



Inspectie van het Onderwijs  
*Ministerie van Onderwijs, Cultuur en  
Wetenschap*

**INSPECTION FRAMEWORK 2017**  
for the monitoring of  
Upper Secondary Vocational Education

1 July 2018

## **CONTENTS**

### **1 INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 Statutory framework for upper secondary vocational education
- 1.2 Robustness requirements and self-defined quality factors
- 1.3 Subjects of monitoring and inspection
- 1.4 Operation and evaluation
- 1.5 Document structure and guide for readers

### **2 BETTER EDUCATION, GOOD GOVERNANCE, APPROPRIATE MONITORING**

- 2.1 Key principles of monitoring and the role of the supervisory authority
- 2.2 Broad outline of monitoring activities
  - 2.2.1 Guaranteeing a basic level of quality
  - 2.2.2 Encouragement to improve: self-defined quality factors
  - 2.2.3 Uniform monitoring and customised monitoring
  - 2.2.4 Alignment with the responsibility of the governing body
- 2.3 Sector developments
  - 2.3.1 Strengthening assessment
  - 2.3.2 Collaboration between vocational education and the business community

### **3 THE EVALUATION FRAMEWORK**

- 3.1 Statutory tasks of upper secondary vocational education
- 3.2 Structure of the evaluation framework
- 3.3 Quality areas and standards
  - Educational Process quality area
  - Assessment and Certification quality area
  - School Environment quality area
  - Educational Outcomes quality area
  - Quality Assurance and Ambition quality area
  - Financial Management quality area
- 3.4 Other statutory requirements

**ANNEX 1: BENCHMARKING AND EVALUATION OF EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES**

**ANNEX 2: EVALUATION FRAMEWORK AND NON-GOVERNMENT-FUNDED UPPER SECONDARY VOCATIONAL EDUCATION**

**ANNEX 3: EVALUATION FRAMEWORK FOR GENERAL SECONDARY EDUCATION FOR ADULTS**

**Mission: Effective monitoring for better education**

*(From: The Education Inspectorate Long-Term Policy Plan, 2015–2020)*

Every child is entitled to a good education. Students and parents should be able to have confidence in the quality of the education provided by a school/programme. The governing body is responsible for the quality of the education and must be accountable for the results. This concerns results in the general sense; are all students receiving an education of sufficient quality, are schools/programmes and institutions complying with laws and regulations, and do they have their finances in order? The Education Inspectorate monitors these matters. It also produces solicited and unsolicited reports on developments in education, with the aim of improving education as a whole.

Good education is the ambition; through our monitoring, we aim to contribute to ongoing quality improvement across all schools and programmes. We put the student and the learning process at the heart of our work. We want to encourage all schools and programmes in the Netherlands to improve, at the level of the governing bodies and their schools/programmes as well as at the system level. We assume that all improvements will have an impact on the classroom. We work on behalf of the government and society, based on the trust we have earned. Better education is the public interest that we place at the heart of our monitoring. If we can contribute to improving education in the Netherlands, we will know we have been effective.

## **1 INTRODUCTION**

The 2017 Education Inspectorate Inspection Framework (hereafter: the Inspection Framework) describes the arrangements for monitoring of upper secondary vocational education. The Inspection Framework includes the evaluation framework and the procedures. The introduction starts by describing the statutory framework which constitutes the basis for monitoring, before moving on to the scope and operation of the Inspection Framework.

The most recent version of the Inspection Framework was adopted on 1 July 2018 and will take effect on 1 August 2018. You can find a summary of the changes from the 1 August 2017 version at [www.onderwijsinspectie.nl](http://www.onderwijsinspectie.nl).

### **1.1 STATUTORY FRAMEWORK FOR UPPER SECONDARY VOCATIONAL EDUCATION**

The Education Inspection Act (WOT, 2002) constitutes the basis for monitoring. Under this Act, monitoring of upper secondary vocational education is entrusted to the Inspectorate, which is tasked with assessing and promoting the quality of education, including the quality of teaching staff in institutions as referred to in the Adult and Vocational Education Act (WEB) and the Adult and Vocational Education in the Caribbean Netherlands Act (WEB BES).

The Inspection Framework covers all institutions (government-funded and non-government-funded) that provide education based on the above statutes. These institutions include regional training centres (ROCs), agricultural training centres (AOCs), specialist trade schools, universities of applied sciences offering upper secondary vocational education, and examination agencies. This Inspection Framework also covers monitoring of general secondary education for adults, other adult education, and education in the Caribbean Netherlands. Further details on these types of education can be found in Chapter 11.

### **1.2 ROBUSTNESS REQUIREMENTS AND SELF-DEFINED QUALITY FACTORS**

The Education Inspection Act (WOT) was amended with effect from 1 July 2017. The amendment prescribes that in its monitoring, the Inspectorate will make a distinction between the robustness requirements mandated by law and quality factors defined by governing bodies and programmes. Robustness requirements are general, objectifiable quality standards, defined in law as far as possible and sufficiently clear-cut that they guarantee freedom of direction and structure. The robustness requirements cover quality of education, assessment and financial management. They are often summarised under the term 'basic level of quality'.

A programme that does not comply with the robustness requirements is providing education of insufficient quality. Insufficient quality of education, insufficient quality of assessments and/or inadequate financial management can lead to penalties, and as a last resort to intervention by the Minister. As part of its quality assurance function, the Inspectorate ensures compliance with the robustness requirements as set out in the relevant statutes.

Self-defined quality factors relate to the ambitions and objectives set by a governing body which extend beyond a basic level of quality. The Inspectorate discusses these with programmes and governing bodies, so that it can give a complete picture in its reports of the quality of a programme and/or institution. In its reports, the Inspectorate draws a clear distinction between judgements relating to robustness requirements and findings relating to self-defined quality factors.

### **1.3 SUBJECTS OF MONITORING AND INSPECTION**

Institutions as defined in the WEB are subjects of monitoring. The WEB uses the term 'competent authority', referring to the governing body of the institution, which acts as the point of contact. Certain programmes<sup>1</sup> may also be subjects of monitoring. The WEB contains rules for designing programmes which must be followed by the governing body. This Inspection Framework is therefore based partly on monitoring at the governance and programme level. Judgements with legal consequences can be issued only at the level of the subject of monitoring, i.e. the governing body, and at the programme level (for programmes listed in the National Register of Professional Training Courses).

A subject of inspection is anything examined by the Inspectorate with a view to forming an evaluation or judgement of a programme or its governance. Such an examination may be done at the level of a location, an education or training team, or a qualification file.

#### **1.4 OPERATION AND EVALUATION**

The Inspection Framework will take effect on 1 August 2018. Ongoing interventions and agreements made under the existing regulatory frameworks will continue in force until that date. Statutory provisions that were still in development or had not yet taken effect at the time of drafting of this framework are cited in square brackets.

In accordance with the provisions of the WOT, the Inspectorate has consulted with all relevant parties concerning the Inspection Framework. In refining the robustness requirements for inclusion in the evaluation framework, the Inspectorate believes it has adopted a reasonable interpretation of the law. That interpretation has been arrived at with the agreement of the education sector.

An evaluation of the operation and effects of the Inspection Framework will be conducted by 1 January 2022 at the latest, by which time the first four-year cycle will have been completed.

The new framework remains subject to change at any time, either in whole or in part, as a result of experiences with its use or wider political, societal or educational developments.

#### **1.5 DOCUMENT STRUCTURE AND GUIDE FOR READERS**

The Inspection Framework includes the procedures and the evaluation framework. A broad outline of the procedures and the fundamental principles behind them are set out in Chapter 2. The evaluation framework can be found in Chapter 3 and the benchmarking and judgement protocols in Chapter 4. Chapters 5, 6 and 7 describe the Inspectorate's procedures when inspecting governing bodies and their programmes. Chapter 8 explains how the results of these inspections are reported and how the Inspectorate communicates these results. Chapter 9 describes the interventions and penalties that may follow the inspection judgements. In Chapter 10 we explain how we organise systemic inspections. Finally, Chapter 11 contains an overview of educational facilities subject to specific legislation and hence a modified evaluation framework. This relates to non-government-funded education, general secondary education for adults, other adult education, education in the Caribbean Netherlands and examination agencies. For the sake of completeness, the full evaluation frameworks can be found in the annexes.

