

**СОФИЙСКИ УНИВЕРСИТЕТ  
„СВ. КЛИМЕНТ ОХРИДСКИ“**  
Факултет по педагогика



**SOFIA UNIVERSITY  
“ST. KLIMENT OHRIDSKI”**  
Faculty of Education

# **POLYCENTRIC INSPECTION OF NETWORK OF SCHOOLS: A CASE STUDY FROM BULGARIA**

**Assoc. Prof. Dr. Rossitsa Simeonova, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Yonka Parvanova**

**Sofia**

**July 2017**

Project's main **purpose for Bulgaria** was *to test a new model of inspection, innovative for the Bulgarian inspection practice – inspection of network of schools*, conceptualized in the framework of the project as form of 'polycentric inspection'.

### **Research methodology**

In accordance with the project goals, **5 main variables** have been developed for the case study, that are used to analyze inspection and inspection results regarding individual schools and the inspected network:

- ✓ *Evaluation practices* – presence of internal evaluation/self-evaluation, peer-evaluation, individual school inspection and inspection of network of schools, inspection frameworks, criteria and indicators for quality that are used in the inspection.
- ✓ *Relationships, collaboration, structure of the network* – types and characteristics of the network, relationships, communication, and level of sharing between network participants, elements, knowledge, and practices that are being shared in the network.
- ✓ *Network-level outcomes* (shared resources, know-how, new practices) – effects of collaboration in the network for its participants and for the network as a whole.
- ✓ *Potential dysfunctional effects* – group thinking, competition, and power- struggle in the network.
- ✓ *External context of the network* – socio-economic characteristics of the environment, interaction with subjects outside of the network, interaction with local authorities, etc.

Each one of these variables includes specific aspects and elements used for data gathering and analysis of all four cases, studied in the project. **Methods for data gathering** include observation of peer-evaluation and inspections of schools in the network, interviews with principals of the schools in the network, interviews with inspectors who have done the inspections, questionnaires for teachers and parents regarding the inspection, the expectation they have about it, and inspections results for both schools and for the network as a whole.

Based on this model for analysis, research teams in all countries, participating in the project, implemented a study of inspection practices, focusing on their polycentric features, elements and context. Findings from each country provide an opportunity for a comparative analysis and formulation of conclusions about the research questions set in the project.

In Bulgaria, research was made not only as a case study but also as an action research, as testing of the polycentric inspection model took place in the actual work setting of the schools and the Inspectorate with the methodological support and coordination of activities done by the research team from Sofia University.

In order to accomplish the project goals in Bulgaria, the research team applied research instruments developed within the research framework, presented above, and its 5 variables. Example questionnaires for inspectors and principals, developed by the international project team, have been adapted to Bulgarian context and upgraded. Additionally, for the purposes of self-evaluation of schools in the network, the Bulgarian research team developed

questionnaires for data gathering information from all stakeholders. These questionnaires were based on the standards and indicators included in the Framework for self-evaluation and peer-evaluation of parent-school interaction, developed by the network.

In particular, the following research *methods and instruments* were developed and implemented in Sofia:

- Interviews with principals of schools in the network – after self-evaluation and before peer-evaluation, after peer-evaluation and before the inspection, immediately after the inspection and 8 months after the inspection (*see Appendices 7, 10, 15, 18*).
- Questionnaire for teachers in the network – for the purposes of self-evaluation (between 90 up to 100% of teachers in each school filled in the self-evaluation questionnaire).
- Questionnaire for teachers – after self-evaluation and before peer-evaluation, after peer-evaluation and before the inspection, immediately after the inspection and 8 months after the inspection (*see Appendices 8, 11, 16, 19*).
- Questionnaire for evaluation teams, who participated in school peer-evaluation – after peer-evaluation and before inspection of the network (*see Appendix 10*).
- Questionnaire for parents – for the purposes of self-evaluation (between 30 up to 80% of parents in each school filled in the self-evaluation questionnaire) and 8 months after the inspection (*see Appendix 20*).
- Questionnaire for self-evaluation of school management team and teachers – for the purposes of self-evaluation of schools in the network.
- Questionnaire for students – for the purposes of self-evaluation of schools in the network (between 30 up to 80% of all students in each school filled in a questionnaire)
- Interviews with inspectors from the Inspectorate who implemented the polycentric inspection – before the inspection, immediately after the inspection and 8 months after the inspection (*see Appendices 12, 14, 17*).
- Observation – researchers from Sofia University observed the peer-evaluation and inspection processes in the network and was present at all network partners meetings throughout the project (where all discussions and joint decisions making took place) (*see Appendices 9 and 13*).
- Focus-groups and group interviews with principals and inspectors – for discussing results at each project phase and the benefits for all participants.

### ***Methodology of inspection***

The criteria for selecting schools and establishing the Sofia network were the following: the network to include different type of schools (primary, secondary); to include both high performing schools and schools needing improvement; schools to be located in different areas of Sofia and not to be in direct competition (for students or resources); professional qualities of schools' principals (experienced professional and younger ones motivated to test innovative practices).

