfort for the pupils. In the centre of the school there will be two open learning centres and Mediatec where the students can get ICT support. The principal is also planning to invest in some new computers both laptops and stationary and some more digital whiteboards. The school management is also aware of the need to produce an implementing plan based on a common and clear ICT-vision and strategy.
PEER LEARNING FOR POLICY MAKING

Peer reviewing between Ministries of Education - as in the P2P and P2V projects - stems from the need to understand the processes by which policy makers can learn from peers working in other educational systems. One of the key underlying principles of peer reviewing is the concept of transferability, is it actually possible to transfer ideas and practice across systems with different histories and organizational structures? This was a key question at the heart of the P2P project.

P2V further developed and valorised the peer learning methodology in new countries (France, Catalonia and Lithuania). The focus of the visits was a central issue linked to the three topics at the core of the project. Digital resources, Digital resources and New learning environments. Visits followed a similar pattern: Preparation of the visit, Peer learning activity, Report from the peers on the observations made at the visit, Reflection on the significance and impact of what is reported.

METHODOLOGY FOR POLICY PEER REVIEWING

The P2V project brought together the idea of peer exchanges and valorisation to refine the methodology developed in the P2P project. Its aim was to enable communities of practice (policy-shapers, inspectors, school leaders in the framework of P2V) to better handle change and innovation on specific issues while taking into account the larger perspective of their national or regional contexts.

For Alan McCluskey of the University of Fribourg, who designed the methodology for policy peer learning, peer exchanges "involve both structured and informal exchange between peers with a view to contributing to the learning of individual participants and organisations as well as the community as a whole on a set of issues defined by the community. However, peer exchange is not necessarily perceived as 'learning' by those taking part in it".

The methodology used in the policy strand combined peer exchange and input from research and development as well as personal experience to empower participants to design innovative solutions to problems they are facing.

The methodology involves five components which lead to formulation of policy solutions: shared understanding; formulating the issue; providing input; designing solutions; and policy shaping.
During peer learning visits, specific technologies or methods were used for each of the headings of the methodology.

**Shared understanding**

This is a crucial part of the learning from peers. Before peer exchanges take place in a formal or informal setting (such as during a peer learning activity), all partners/peers should agree on the terms and methodology to be used. As for school peer reviews (see in ‘Selection of schools and formation of triads’), this is the moment when partners should clearly express and discuss what they expect from the peer reviews and how the aims will be achieved. Also practical matters around the visits can be dealt with at this step. In the case of P2V, this was achieved by a mix of face-to-face and virtual meetings (using Skype). Other web 2.0 technologies were used which allow sharing, commenting and working on the same documents.

**Formulating the issue**

Actors in the home country agree on a key issue for which they consider peer exchange (ie external help from peers working on the same issues or sector) would help. The issue will be the centre of the peer learning activity with the aim to provide policy solutions.

Criteria for the issue include:

- The issue should be able to be addressed by a reasonable policy response (start small, grow big)
- Partners and networks should be able to identify material that might help develop pertinent policy solutions
- The detail and technicalities of the issue are within the experience, interests and knowledge of participants
- The issue has been addressed and at least partially solved in peer countries

A series of preparatory meetings (virtual or not, face to face or asynchronous) can be organized to help the host design the issue. The success of the peer learning exchange will be highly dependent on this ‘issue’ as it is the cornerstone of the peer learning activity.
Providing input
This stage of the methodology covers work done on identifying, annotating and sharing practical experience, policy examples, theories and research and development results that might contribute to imagining possible solutions to the host country’s issue. This step is implemented before and during the visit and involves peer analysis of the issue at stake and how it might best be addressed. Input is provided both by peers but also external experts which are called as support. During the peer learning visit in Barcelona, for example, this methodology was used and a group of experts (inspectors, policy makers…) provided additional support.
Use of online communication tools is encouraged. In Barcelona, the use of the web 2.0 platform Diigo was used as it allows contributing materials in the form of annotated links with an alert system to keep track of ideas about the issue to be dealt with.