---

<sup>1</sup> Programmes consisting of both courses leading to qualifications and optional courses. These qualifications are listed in the National Register of Vocational Courses and have a 'CREBO' number.

## 2 BETTER EDUCATION, GOOD GOVERNANCE, APPROPRIATE MONITORING

The Dutch education sector is performing better all the time. The number of programmes judged 'Unsatisfactory' is falling, and 'Weak' or 'Very Weak' programmes are increasingly managing to bring their educational quality up to a 'Satisfactory' level and keep it there. This is good news. But programmes which are already performing well also need to seize every opportunity to improve. That is good for all students and good for society.<sup>2</sup> This is where the principal challenge of the next few years lies, for every sector of education. This challenge requires governing bodies to work to build a quality culture, which obviously means that all parties involved must continually strive for improvement, even if the basic level of quality has been reached.

We support this in our monitoring by helping to ensure that the basic level of quality and financial management standards are and continue to be met, and by encouraging governing bodies to fully harness the potential for improvement that we observe in programmes as they strive to achieve high levels of educational quality. We summarise these two roles as the 'quality assurance' and 'encouragement' functions of monitoring.

In this chapter, we describe the broad outline of our monitoring: what we hope to achieve with our monitoring and the key principles under which we operate.

### 2.1 KEY PRINCIPLES OF MONITORING AND THE ROLE OF THE SUPERVISORY AUTHORITY

Ownership of educational quality rests with governing bodies<sup>3</sup> and their programmes. The governing bodies are ultimately responsible for the quality and continuity of education. For this reason, we apply a governance-focused approach. Based on our quality assurance and encouragement functions, in our evaluation framework we make a clear distinction between the basic level of quality (what the governing body and programme must do) and the self-defined quality ambitions (what they want to do). We operate transparently, with all quality information in the public domain. At the systemic level we aim to find solutions to problems common to multiple institutions, and we set agendas to do so. We hope this Inspection Framework will encourage more self-evaluation and peer evaluation by governing bodies. Our monitoring aims to support this practice.

More specifically, the Inspection Framework assists us in the following tasks:

- *Ensuring* that, at the very least, institutions (governing bodies and programmes) meet the basic quality standard;
- *Intervening* at institutions where the governing body and/or programmes are not meeting the basic quality standard, to bring them up to that standard as quickly as possible;
- *Encouraging* both governing bodies and programmes to formulate their own ambitions and to pursue them in a focused manner;
- *Reporting* on the state of education at both institutional and systemic levels;
- *Setting agendas* where solutions are required for systemic issues in the education sector;
- *Communicating* with interested parties about monitoring information relating to the performance of the system and of governing bodies and programmes.

### 2.2 BROAD OUTLINE OF MONITORING ACTIVITIES

---

<sup>2</sup> 'Toezicht in transitie' (Monitoring in transition). Letter to the Lower House of Parliament, 33905, No. 1, 2013–2014.

<sup>3</sup> Non-government-funded institutions do not always have a governing body; they may have a director or owner, for example. In this Inspection Framework, the term 'governing body' refers to the person or body having final responsibility for compliance with the statutory requirements.

The substance of the Inspection Framework is structured as described below.

### **2.2.1 Guaranteeing a basic level of quality**

Society must be able to have confidence that students are receiving an education of sufficient quality. We call this a 'basic level of quality'. The standard for this basic level of quality is that a governing body and its programmes meet the robustness requirements with regard to educational quality, quality assurance and financial management as set out in the evaluation framework.

In performing our quality assurance function, it is important for us to obtain a good insight into the financial continuity of institutions and the risks inherent in programmes with regard to educational quality. Accordingly, we continually monitor performance and carry out a performance analysis of each governing body at least once a year. In addition, once every four years we inspect all governing bodies and a selection of their programmes. This four-yearly inspection enables us to determine whether the governing body is taking adequate steps to ensure educational quality and sound financial management. If our analysis and/or inspection shows that a programme is not meeting the basic quality standard, our interventions will focus on helping the governing body remedy the matter so as to ensure that the programme complies with the relevant robustness requirements within an acceptable timeframe. The same applies to any shortcomings observed with regard to the governing body itself.

Each year, in the context of our systemic monitoring inspections (see Chapter 10), we specify in our annual work plan which robustness requirements we will be inspecting in one or more sectors.

### **2.2.2 Encouragement to improve: self-defined quality factors**

We are strict where we have to be, and encouraging wherever possible. In addition to ensuring a basic level of quality, in upper secondary vocational education we try to give a greater emphasis to the factors defined by governing bodies and programmes.

Within the upper secondary vocational education sector, over the past few years a great deal of attention has been given to institutions acquiring an insight into their own levels of educational quality and to the targeted implementation of improvements. When institutions learn from each other through quality networks, a collective picture emerges of definitions of 'good education', and how this could be evaluated by other institutions (through peer reviews). The sector has shown that it considers itself responsible for continuous improvement and for guaranteeing educational quality, and that it hopes to shape these matters by working collaboratively.

We support this through our monitoring in the following way: based on our evaluation of compliance with the robustness requirements, we assign a judgement of 'Satisfactory' or 'Unsatisfactory'. For a 'Good' evaluation, in addition to the robustness requirements the self-defined quality factors must also be met. If a governing body or programme meets the basic quality standard, we then look at the goals and ambitions formulated by the governing body and the programme and how they are being implemented. Ideally, information about the implementation of these goals should come from independent experts. We aim to encourage the governing body and programmes to establish for themselves whether the education they are providing deserves to be rated as 'Good'. If governing bodies and programmes are successful, we can include that information in our report as an example of good practice.

During our inspections, we look at whether a programme has an improvement culture: a collective desire not only to bring educational quality up to the level of 'Satisfactory', but to continue to



improve on an ongoing basis. If the programme does have such an improvement culture, there is scope to take the educational quality as a whole to a higher level. In our encouraging role we aim to actively contribute to the above approach.

Our encouraging role is also reflected in the style of our conversations with programmes and governing bodies. At the start of the inspection, we give programmes an opportunity to present their vision and ambitions and explain how these are reflected in their educational practice. Once we have completed the inspection we arrange feedback sessions. Through their own case studies, programmes and governing bodies also gain greater insight into our judgement protocols, which provides them with concrete starting points for improvement. Finally, our encouragement role is reflected in our reports. Where programmes do not meet the robustness requirements, we state this in our reports; however, we also note in our reports any examples of good practice that we find. This ensures we provide a balanced picture of the level of quality we observed.

### **2.2.3 Uniform monitoring and customised monitoring**

Governing bodies and programmes organise their education in such a way that it is optimally adapted to their target group and ensures the continuous development of students. We have noticed an increase in the diversity of both conventional and experimental forms of teaching and organisation, as well as in the number of combined governing bodies. Accordingly, for primary education, secondary education, special education and upper secondary vocational education we largely apply a common evaluation framework, which can be used to assess any of the wide range of programmes we encounter in practice. This ensures that our monitoring is uniform for all governing bodies delivering programmes under multiple sector-specific statutes. We focus our inspections to ensure we arrive at meaningful judgements. We tailor our inspection activities based on an institution's educational setup.

If a governing body works with a community of upper secondary vocational education colleges, that will affect how we conduct our inspection. In certain situations, we also involve college directors in our inspections. Any interventions in the context of remedying non-compliance with the robustness requirements are directed at the governing body. The customisation we strive to achieve relates to alignment not only with an institution's organisation of education, but also with the governing body's responsibility for educational quality.

### **2.2.4 Alignment with the responsibility of the governing body**

The governing body is responsible for the quality and continuity of education. Each governing body has its own process for ensuring and developing educational quality; that specific process forms the starting point for our monitoring.

In parallel with the annual performance analysis, once every four years we conduct a governance-focused inspection of the governing body's quality assurance and financial management. We first examine whether the governing body has a clear picture of educational quality, so that it can implement any improvements that may be necessary, and whether the finances are in order. We conduct an audit as part of the four-yearly inspection. We do this for a selection of programmes, which ensures that the inspection provides us with insight into the quality of the education delivered in the inspected programmes, and the financial management by the governing bodies concerned. In our investigation, we look at whether the governing body has taken into consideration the importance of small-scale and identifiable education for its students. Our investigation covers both high-risk programmes and those that are performing well; the latter may be inspected at the request of the governing body (see paragraph 5.2.4). Governing bodies have a great deal of knowledge and information about their programmes, and programmes themselves gather all kinds of information to

obtain insights into their own educational quality and financial management. We incorporate this information in our monitoring.

As governing bodies and programmes begin to apply better management and quality assurance processes, they will be able to provide more reliable information about the quality of their education. In turn, we will trust them more and give them more space. Where governing bodies and internal monitoring are working well, society can have confidence that the level of quality is assured. In cases where a basic level of quality has not been achieved and the governing body has proved incapable of making changes, we will adjust our monitoring accordingly. We summarise this as 'appropriate monitoring': less monitoring where possible, more where necessary.

## **2.3 SECTOR DEVELOPMENTS**

The upper secondary vocational education sector is constantly changing and we try to allow for that in our monitoring. Set out below are a number of developments which (over time) will lead to legislative amendments and/or which had an impact on how monitoring was conducted when the Inspection Framework was first introduced.

### **2.3.1 Strengthening assessment**

The examination board plays an essential role in ensuring the quality of the assessment and certification of students. It is responsible for ensuring that assessment and certification meet all quality requirements. As of 1 August 2017, the tasks and powers of examination boards in upper secondary vocational education have been strengthened and the boards have been given a number of new tasks. The same applies to the tasks and powers of the competent authority vis-à-vis the examination board.

As a result of the legislative amendment, we have given quality assurance of the examination board a more prominent place in the Inspection Framework. We start by evaluating whether the examination board is providing quality assurance of the assessment tools, the administration and grading of assessments, and certification. Depending on our initial judgement in this matter, we then decide how much our investigation should focus on assessment and certification. This means that we perform limited verification where possible, but a comprehensive inspection where necessary. We hope that this will boost the further development of an internal quality culture that is responsible for long-term quality assurance of assessment and certification. We will start applying this procedure once the Inspection Framework takes effect.

#### *Implementation 2016–2020*

From 1 August 2017, programmes must comply with the new requirements for examination boards. In evaluating the three assessment standards, we follow the procedure described above, in which the examination board is the starting point for our monitoring. Depending on our judgement of the functioning of the examination board, we determine how we will investigate whether the other two standards are also being met with a sufficient level of quality. However, at this stage we expect that a full inspection into assessment quality, focusing on both the quality of the assessment tools and administration/grading, will be scheduled more frequently than a limited verification of the examination board's performance in the quality assurance area. As the policy-related implementation becomes increasingly successful our monitoring will be adjusted accordingly. We will then limit ourselves to a simple verification.

#### *Quality label/certification of assessment suppliers*

As part of evaluating the quality of the assessment tools used by programmes, we will be closely following the quality label/certification process over the coming years. Although, in principle,

verification based on the operations of the examination board should suffice, for the first few years we will look at whether quality labels are being issued appropriately by the certifying authority. We will then involve external experts in the evaluation of the assessment tools.

If our judgement of an assessment tool used by a programme is unsatisfactory, the judgement of the Inspectorate will be decisive for the programme concerned. We will then discuss our findings from our monitoring of the programmes with the authority that issued the quality label. If, in our judgement, an assessment tool used by a programme is satisfactory, it is possible that we will not have to do a similarly in-depth investigation in the future, if we encounter the same assessment tool again in the same or a different programme. We expect that this procedure will contribute to growing confidence in the quality labels/certificates.

### **2.3.2 Collaboration between vocational education and the business community**

Innovation is driving increasingly swift and radical changes in the economy and in society. The labour market is also becoming increasingly dynamic. Upper secondary vocational education institutions – in conjunction with the professional world – must respond quickly to current developments in society and in the labour market. Collaboration between upper secondary vocational education institutions and both the nationally-organised and the regional/local business communities is important to ensure education is aligned as smoothly as possible with professional practice. Active dialogue is therefore necessary between upper secondary vocational education institutions and the professional world.

In the Foundation for Cooperation between Vocational Education, Training and the Labour Market (SBB), the vocational education sector and the business community work together to give students good practical training with job prospects. This ensures that businesses get the professionals they need, now and in the future.

The Inspectorate is charged with monitoring the SBB's performance of its statutory tasks as defined in the WEB (s. 1.5.1) and in conjunction with that statute, the Secondary Education Act (WVO) (s. 10b(4)). The procedure and the evaluation framework are described separately in the Inspection Framework. The SBB Inspection Framework took effect on 1 August 2016. Upper secondary vocational education institutions and the SBB are interdependent with regard to the quality of the qualification structure and qualification files, and the quality of work-based learning. The way in which upper secondary vocational education institutions and the SBB harness this interdependence is subject to monitoring by the Inspectorate. We therefore incorporate into our monitoring of the SBB reports from education institutions about qualification files, work-based learning, recognition of training companies and the role of the SBB in general.

### **3 THE EVALUATION FRAMEWORK**

In this chapter, we describe the upper secondary vocational education evaluation framework. After summarising the statutory tasks of upper secondary vocational education (Paragraph 3.1), we describe the structure of the framework in Paragraph 3.2. Paragraph 3.3 then sets out the evaluation framework. In the final paragraph (3.4) we look at the other statutory requirements.

Chapter 11 contains an overview of educational facilities subject to specific legislation and hence a modified evaluation framework. This relates to non-government-funded education, general secondary education for adults, other adult education, education in the Caribbean Netherlands and examination agencies. For the sake of completeness, the full evaluation frameworks can be found in the annexes.

#### **3.1 STATUTORY TASKS OF UPPER SECONDARY VOCATIONAL EDUCATION**

Pursuant to section 1.2.1 of the WEB, upper secondary vocational education has three objectives:

1. Theoretical and practical preparation of students to practise the professions for which a vocational qualification is required or would be useful;
2. Promoting the general education and personal development of students;
3. Creating a connection with pre-vocational education (VMBO) and senior general secondary education (HAVO).

Based on section 1.3.5 of the WEB, institutions should therefore ensure the accessibility of education, provide efficient learning pathways, and offer opportunities for career orientation and guidance. The WEB goes on to set out requirements which must be met by the governing body of each institution; these are operationalised in the evaluation framework. The basis for the evaluation framework can primarily be found in the following statutory requirements.

The governing body must:

- Set up a quality assurance system, and in connection with that system, regularly evaluate the quality of the education provided (s. 1.3.6 WEB);
- Ensure that both curriculum and assessment are of high quality and well organised (s. 7.4.8(1) WEB);
- Design the curriculum in accordance with the requirements set out in the qualification file and the associated optional courses (s. 7.1.2(2) WEB);
- Design its education programme in a way that is balanced and allows students to both obtain the qualification and complete the associated optional courses within the set duration of studies (s. 7.2.7(1) WEB);
- Inform interested parties and render an account to them: students and parents, the student council, the parents' council (if any), the works council, the supervisory board and the government (s. 1.3.6, s. 2.5.4, s. 6.1.3a, s. 7.4.8(2) WEB, Chapter 8a WEB, s. 9.1.4 WEB);
- Manage its financial resources in such a way that the proper operation and survival of the institution are assured (s. 2.8.3 WEB);
- Spend the government funding effectively and legitimately (s. 2.5.3 and 2.5.4 WEB).

#### **3.2 STRUCTURE OF THE EVALUATION FRAMEWORK**

The evaluation framework is divided into six quality areas: Educational Process, Assessment and Certification, School Environment, Educational Outcomes, Quality Assurance and Ambition, and Financial Management. The evaluation framework is used to answer the three basic questions about students' education: are they learning enough (Educational Outcomes and Assessment and Certification), are they being taught well (Educational Process) and are they safe (School

Environment). The standards in these areas reflect the essence of the education received by the students. The Quality Assurance & Ambition and Financial Management areas examine the conditions for a robust, long-term level of quality. We therefore define educational quality as the overall performance of the programme in these areas. Each standard within the quality area has been operationalised on the basis of the relevant robustness requirements.