Designing solutions
The aim of this stage of the methodology is to draw up possible policy strategies to address the issue raised by the host country and to present these strategies to the host country authorities. The activity takes the form of a two-day face-to-face seminar involving project partners, local actors, and experts (people working in the ministry, inspectors, people from educational services, head teachers, teacher trainers…) along with local authorities at the end of the meeting.
Here are suggested activities for a successful the peer learning visit:
- Presentation of the issue to be dealt with and ice-breaking activities
- Production of a draft policy response in small groups with local actors and experts
- Presentation to participants of group’s ongoing work and building on comments (a ‘spokesperson’ per group should be appointed)
- Sharing or resources on a web-based platform
- Presentation to local authorities from the host country of the policy responses drafted by groups, Q&A
- Evaluation of the peer learning activities and policy responses
Policy shaping

Following the seminar, the major challenge is the transformation of policies and actions in the host country on the basis of the tentative “solutions” developed during the exchange visit. In a podcast for the P2V Blog, Jordi Vivancos, head of the Knowledge and learning technologies unit at the Department of Education of Catalonia, gave the following feedback: “The peer review process and policy developed during the [P2V] seminar has enriched the issue defined previously and validated and confirmed the policy process we are developing at the moment. The contact with International, European experts have allowed us to have a first hand example of good practice already taking place in other European countries. The transversality and systemic approach developed during the seminar will allow for networking internally within the department of education and will be a blueprint for future policies in innovation and ICT implementation.”

SNAPSHOTS OF VISITS AND LESSONS LEARNED
LITHUANIA (VILNIUS)

1 – Format of the visit
› **Participants:** 23 participants from five countries, experts from industry and publishers
› **Issue:** The reuse of digital methodical material (digital resources) and the pedagogical use of units of learning by teachers.
› **Programme:** The visit lasted two and a half days. Sessions included presentations of the Lithuanian issue and its background, input on peer country solutions and discussions on answers to Lithuania’s issue. Discussions and examples focused particularly on Lithuania’s use of IMS LD-compliant Units of Learning and Microsoft’s Virtual Classroom Tour. A Unit of Learning is a course, a module, a lesson or single activity such as a discussion.

2 – Key points made by peers
› Participants from Catalonia presented tools and learning objects developed by XTEC,
Catalonia's Educational Telematic Network such as 'Quaderns virtuals', virtual notebooks and JClic. They commented: "We think that the main question hides another issue: the lack of digital content in Lithuanian language. As Catalan people who speak a minority language, we faced, in the past and nowadays, the same problem."

Participants from France presented the French VLE solution ‘Espace Numérique de Travail (ENT)’. The scheme aims to roll out common VLE in all classrooms in the years ahead to strengthen the education community as well as help parents to be more informed and involved in the education of their children.

3 – Comments on methodology

› The Lithuanian visit showed the difficulties of participants to grasp the full depth of the issue debated.

› When asked about the outcomes of the P2V project, most of the project participants responded to the evaluation study in Lithuania by saying they saw it as a learning experience that would be of use to them individually, to their organisation and to their country. One person hoped that it would improve teaching resources. And the project partner from the host country expected the project to enable him to meet all the stakeholders and get a better understanding of their needs.

SPAIN/CATALONIA (BARCELONA)

1 – Format of the visit

› Participants: Thirty experts and project partners from seven European countries

› Issue: Ways of encouraging innovation in Catalanian schools. Catalonia is currently facing a number of economical and social changes. School is seen as a key player in responding to these changes. However, there is a considerable concern in Catalonia about the efficiency of
schools. Promoting innovation and implementing ICT at school, particularly at a secondary level, is seen as a way to improve ratings, student motivation and overall school performance.

Programme. A two-and-a-half day seminar with three work groups created to design in parallel policy solutions, a pool of 10 experts were on hand to advise the groups. At the end of the seminar, a session was organised to present, in Catalan, the outcomes of three workgroups’ discussions and suggest appropriate policy actions.

2 – Key points made by peers

In designing ‘innovative policies’, finding the balance between “innovativeness” and “acceptability” is a challenge. It is perhaps not surprising in the first of such seminars that seeking acceptance was a priority (over groundbreaking innovation which would have little chance of been adopted).

Those not directly involved in policy-making were able to get a better understanding of the demands of such a process and those concerned with policy-making were able to gain wider involvement and support in developing policy ideas.

The process provided leverage for those ideas to go forward into practice, capitalising on the interest expressed by the authorities present at the final session.

3 – Comments on methodology

Some participants were more sceptical than others about the methodology and the real effects such meetings to ‘shape’ policy have on actual policy making. Comments such as these raised valid questions about the extent to which “policy-shapers” and others believe they can influence policy formulation.

The level to which participants are involved in policy making/shaping is crucial: “A lot of people didn’t have much to do with policy and confused operational work with higher level policy and strategy” mentioned a group chair.
One of the group chairs mentioned whoever that the diversity of perspectives in the groups was both a source of learning and a challenge. Additionally, it was acknowledged and explained that a wide base of people could be directly involved in formulating policy solutions.

The idea of working in groups was often praised during the evaluation: "An enriching process." Additionally, the dynamics of working in groups and presenting outcomes with the whole group allowed cross fertilisation between the groups, with some adopting ideas from other groups.