#### *Specific applications of the evaluation framework*

Specific laws and regulations relating to educational facilities as defined in paragraph 1.1 are also reflected in an evaluation framework. Chapter 11 contains an overview of these specific forms of education, with reference to the statutory framework. For the sake of completeness, the relevant evaluation frameworks are included in full in the annexes.

The evaluation framework for upper secondary vocational education is structured as follows:<sup>4</sup>

### **QUALITY AREAS AND STANDARDS IN UPPER SECONDARY VOCATIONAL EDUCATION**

<b>OP</b>	<b>EDUCATIONAL PROCESS</b>
OP1	Curriculum
OP2	Development and Guidance
OP3	Teaching Strategies
OP7	Work-Based Learning
<b>ED</b>	<b>ASSESSMENT AND CERTIFICATION</b>
ED1	Quality Assurance of Assessment and Certification
ED2	Assessment Tools
ED3	Administering and Grading Assessments
<b>SK</b>	<b>SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT</b>
SK1	Safety
SK2	Learning Environment
<b>OR</b>	<b>EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES</b>
OR1	Study Success
OR3	Future Success
<b>KA</b>	<b>QUALITY ASSURANCE AND AMBITION</b>
KA1	Quality Assurance
KA2	Quality Culture
KA3	Accountability and Dialogue
<b>FB</b>	<b>FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT</b>
FB1	Continuity
FB2	Efficiency
FB3	Legitimacy

### **3.3 QUALITY AREAS AND STANDARDS**

The evaluation framework specifies a number of standards for each quality area. For each standard, the red box describes what the basic level of quality looks like (what the governing body and the programme must do). Below this box is a question which provides scope for a discussion on self-

---

<sup>4</sup> The evaluation frameworks have been designed to be as similar as possible across all sectors. All sectors use the same letter codes for the quality areas. The numbering of the standards does not always follow the same pattern, because there are differences in the details of the quality areas for each sector, as well as differences in the number of standards included in certain quality areas.

defined quality factors. The governing body and programmes can nominate their own topics for this discussion.

Finally, as a justification for the operationalisation of the basic level of quality we provide an explanation for each standard of the statutory requirements applicable to that standard.

## **Educational Process quality area**

### **EDUCATIONAL PROCESS (OP)**

#### **OP1. Curriculum**

The curriculum prepares the students for professional practice, further education and society.

#### **Basic level of quality**

The programme delivers a curriculum that is tailored both to the target group and to the area of professional practice for which the programme offers a qualification/diploma. The curriculum is aligned with the educational and training goals in the qualification file, the associated optional courses and any statutory professional requirements as well as with the educational and training goals of the programme itself. The curriculum has a clear structure and coherence, it is appropriate for the duration of the programme, and there are sufficient supervised teaching hours and work-based learning hours. The acquisition of generic competencies, including those relating to citizenship and forging a career, forms part of the curriculum. The curriculum is in line with prior education, prepares students for the range of subsequent education, and offers opportunities for customisation. Students are informed of the curriculum in a timely manner before the start of the programme.

#### **Self-defined quality factors**

Are there any additional policies around the quality of the curriculum and if so, how are they implemented?

#### **Explanation of the statutory requirements**

For the Curriculum standard, monitoring focuses both on the planned design of the programme and on its actual implementation.

The institution must ensure the curriculum is of high quality and well organised (s. 7.4.8(1) WEB). The curriculum must be based on the educational and training goals in the qualification file, the associated optional courses and any statutory professional requirements as well as on the educational and training goals of the programme itself (s. 7.1.2(2), s. 7.2.6(2) and s. 7.2.7(5) WEB). The qualification file includes generic competencies (for those relating to citizenship and forging a career, see also s. 17a(3) WEB and Annex 1 of the WEB Vocational Education Assessment and Qualifications Decree).

In addition, the curriculum must be designed in such a way that students can both obtain the qualification and complete the associated optional courses within the set duration of studies (s. 7.2.7(1) WEB). This means that the curriculum must be tailored to the target group, and where necessary must also allow for customisation for individual students (s. 7.2.7(1) and s. 7.4.8(1) WEB). In addition, the curriculum should be distributed across the programme in a balanced way, and should include a sufficient amount of supervised teaching time and work-based learning time. 7.2.7 WEB). This will ensure that institutions provide efficient learning pathways, including by ensuring that the programme is aligned with prior and subsequent education and with the labour market (s. 1.3.5(b) WEB).

Students must be informed of the curriculum in a timely manner before the start of the programme by means of teaching and examination regulations drawn up for that purpose (s. 7.4.8(2) WEB).

## **OP2. Development and Guidance**

The programme monitors the development of the students so that the teaching can be adapted for their needs, and provides appropriate guidance and additional support.

### **Basic level of quality**

Before enrolment, students are given sufficient information to enable them to select a suitable programme, and after enrolment they are placed in appropriate classes and given proper guidance. Where necessary, the programme works with the prior education institution to ensure this is the case. Guidance relating to their progress is provided to students in a thorough and structured manner, and is tailored to the needs of the student and the required competency development. The programme makes it possible for students to reach the required level within the set period of time. Teachers regularly check the extent to which students are benefiting from the teaching delivered and how their development is progressing. They analyse the causes of anomalous performance. Additional support is offered to students who need it and the programme provides timely and comprehensive information to students (and parents) about the options for additional support.

### **Self-defined quality factors**

Are there any additional policies around the quality of development and guidance and if so, how are they implemented?

### **Explanation of the statutory requirements**

The institution must provide prospective students with sufficient information to enable them to select a suitable programme (s. 6.1.3a(1) WEB). Prospective students who enrol in a timely manner<sup>5</sup> are entitled to programme selection advice on request, provided they participate in the intake activities organised by the institution for that purpose (s. 8.0.4 WEB).

The institution must also ensure that the curriculum is of high quality and well organised and that it is designed in such a way that students can both obtain the qualification and complete the associated optional courses within the set duration of studies (s. 7.2.7(1) and 7.4.8(1) WEB). This means that students must be placed in suitable classes; where necessary, the programme must work with the prior education institution to ensure this is the case. 1.3.5(b) WEB). It also means that students must be given thorough, structured guidance, tailored to their needs and to the required competency development (s. 7.1.2(2) WEB). Teachers must monitor students' development and regularly check the extent to which students are benefiting from the teaching delivered.

The institution must offer additional support to students who need it and provide the students with timely and comprehensive information about such support (s. 7.4.8(2) and see also s. 1.3.5(a) WEB). Where applicable, the education agreement must contain provisions relating to the additional support (s. 8.1.3(3)(g) WEB).

## **OP3. Teaching Strategies**

The teaching strategies of the teaching team enable the students to learn and develop.

---

<sup>5</sup> 'In a timely manner' means by no later than 1 April of the calendar year in which they intend to start their studies.

**Basic level of quality**

The teaching approach of the teaching team is appropriate for the level of the qualification file. The team creates effective learning situations; learning objectives and structured learning activities focus on developing competencies. The team creates a balanced connection between learning in professional practice and learning at the institution. Teachers adapt their approach to the needs of groups of students and individual students, to keep them active and engaged.

**Self-defined quality factors**

Are there any additional policies around the quality of teaching strategies and if so, how are they implemented?

**Explanation of the statutory requirements**

The institution must ensure the curriculum is of high quality and well organised, and must divide up the curriculum in a balanced manner (s. 7.2.7(1) and s. 7.4.8(1) WEB). Among other things, this means there must be a balanced connection between learning in professional practice and learning at the institution. In addition, the curriculum must be designed in such a way that students can both obtain the qualification and complete the associated optional courses within the set duration of studies (s. 7.2.7(1) WEB). To achieve this, the teaching team must create effective learning situations in which the learning objectives and learning activities focus on developing the required competencies (s. 7.1.2(2) and s. 7.2.7(5) WEB). Finally, it means that where necessary, teachers must be able to differentiate between groups of students and/or individual students (s. 7.4.8(1) WEB).

**OP7. Work-Based Learning**

Preparation for, implementation of and guidance during work-based learning are effective.

**Basic level of quality**

Students and training companies receive timely information about the arrangements for work-based learning. The programme arranges a suitable location for work-based learning, provides guidance to students in selecting and preparing for the work-based learning, and drafts the contracts to be signed with the training companies. The programme creates a balanced connection between learning in professional practice and learning at the institution. Learning objectives and learning activities focus on developing the competencies of individual students in professional practice. Appropriate and structured learning activities are provided in the workplace.

The programme ensures that training companies provide guidance to students in accordance with the agreements made. The programme monitors the students' progress, makes adjustments where necessary and works in collaboration with the training company. The programme conducts a robust evaluation of whether participants have completed the work-based learning with a positive assessment.

The programme initiates and maintains contacts with the local and regional business community for the purpose of embedding professional practice into the programme. The institution works with the SBB to ensure that work-based learning locations are appropriate.

**Self-defined quality factors**

Are there any additional policies around the quality of work-based learning and if so, how are they implemented?

**Explanation of the statutory requirements**

The institution must inform the students about the arrangements for the work-based learning in a timely manner before the start of the programme (s. 7.4.8(2) WEB). The institution is also tasked with ensuring the availability of suitable locations for work-based learning and guiding students in



selecting such locations (s. 7.2.9(1) WEB). The institution must then draft the contracts to be signed with the training companies (s. 7.2.9(1) WEB).

Furthermore, the institution must ensure the curriculum is of high quality and well organised, and must divide up the curriculum in a balanced manner (s. 7.2.7(1) and s. 7.4.8(1) WEB). Among other things, this means there must be a balanced connection between learning in professional practice and learning at the institution. To embed professional practice into the programme, the institution must also maintain contacts with the local and regional business community. This also means that appropriate and structured learning activities must be provided in the workplace, based on the part of the qualification to be obtained during the work-based learning or based on the associated optional courses (s. 7.1.2(2) and s. 7.2.8(2)(c) WEB).

The contracts to be signed with the training companies must include agreements concerning guidance and assessment of the student, but the institution retains final responsibility for the quality of the programme as a whole (s. 7.2.8(2) and (3) and s. 7.2.9 WEB). The institution must therefore regularly check that the agreements are being adhered to and must make adjustments where necessary. The institution must also conduct a robust evaluation of whether participants have completed the work-based learning with a positive assessment (s. 7.2.8(3) and s. 7.4.8(1) WEB). For this evaluation, collaboration with the training company is required.

If, after the training contract is signed, the institution and the SBB establish that the work-based learning cannot take place in a proper manner, in consultation with the SBB the institution will facilitate the selection of a satisfactory replacement provider (s. 7.2.9(2) WEB). This requires collaboration with the SBB, which is also important to enable the SBB to ensure the quality of the work-based learning locations (in relation to this SBB task see also s. 7.2.10 WEB).

## **Assessment and Certification quality area**

### **ASSESSMENT AND CERTIFICATION<sup>6</sup> (ED)**

#### **ED1. Quality Assurance of Assessment and Certification**

The examination board ensures robust assessment and certification.

#### **Basic level of quality**

The examination board determines, in an objective and expert manner, whether a candidate meets the conditions required to obtain a diploma, certificate or institution declaration. The examination board oversees, monitors and analyses the quality of the assessment tools, of the administration and grading of assessments, and of the certification, and where applicable ensures that improvement measures are implemented. The examination board ensures the expertise of the persons involved in all phases of the assessment process. The professional field is involved in assessment. The examination board produces an annual report covering both the assessment quality of each programme, based on the assessment standards, and the work it has performed. The independent and expert functioning of the examination board is sufficiently guaranteed by the competent authority.

#### **Self-defined quality factors**

Are there any additional policies around the quality of the examination board and if so, how are they implemented?

---

<sup>6</sup> In this quality area we refer to 'candidates' instead of 'students', since that is the term used in the Upper Secondary Vocational Education Assessment Quality Standards Regulation 2017.

### **Explanation of the statutory requirements**

The three standards in the area of assessment and certification and the associated benchmarking in this evaluation framework are in line with the standards and benchmarking in the Upper Secondary Vocational Education Assessment Quality Standards Regulation 2017.

### **ED2. Assessment Tools**

The assessment tools meet the exit requirements and comply with the technical assessment requirements.

#### **Basic level of quality**

The assessment tools cover the requirements of the qualification. The same applies to the requirements of the optional course or courses in the programmes followed by each candidate.<sup>7</sup> The forms of assessment are appropriate to the content being assessed. The assessment tools have an appropriate task complexity. The tools enable even-handed grading and are consistent with the core tasks, work processes and other requirements in the qualification file and with those of the optional courses. The pass mark is at the level at which the candidate has met the requirements. The marking instructions enable objective grading.

#### **Self-defined quality factors**

Are there any additional policies around the quality of the assessment tools and if so, how are they implemented?

### **Explanation of the statutory requirements**

The three standards in the area of assessment and certification and the associated benchmarking in this evaluation framework are in line with the standards and benchmarking in the Upper Secondary Vocational Education Assessment Quality Standards Regulation 2017.

### **ED3. Administering and Grading Assessments**

The design and implementation of the process of administering and grading assessments is robust.

#### **Basic level of quality**

The assessment and grading conditions are comparable for all candidates. The conditions are consistent with the context of the future profession; components of the assessment occur in actual professional practice. Grading produces reliable results, is performed with expertise and focuses on achieving an appropriate balance of the knowledge, skills and behaviour required. The design of the assessment, the scheduling of assessment periods, the grading procedures and the objection and appeal procedure are communicated to candidates in a timely manner and are clear and transparent to all persons involved.

#### **Self-defined quality factors**

Are there any additional policies around the quality of the administration and grading of assessments and if so, how are they implemented?

### **Explanation of the statutory requirements**

The three standards in the area of assessment and certification and the associated benchmarking in this evaluation framework are in line with the standards and benchmarking in the Upper Secondary Vocational Education Assessment Quality Standards Regulation 2017.

---

<sup>7</sup> This applies to programmes for which the first year of study started on or after 1 August 2016.

## **School Environment quality area**

### **SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT (SK)**

#### **SK1. Safety**

The programme ensures a safe and respectful environment for students.

#### **Basic level of quality**

The programme provides its students with an environment that is both physically and socially safe. The programme acts effectively in response to signs that students' social or physical safety may be under threat. Communications from staff are consistent with the fundamental values of the democratic constitutional state, and the same is expected of the students.

#### **Self-defined quality factors**

Are there any additional policies around safety and if so, how are they implemented?

#### **Explanation of the statutory requirements**

The institution must ensure that both curriculum and assessment are of high quality and well organised (s. 7.4.8(1) WEB). Moreover, the institution must set up a quality assurance system, and in doing so, must incorporate the opinions of students (s. 1.3.6 WEB). In view of this, the institution may be expected to have an understanding of the physical and social safety of students and of their perception of their safety, implement a safety policy, and act effectively in response to signs that the students' social and/or physical safety may be under threat (see also s. 8a.2.2(3)(k) WEB). After all, a lack of physical and/or social safety can hinder both the provision and receiving of a good education.

The responsibility of the institution in this regard is also based on s. 7.2.7 (and the general scheme) of the WEB. The curriculum is now delivered under the responsibility and subject to the monitoring of the institution and the supervised teaching hours must be provided under the responsibility and with the active involvement of the teaching staff (see s. 7.2.7(5) and (6) WEB).

Finally, the curriculum must also cover the competencies relating to citizenship (s. 7.1.2(2) WEB and see also s. 17a(3) WEB and Annex 1 of the WEB Vocational Education Assessment and Qualifications Decree). This cannot be achieved if either staff or students promote ideas that are inconsistent with the fundamental values of the democratic constitutional state.

#### **SK2. Learning Environment**

The programme is delivered in a supportive and stimulating learning environment.

#### **Basic level of quality**

The programme creates a stimulating educational learning environment which supports cognitive and social development and is beneficial to students' wellbeing. The programme has clear rules.

#### **Self-defined quality factors**

Are there any additional policies around the quality of the learning environment and if so, how are they implemented?

#### **Explanation of the statutory requirements**

The institution must ensure that both curriculum and assessment are of high quality and well organised (s. 7.4.8(1) WEB). This means that there must be a stimulating educational learning environment, which is essential for the proper teaching of students as well as for the required cognitive and social development (s. 7.1.2(2) WEB). Finally, the institution must draw up candidate regulations setting out candidates' rights and obligations, so that staff can apply clear rules (s. 7.4.8(4) WEB).