FRANCE (PARIS)

1 – Format of the visit

- **Participants:** P2V partners from France, Lithuania and Catalonia and invited French experts. The visit included also meetings with head teachers, teachers and representatives from local pedagogical resource centres.
- **Issue:** French experiences in using ICT and Learning Management Systems (LMS), one of the priority actions of the French Ministry of Education for the coming years.
- **Programme:** The two and a half day meeting was divided into sessions at the CIEP featuring introduction to the French education system as well as to the French Virtual Learning Environments. On the second day, three visits were organised to see how ICT are implemented on the ground in the Academy of Versailles: to a pedagogical resource and training centre (CDDP of Boulogne), and to two secondary schools (Lycée Auffray of Clichy and Collège N. 4 of Goussainville).

2 – Key points made by peers

- Peers from Lithuania from the Centre of IT of Education the mentioned similarities and differences. For instance the scheme to provide newly graduated teachers with a USB key containing teaching resources was seen as inspirational. Lithuania faces similar challenges to France in the area of in-service training for teachers, but in Lithuania in-service training activities are compulsory for all teachers.
- Jordi Vivancos, head of the Knowledge and learning technologies unit at the Department of Education of Catalonia reported on interesting common points between the French
and Catalan education systems: “Many common trends have been identified between Catalonia and the Academy of Versailles, thus it could be useful to establish some bilateral relations”. The main challenge we see in Catalonia, he said, is scaling up ICT use explain Mr Vivencos, some question did arise from the visit such as will VLEs be deployed in primary education? Or are VLEs capable to deliver personalised educational content based? How are educational content editors involved in this project? Is there a student digital identity model interoperable between VLEs? One of the key approaches which was of great interest was the ability of France to develop public private partnership to provide VLEs, the approach of government and industry partnerships developed in France have proven great success and need also a further consideration.

› An invited expert from the UK, Gareth Davies, e-Learning Manager at the Education ICT Service from the Cambridgeshire County Council (UK) reported on similarities and differences between the French and UK experiences in LMS: “France appears to be ahead of other countries in identity authentication. They appear to have solved the problem of logins and identity management. The challenge facing Cambridgeshire (and many other areas of the UK) is how to implement systems that enable schools to work together using their existing technologies. There is much work to be done around standards-based developments, such as Shibboleth for single-sign on to multiple systems and the, recently-adopted, SIF (Schools Interoperability Framework) standard for data exchange.

3 – Comments on methodology

› The methodology used in P2V was applied to a lesser extend during the French P2V, focusing more on showcasing experiences from host country and collecting comments and experiences from peers.
“The P2V visit had provided a clear and detailed view of the state of the art of the ICT policies and current ICT projects in French education both at national and regional level” (Catalan participant)

“These contributions and inputs coming from all the participants are very useful for reflection on the actions France has undertaken in ICT” (French participant)

“As is often the case, looking at someone else’s situation makes you look at your own far more critically. In the light of our visit to the Versailles Academy, I will be looking particularly at how they have developed their online resources and whether we could replicate the idea of a USB key for newly-qualified teachers” (UK participant)

**EUN PEER LEARNING PROJECTS**

Three projects supported with funding from the European Commission Directorate General for Education and Culture form the genesis of European Schoolnet’s (EUN) work in the area of peer learning. Together with several European partners, EUN aimed to consistently refine and develop methodologies for school description, evaluation techniques, peer and self assessment frameworks, tools and techniques at the heart of the peer learning projects. The ultimate aim is to identify what constitute an innovative/e-mature school (School/practice strand), how innovative policies are implemented and bring about change (Policy strand) and how inspectors assess and evaluate school e-readiness and e-maturity at the local, national and European level (Inspection strand).

At the end of the P2V project, a constellation of tools, techniques and methodology exists to help identify change happening in schools in Europe as they adapt to the opportunities and challenges of 21st century technological opportunities.
ernerst

The purpose of the European Research Network for ICT in Schools of Tomorrow (ERNIST) was to create a network of leading experts and institutions in research and evaluation of ICT in learning and innovative schools. It has brought together researchers and education inspectorates from The Netherlands, the UK, Finland, Austria, Belgium and Switzerland. The project under the eLearning programme ran over two years from October 2002 until spring 2004. It has brought together researchers and education inspectorates to investigate and exchange effectively their insights into the use of ICT in schools. A major outcome of the project which served as a basis for P2P was 20 school portraits from six countries which offered decision-makers a valuable insight into the innovation happening in today’s schools. 