## **Educational Outcomes quality area**

### **EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES<sup>8</sup> (OR)**

#### **OR1. Study Success**

The institution must achieve outcomes for its students that meet or exceed the set standard.

#### **Basic level of quality**

The educational outcomes show that the programme adequately prepares students to obtain a diploma at the desired level. The programme ensures that students make a successful start and complete their studies within the set duration. The outcomes also show evidence of a transition to higher levels of education.

#### **Self-defined quality factors**

Are there any additional policies around educational outcomes and if so, how are they implemented?

#### **Explanation of the statutory requirements**

The standard for study success for the current four-year period is specified in detail in Annex 1 of this Inspection Framework. We evaluate study success based on this standard and on the qualification file. The standard for study success depends first and foremost on the obligation to ensure that both curriculum and assessment are of high quality and well organised (s. 7.4.8(1) WEB). Vocational education programmes must also be designed in such a way that students can both obtain the qualification and complete the associated optional courses within the set duration of studies (s. 7.2.7(1) WEB). Moreover, institutions must ensure the provision of efficient learning pathways, including by ensuring that the programme aligns with prior and subsequent education (s. 1.3.5(b) WEB). In view of the relationship between study success and educational quality, in the context of quality assurance the institution may be expected to have an understanding of study success and to implement a corresponding policy (s. 1.3.6 WEB).

#### **OR3. Future Success**

The destination of the students after they leave the programme is known and meets or exceeds the expectations of the programme.

#### **Basic level of quality**

The institution has a good level of knowledge about developments in the local and regional labour market. It has information about the next step in the career paths of students who left the programme prematurely and of those who left with a diploma. This may include a transition to further education, a place in the labour market or an appropriate follow-up for students with a specific educational need. Future success meets or exceeds the expectations of the programme in relation to the average national results for comparable programmes and the situation in the regional labour market.

#### **Self-defined quality factors**

Are there any additional policies around future success and if so, how are they implemented?

#### **Explanation of the statutory requirements**

The institution must ensure that both curriculum and assessment are of high quality and well organised (s. 7.4.8(1) WEB). A good connection between the programme and the labour market

---

<sup>8</sup> See Annex 1, *Benchmarking and Evaluation of Educational Outcomes*.

and/or further education forms part of and also derives from the task of ensuring the provision of efficient learning pathways (s. 1.3.5(b) WEB). Knowledge of the local and regional labour market is also necessary to be able to inform aspiring students about their labour market prospects after leaving the programme and to be able to offer career orientation and guidance (s. 1.3.5(c), s. 6.1.3a(1)(c) and s. 7.1.2(2) WEB). Furthermore, in view of the relationship between future success and educational quality, in the context of quality assurance the institution may be expected to have an understanding of future success and to implement a corresponding policy (s. 1.3.6 WEB).

The duty of institutions to ensure adequate labour market prospects and to offer an effective range of programmes is explicitly set out in the WEB (s. 6.1.3). It follows that the institution can only offer a vocational education programme if there are adequate labour market prospects for the student and if the support provided by that programme is effective, in light of the complete set of services in the area of vocational education. 'Labour market prospects' means finding a job within a reasonable time at the level of the completed programme.

## **Quality Assurance and Ambition quality area**

### **QUALITY ASSURANCE AND AMBITION (KA)**

#### **KA1. Quality Assurance**

The governing body and the programme have set up a quality assurance system and are using it to improve the quality of education.

#### **Basic level of quality**

The governing body and the programme have a quality assurance system. This quality assurance system relates to educational quality and, at a minimum, deals with the educational process, assessment and certification, educational outcomes and maintaining the competence of the staff. The governing body and the programme regularly evaluate educational quality, involving independent experts and interested parties. The governing body and the programme set verifiable targets and regularly evaluate whether these targets have been met. The outcomes are made available in an accessible manner. The causes of any inadequate educational quality are analysed and improvements are implemented where necessary.

Organisational design and the allocation of responsibilities enable a functioning quality assurance system.

#### **Self-defined quality factors**

Are there any additional policies around quality assurance and if so, how are they implemented?

#### **Explanation of the statutory requirements**

The institution must set up a quality assurance system, and in connection with that system, must regularly evaluate educational quality (s. 1.3.6 WEB). Section 1.3.6 explicitly states that the quality assurance system must pay specific attention to assessment, and to the measures and instruments used to ensure the maintenance of staff competence (in relation to staff, see also s. 1.3.6a and Chapter 4, Title 2 and 2a WEB). It also goes without saying that educational quality depends on the educational process and educational outcomes; accordingly, the quality assurance system must also pay attention to these matters.

For the purposes of assessing educational quality, the institution must involve students (by canvassing their opinions) as well as independent experts and interested parties (s. 1.3.6(1) WEB). The institution must formulate its policy based on the outcomes of this consultation (s. 1.3.6(2)(c) WEB). Setting verifiable targets, regularly evaluating whether these targets have been achieved, and

implementing improvement measures are all essential elements of a quality assurance system. Moreover, the implementation of improvement measures depends on the obligation to ensure that both curriculum and assessment are of high quality and well organised (s. 7.4.8(1) WEB). The outcomes of the evaluation must be made public, and must be described in the management report along with the policy made as described above in light of these outcomes, (s. 1.3.6 and s. 2.5.4(1) WEB).

The organisation and the allocation of responsibilities must be designed in such a way that the quality assurance system actually has an impact on educational quality and that impact is not restricted by the governing body or by management. The allocation of responsibilities is set out in the constitution and/or board regulations (s. 9.1.4, s. 9.1.7 and s. 9.1.8 WEB).

## **KA2. Quality Culture**

The governing body and the programme have a professional quality culture and operate in an honest and transparent manner.

### **Basic level of quality**

The governing body acts in accordance with the Sector Code to deliver proper governance of the upper secondary vocational education institution and provides an explanation when it deviates from that code. This practice leads to an honest and transparent organisational culture, in which everyone has a role to play in strengthening the quality of education. The governing body and the programme work together to continuously improve staff professionalism. The quality assurance system and the educational leadership are properly embedded and everyone in the organisation is familiar with them. People at all levels work in a results-oriented manner and are accountable for agreements made, and they also hold others accountable.

### **Self-defined quality factors**

Are there any additional policies around the quality culture and if so, how are they implemented?

### **Explanation of the statutory requirements**

In its management report, the governing body must account for how it delivers proper governance of the upper secondary vocational education institution in accordance with the Sector Code (s. 2.5.4 WEB), including any derogations from the Code – in other words, the 'comply or explain' principle. The Sector Code sets out various conditions for an honest and transparent administrative culture, which again is connected to the operation of the quality assurance system (s. 1.3.6 WEB).

The institution must ensure that the quality of the teaching staff remains high (s. 1.3.6a WEB). The instruments and measures used to maintain staff competence must be explicitly included in the quality assurance system (s. 1.3.6(1) WEB). The institution must give teachers independent responsibility for the evaluation of students' educational performance as well as sufficient control over subject content, subject-specific teaching methods and pedagogical process within the institution (s. 4.1a.1(1) to (3), WEB).

Finally, the quality assurance system must be embedded in the organisation in such a way that it actually has an impact on educational quality and that impact is not restricted by the governing body or by management. This also means that people at all levels must work in a results-oriented manner and be held accountable for the agreements they have made. Everyone in the organisation must recognise the educational leadership.

## **KA3. Accountability and Dialogue**

The governing body and the programme are approachable, both internally and externally, and are dependably accountable for targets and results; to that end, they actively engage in dialogue.

### **Basic level of quality**

The governing body facilitates opportunities for discussions with the Supervisory Board, the Works Council and the Student Council. The governing body and the programme involve internal and external experts and interested parties, particularly the business community, in developing the quality assurance policy and in evaluating educational quality, and are open to their suggestions. The governing body reports annually (at a minimum) on the targets and on the results achieved. The governing body is approachable and accountable to the internal supervisory authority, the government and interested parties.

### **Self-defined quality factors**

Are there any additional policies around the quality of accountability and dialogue and if so, how are they implemented?

### **Explanation of the statutory requirements**

The institution must have a student council, a works council, a supervisory board and possibly a parents' council (s. 8a.1.2, s. 8a.1.3 and s. 9.1.4 WEB).<sup>9</sup> With regard to the student council and the parents' council (if any), the institution must help them become full, effective and properly-functioning representative advisory bodies for students and parents (if applicable) (s. 8a.1.4(1), s. 8a.2.1 and s. 8a.2.2a WEB). A similar duty applies with respect to the supervisory board (s. 9.1.4(4) and (5) and s. 9.1.7(1)(a) WEB).

The operation of these bodies also depends on the operation of the quality assurance system and associated regular evaluation of educational quality (s. 1.3.6 WEB). In addition to these bodies, other internal and external (independent) experts and interested parties must also be involved in this evaluation (s. 1.3.6(1) WEB). Some of the external experts must come from the business community (pursuant to sections such as s. 6.1.3(1), s. 7.1.2(2), s. 7.2.8 and s. 7.4.8(1) WEB).

The institution must regularly (or annually, in the case of assessments) publish the outcomes of the evaluation and the policy made as described above in light of these outcomes (s. 1.3.6(2) WEB). The institution must report on this topic in its management report (s. 2.5.4 WEB). The supervisory board must contribute to this report, and obviously the examination board must do so too (s. 1.3.6(2), s. 2.5.4 and s. 9.1.4(3)(g) WEB).

### **Financial Management quality area**

#### **FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT (FB)**

##### **FB1. Continuity**

The institution is financially healthy and is able to meet its financial obligations in the short and long term.

##### **Basic level of quality**

The institution's long-term survival is assured and it has met the basic financial conditions that make this possible. The financial position of the institution makes it possible for it to meet all of its financial obligations in the short and long term, due in part to the institution's strategic planning. This is evident from its liquidity and solvency, developments in the operating result and the amount of the salary expenses.

---

<sup>9</sup> *The Works Councils Act stipulates that the institution must have a works council. In Chapter 8a, the WEB also sets out a number of additional requirements with regard to the works council.*

For the sake of continuity, it's important that the governing body understands the financial starting position and the expected developments over the next three years, and implements policies accordingly. The governing body regularly discusses these matters with the supervisory board and the representative advisory bodies, implements corrective measures where necessary, and renders an account of everything in the management report.

### **Explanation of the statutory requirements**

The institution must manage its resources in such a way that the proper operation and survival of the institution are assured (s. 2.8.3 WEB). This means that the institution must be able to meet all of its financial obligations in the short and long term, which is evident from its liquidity and solvency, developments in the operating result and the amount of the salary expenses. From the obligation to prepare annual accounts and a management report, including a section on continuity, arises a further obligation for the institution to have an understanding of its financial starting position (s. 2.5.3 and s. 2.5.4 WEB and s. 4(4) RJO).

The WEB requires the supervisory board to approve the institution's budget, annual accounts, management report and any strategic long-term plan (s. 9.1.4(3)(c) WEB). The supervisory board must also render an account of its activities in the management report (s. 9.1.4(3)(g) WEB). The supervisory board cannot fulfil these tasks without holding regular discussions with the governing body about the financial management of the institution. Furthermore, the governing body must periodically give the student council an opportunity to discuss the general course of affairs with the governing body; in addition, the student council can hold discussions with the governing body at its own initiative, and the student council must be kept informed by the governing body (on request) on matters including financial management (s. 8a.1.5(1) and (2) and s. 8a.2.1 WEB). Following these discussions with the supervisory board and/or student council, the governing body must implement corrective measures where necessary (s. 2.8.3 WEB). Finally, the governing body needs prior approval on the broad outline of the annual budget from a collective meeting of the student council, the works council and, where applicable, the parents' council (s. 8a.1.6 WEB).

### **FB2. Efficiency**

The governing body makes efficient and effective use of the government funding.

#### **Basic level of quality**

The governing body spends the government funding in such a way that it adequately benefits the ambitions formulated in the policy relating to effective education and the development of all students.

### **Explanation of the statutory requirements**

The annual accounts must show evidence of an effective use of the funding (s. 2.5.3(2) WEB). It follows that the institution must spend the funding effectively (see also s. 2.5.9(2) WEB).

### **FB3. Legitimacy**

The governing body obtains and spends the government funding in accordance with the laws and regulations.

#### **Basic level of quality**

The governing body has the necessary expertise and acts transparently and with integrity in relation to the spending of the funding. It is accountable for its obtaining and spending of the funding, which is primarily evaluated by an auditor appointed by the supervisory board. This auditor operates in



accordance with the professional standards of the NBA<sup>10</sup> and particularly in accordance with the Educational Auditor Protocol, which is set by the Inspectorate.

#### **Explanation of the statutory requirements**

The annual accounts must show evidence of the legitimate use of the funding (s. 2.5.3(2) WEB). It follows that the institution must spend the funding legitimately (see also s. 2.5.9(2) WEB). Title 9, Book 2 of the Civil Code, Article 3(a) of the Annual Reporting in Education Regulation (RJO) and the Annual Reporting in Education Guidelines, as well as the Educational Auditor Protocol,<sup>11</sup> also set many other rules concerning transparent accountability.

The supervisory board must appoint an institutional auditor (s. 9.1.4(3)(f) WEB). This institutional auditor must work in accordance with the Educational Auditor Protocol, and finally, must issue an audit report on the annual accounts (Art. 2.5.3(4) 2 RJO in conjunction with Art. 2:393 Civil Code).

### **3.4 OTHER STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS**

The evaluation framework does not include all of the robustness requirements contained in the sector-specific statutes and other educational laws, such as the Certificate of Good Conduct (VOG), school fees and prevention of early school leaving (VSV). The robustness requirements that are not connected to a standard in the evaluation framework are summarised under the heading 'other statutory requirements'.

In our annual work plan, published on the Inspectorate website, we indicate which themes and/or specific statutory requirements we will be focusing on in our systemic monitoring inspections (see Chapter 10). Non-compliance with one or more of the other statutory requirements will not result in a judgement such as 'programme lacks sufficient quality' or 'very poor teaching'. However, the programme/governing body must remedy the shortcoming within the time period set by the Inspectorate. The remedial work required will be set out in the report.

---

<sup>10</sup> *Dutch Professional Association of Accountants (NBA).*

<sup>11</sup> <https://www.onderwijsinspectie.nl/documenten/publicaties/2017/11/29/onderwijsaccountantsprotocol-ocw-2017>.

## ANNEX 1: BENCHMARKING AND EVALUATION OF EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES

For government-funded vocational education, the Educational Outcomes quality area comprises two standards: Study Success and Future Success. In this annex we describe the benchmarking, the judgement protocols, and the specific exceptions and/or applications of these standards.

### 1. Study Success standard in government-funded education

For programmes at Level 2, 3 and 4 we evaluate the Study Success standard using three indicators: Year Result (JR), Diploma Result (DR) and Retention Result (SR). In addition, we describe the standard using the indicators Appropriate Placement, Appropriate Diploma and Upward Progression.

For the first three indicators an absolute standard applies, the level of which was set after consultation with the education sector, based on the thirtieth percentile for a judgement of 'Satisfactory', and which took effect on 1 August 2017 for a four-year period. An evaluation of 'Good' for high educational outcomes for the Year and Diploma Results is determined on the basis of the eightieth percentile. The thirtieth percentile is again applied to the Retention Result. The results lead to an evaluation of 'Good' and a judgement of 'Satisfactory' or 'Unsatisfactory' for the level of each standard.

There is no set standard for the other three indicators. The results for these indicators provide a picture of the institution's performance in relation to its own goals and ambitions and in relation to the national average. The results show the relationship with the primary educational process and thus form the basis for a discussion with the teaching teams and the institution.

*Study success at Level 2, 3 and 4: indicators, definitions, standard and benchmark<sup>12</sup>*

Indicator	Definition	Level	'Satisfactory' standard	'Good' evaluation
Year Result	The number of graduates in a given year (number of students leaving the institution with a diploma plus graduates enrolling in further study at the institution) as a percentage of the same number of graduates plus the number of students who left the institution without a diploma in the same year.	2	67	82
		3	68	85
		4	68	85
Diploma Result	The number of students leaving the institution with a diploma in one year as a percentage of all students leaving the institution that year.	2	61	79
		3	70	89
		4	70	89
Retention Result	The proportion of newly-enrolled students in a given year who either obtain a diploma in their first year and leave or are still studying at the institution the following year.	2	79	79
		3	82	82
		4	82	82

<sup>12</sup> The method of calculation is set out by the Inspectorate in a technical explanation document which is made available to the institutions.