http://schoolportraits.eun.org

P2P

Peer Reviews and Observatory on Policy and Practice in ICT (P2P) was a project within the framework of the European Commission eLearning programme from January 2004 to April 2006. The purpose of P2P was to aggregate and expand existing activities related to identifying, sharing and transferring excellence in the policy and practice of e-learning in school systems at regional, national and European level. The P2P project took place in three strands: Policy Peer Reviews, Inspectorate Peer Reviews and (School) Practice Peer Reviews and included:

Three policy peer reviews: in Ministries of Education of Northern Ireland, France and Finland to develops a closer dialogue between senior officials working on eLearning policy. Partners from the CTIE (Switzerland, self funded) and Nottingham University provide the framework for the reviews and produce analytical review reports looking into the transfer and scalability of discussed policy examples.

Fourteen practice peer reviews: school leaders and teachers in schools from France (four), Northern Ireland (four), Finland (four), France (four) and The Netherlands (two), were paired for peer learning activities. Researchers from the University of Helsinki, The
Open University, UK and the centre for international education studies in France provided the methodological framework or input for the mutual peer learning experience.

**Six inspection peer reviews:** Under the lead of the Dutch inspectorate, inspectors of education from England, Scotland, Ireland, France, Sweden and The Netherlands evaluated their instruments, participated in school visits and worked, thanks to the process of peer learning, on a better understanding of the context they work in, of the way they operate during school visits and of the place of ICT in increasing the quality of education.

More about P2P: [http://p2p.eun.org](http://p2p.eun.org)

**P2V**

Peer to Peer networking for Valorisation (P2V) was a two-year project supported by the European Commission Directorate General for Education and Culture from January 2007 to December 2009. The project aimed to help teachers, inspectors and policy makers discover methods, pedagogies and inspection schemes in other countries using peer learning.

**Partners in the project**

› EUN Partnership AISBL Belgium (coordinator),
› Inspectorate of Education, The Netherlands
› Regional Training Unit, Northern Ireland
› Centre International d’Etudes Pédagogiques, France
› Centre of Information Technologies of Education, Lithuania
› Departament d’Educació, Catalonia, Spain
› UNI-C, Denmark
› ENIS, Austria.
› Did@ctic, University of Fribourg, Switzerland (self-funded)
› Directorate for Education and Training, Norway (Self-funded).
Partners worked on three topics that are significant in widening the uptake of e-learning in schools: Digital resources: accessing, sharing across borders, common standards; Digital literacy: competent, effective and responsible use of technology by all; New learning environments: online learning, future schooling models.
The P2V project took place in three strands: Policy Peer Reviews, Inspectorate Peer Reviews and School Peer Reviews and included:

**Three policy peer reviews:** in Ministries of Education in Lithuania, Spain (Catalonia) and France organised peer learning visits to exchange experience and views on the use of ICT in three contrasting education systems. From the visits emerged some key points related to successful ICT adoption in education systems.

**Sixteen school peer reviews:** Schools from Denmark, Norway, UK (Northern Ireland), Spain (Catalonia), the Netherlands and Austria participated in peer learning activities. In P2V it was decided to create triads of schools peer reviewing each other. The approach was for all schools, while picking up ideas from all three topics of the project, to look more specifically at the topic of new learning environment and apply the P2P methodology to peer review innovative activities in these areas.

**Six inspection peer reviews:** Under the leadership of the Dutch inspectorate, Inspector of Education from France, Catalonia, Scotland, Sweden and Lithuania engaged in peer learning activities with support from the Standing International Conference of Inspectorate (SICI). The aim of the strand was to valorise the ICT assessment framework developed by inspectorates in the P2P project, testing and using it in different countries and look into the possibilities of adapting it for use as an audit tool for self-evaluation and as a roadmap for institutional change towards school e-maturity.
EUROPEAN SCHOOLNET (EUN) is an international partnership of 31 European Ministries of Education developing learning for schools, teachers and pupils across Europe. EUN runs leading European education portals for teaching, learning, collaboration, and innovation with a vibrant European community of educators and learners. It provides information on policy, strategy and school practice for policy-makers and education professionals and fosters technical innovation, and interoperability through common standards so as to enable closer collaboration between European educational systems and improve efficiency and cost-effectiveness.

www.eun.org | www.europeanschoolnet.org

INSIGHT is EUN’s observatory for the latest elearning developments in educational policy, interoperability and school innovation. Key documents in INSIGHT include country reports on ICT in education, thematic dossiers, surveys, the monthly insight into interoperability, school portraits on innovative practices and research findings relevant to schools and policy makers. Themes are transversally interlinked and access is given to outside resources, elearning networks and observatories.

insight.eun.org
With the support of the eLearning programme of the European Union