Indicator	Definition	Benchmark
Appropriate Placement	The extent to which the institution places newly-enrolled students at the programme level which would be expected based on their prior education.	National average
Appropriate Diploma	The proportion of departing students who have obtained a diploma at or above an educational level that is appropriate in view of their prior learning, as a percentage of the total number of departing students.	National average
Upward Progression	The proportion of enrolled Level 2 or 3 students in a given year who enrol in a higher level at the same institution the following year, as a percentage of the students progressing that year.	National average

## 2. Future Success standard in government-funded education

The Future Success standard relates to students' paths after leaving upper secondary vocational education. It requires institutions to keep data on the subsequent careers of students who leave the programme either prematurely or with a diploma, and to relate this data as much as possible to their own objectives or ambitions in this area. One indicator relates to students' progression to further education. The other indicator relates to alignment with the labour market.

Over the next few years, we hope to work with the sector to develop indicators for future success. In discussions with the institutions we will consider the development of the future success indicator and the data that institutions hold in this area. This indicator will not be evaluated in the current four-year cycle. At the end of this cycle, it will be determined whether and to what extent the indicator will be included in future evaluations.

### *Future Success at Level 2, 3 and 4*

Indicator	Definition	Benchmark <sup>13</sup>
Progression to further education	The evolution in the proportion of students transitioning to further education.	Still being developed
Quickly employed	Within a reasonable timeframe, a graduate has found a job appropriate to his/her level of education.	Still being developed

## 3. Entry-level programmes

We inspect the Study Success and Future Success of entry-level programmes based on three indicators: Educational Outcomes, Outflow to Employment and Binding Study Recommendations. For Educational Outcomes and Outflow to Employment no standard has been set for the next four years, but the indicators will be applied as risk indicators. The results for these indicators provide a picture of the institution's performance in relation to its own goals and ambitions and against the national

<sup>13</sup> This is the benchmark of the national average for the specific area, subgroup or programme. For work-based pathway programmes, the professional context may play a role in placement.

average. The proportion of students with a negative binding study recommendation will be the subject of discussion and will be interpreted qualitatively and in conjunction with the other indicators.

Together with the institutions and the sector, over the next few years the Inspectorate will build up its knowledge of the educational outcomes of entry-level programmes so as to arrive at a good/fair description of the level of the educational outcomes of entry-level programmes.

*Study success and future success in entry-level programmes: indicators, definitions and benchmarks*

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>
Educational Outcomes	The number of enrolled students in Year T who, one year later, have either obtained a diploma or progressed, as a percentage of the total number of enrolled students in Year T.	National average
Outflow to Employment	The proportion of enrolled students in Year T who, one year later, have left without a diploma to take up paid employment.	National average <sup>14</sup>

**4. Study success: judgement protocols and procedures**

The results for the three benchmarked indicators will be calculated at the level of the programme (vocational education (BC) code x level), the subgroup and the domain. The educational outcomes are (if possible) based on three-year averages, or at a minimum on the outcomes for the most recent educational outcome year and one other year. If too little information is available because indicators are missing, it is possible that the judgement will be 'Unable to determine'.

Application of the judgement protocol at the programme level (BC code x level) based on the three benchmarked indicators will lead to one of the following judgements and evaluations:

*Evaluation under the Study Success standard at Level 2, 3 and 4*

<b>Study Success</b>	<b>Standard</b>
Good	The programme meets the standard for all three indicators, and the level for the Year Result and Diploma Result is at the eightieth percentile or better.
Satisfactory	The programme meets the standard if at least two of the three indicators are met.
Unsatisfactory	The programme is unsatisfactory if it is not meeting the standard for two of the three indicators.

We have included the other indicators – Appropriate Placement, Appropriate Diploma and Upward Progression – in the description of the educational outcomes.

<sup>14</sup> Information for the 'Outflow to Employment' indicator is recorded by institutions themselves. In the long term, we are hoping to be able to use information from Statistics Netherlands on this topic.

### *Evaluation of the Educational Outcomes quality area*

<b>Educational Outcomes</b>	<b>Standard</b>
Good	Study success is good.
Satisfactory	Study success is satisfactory or better.
Unsatisfactory	Study success is unsatisfactory.

The educational outcomes (the six indicators) at the level of the subgroup and of the domain will form the basis for the institution analysis, on the basis of which we will discuss with the institution the level and evolution of the educational outcomes at the institutional level.<sup>15</sup>

#### **5. Description of results for non-benchmarked indicators**

The results for the three non-benchmarked indicators (Appropriate Placement, Appropriate Diploma and Upward progression) are described in the report at the level of the programme and/or institution, but no judgement is assigned. The results, which are compared with the national average for similar institutions, provide a coherent picture of the efforts made by the programme and institution, emphasise the relationship with the quality of the educational process, and provide input for a discussion about the programme and institution's goals and ambitions.

#### **6. Study success at non-government-funded institutions<sup>16</sup>**

For non-government-funded institutions, the Study Success standard is evaluated using the following indicator: Cohort Performance. In addition, we describe study success based on the following indicators: Year Result at the institution level, Length of Study and Appropriate Placement.

For the Cohort Performance indicator, we apply a target group classification: programmes whose students are predominantly under the age of 23, programmes whose students are predominantly over the age of 23, and programmes that are part of the 'third learning pathway'.

The level of the benchmarked indicator was set for a two-year period after consultation with the education sector.<sup>17</sup> The standard must be fair. For programmes whose students are predominantly under the age of 23, a judgement is issued on the standard. For the other groups, only a description of compliance with the standard is given.

#### *Study success indicators*

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Standard</b>
Cohort Performance (programme level)	The proportion of successful students from Starting Year Y out of the total number of students who started in Year Y.	P30
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>

<sup>15</sup> For each institution, the Inspectorate will make available via the ISD the definition, the method of calculation and also the results (ahead of the first inspection).

<sup>16</sup> We do not evaluate the Future Success standard for non-government-funded institutions.

<sup>17</sup> The standards that are set are based on the most recent known educational outcomes as at 1 August 2017.

Length of Study	Ratio of the actual length of study to the planned/nominal length of study.	Still being developed <sup>18</sup>
Appropriate Placement	The extent to which the institution places newly-enrolled students at the programme level which would be expected based on their prior education.	Still being developed <sup>19</sup>
Year Result at the institution level	The number of graduates in a given year as a percentage of the same number of graduates plus the number of students who left the institution without a diploma in the same year.	Still being developed <sup>20</sup>

To get an institution-level picture of the educational results we determine the annual performance for each year group at the institution level. During the institution inspection, we discuss developments in this performance with the institutions.

*Study success: judgement protocols and procedures*

We calculate the cohort performance as follows: the proportion of successful students from Starting Year Y out of the total number of students who started in Year Y. This proportion must meet or exceed the standard. This standard relates to enrolled students who are under the age of 23 in their starting year.

*Evaluation of study success for programmes whose students are predominantly under the age of 23*

Study Success	Standard
Satisfactory	The programme is satisfactory if the cohort performance is above the standard.
Unsatisfactory	The programme is unsatisfactory if the cohort performance is below the standard.

## 7. General secondary education for adults

The average result for the national examination is calculated over three years. The average difference between the school examination (SE) and the national examination (CE) is also calculated over three years.<sup>21</sup>

Indicator	Definition	Standard
Average CE result	The average final result for the national examination across all students and subjects cannot be below the standard.	6.0

<sup>18</sup> This indicator will be developed on the basis of data from DUO Source Data.

<sup>19</sup> This indicator will be further developed on the basis of the data from DUO Source Data.

<sup>20</sup> The population is all enrolled students in any given year.

<sup>21</sup> Due to the continued growth of the Education Number, more data is becoming available and we are investigating whether adjustments and additions to the indicators are possible.

Difference between CE–SE result	The average difference between the national examination result and the school examination result across all students and subjects cannot be too high. The school examination result cannot be too high on average compared with the national examination result.	Maximum of 0.5 point
---------------------------------	--	----------------------