During the **first phase** of the project the schools within the network met regularly for sharing good practices on topics and issues of common interest regarding provided education, mainly

on: education for students with special needs/disabilities, teachers in-service training and professional development, extracurricular and extra school activities, school-parents interaction and cooperation. Other activities were designing tests for evaluating students' knowledge at different educational levels, training seminars (school self-evaluation, school strategy development, etc.). Different school hosted each of the network meetings. Sofia Regional Inspectorate of Education representatives and researchers from Sofia University participated in each network meeting, providing expertise and methodological support. Sofia University coordinated all meetings and network activities. This phase was crucial for building up partnership attitude and sense of belonging to the network.

During the **second phase** of the project a model of polycentric inspection of Sofia network of schools was tested, implemented into 3 *steps*: self-evaluation of the schools within the network, peer-evaluation of the schools within the network, inspection of the network by Sofia Inspectorate of Education. First, the inspection topic was chosen by the network—school-parents' interaction and cooperation – and ***Framework for self-evaluation and peer-evaluation*** of the schools within the network was designed (see *Appendix 1*). The National Association of head teachers in England (NAHT)'s School review guidebook was used as a methodological basis. The framework includes: subject/topic of the evaluation, definition for quality of school parents cooperation, 4 standards, indicators, sources of information, methods, instruments and scale for valuing and judging school performance of the chosen schooling area and 6 appendices (questionnaires for gathering information from all stakeholders and standardized report forms). Efforts for involving Sofia Inspectorate into the framework development were made, but due to tense discussions, eventually the final version of the framework was developed only by the schools in the network and consulted by the university research team.

***Self-evaluation*** of the schools in the network was implemented in January 2016. Results for each school were summarized in *report* (see *Appendix 2*). The self-evaluation procedure and results (benefits, difficulties), were discussed on a joint meeting of Bulgarian partners and peer-evaluation activities were planned (9.02.2016).

***Peer-evaluation*** of the schools within the Sofia network as a second step of the implementation phase of the project was planned and realized for 2 weeks period upon agreed by all partners schedule (29.02-12.03.2016). Each school was visited for a day by evaluation team, consisting representatives of two other schools – principal, deputy principal and/or 1-2 teachers. The evaluation team had the self-evaluation report of the evaluated school prior to the school visit as preliminary valuing data and as a basis for gathering evaluation data during the visits. The peer-evaluation *methods* used were: meetings and discussions with school leadership team, teachers, students (representatives of student councils/parliaments) and parents/school board of trustees, inquiry of school records and documentation. Based on the evaluation data gathered and taking into account self-evaluation data, the peer-evaluation team prepared peer-evaluation *report* in standardized form agreed by the network (see *Appendix 3*). Peer-evaluation findings, benefits and positive effects were discussed and recognized by all Bulgarian partners on a closure meeting (28.03.2016) and inspection of the network activities were planned.

*Inspection of the Sofia network of schools* took place within a two weeks period (11-22.04.2016) by schedule agreed by all participants. The inspection was implemented by a team of five inspectors, coordinated by the deputy chief inspector of Sofia Inspectorate. For the purposes of the inspection the team designed an **Inspection Framework** (see *Appendix 4*) specifically on the school-parents cooperation topic, building up on the Framework for self-evaluation and peer-evaluation created by the network, by adding and revising its elements. NAHT School review guidebook was used as a methodological source as well. *Documents* in standard form for the inspection procedure and for recording results were also developed. These documents were based on those applied for the inspection of a single school in Bulgaria but some of them adapted and elaborated for the purposes of the polycentric inspection: order for inspection issued by the head of the inspectorate, procedure, schedule, written statement with findings provided to the school, report to the written statement to the principal with inspection findings for a single school (see *Appendix 5*) and report to the head of the inspectorate for inspection findings about the network (see *Appendix 6*). Inspection procedure and *methods* were the same as for the peer-evaluation – meetings and discussions with school management team, teachers, parents, students, school documentation checking. The inspection of each school was done by two inspectors for a day.

The inspection framework was not discussed with the school from the network but consulted with the university research team. The framework was presented to the network on a preliminary meeting prior to school visits (28.03.2016). Prior to the inspectors visit the principals were asked to provide self-evaluation and peer-evaluation reports, School development and School year plan to the Inspectorate as preliminary information to be taken into account when valuating and making judgments for individual school performance. Written statement with findings for each school was provided to the principal, with evaluation of the level of achievement of each standard in the framework and overall judgment for the quality of school-parents cooperation. Both the written statement and the report with findings for the network consist judgment about the level of concurrence of self-, peer-evaluation and inspection findings on a single school and network level, and also recommendations for improvements given to each school and to the network. Written statements were provided to the principals and they were able to comment on the judgments. Inspection findings presented in the inspection report were discussed on a closure meeting of the Bulgarian partners (8.06.2016). During the meeting Sofia inspectorate expressed readiness to assist and support schools and the network in their efforts targeted to the recommendations provided by the inspection team.

Inspection team recommendations to the network were discussed on a follow up meeting of the principals and research team (June 11-12, 2016). Inspectors were not able to participate due to other engagements. Priority areas for improvement of school-parents cooperation were outlined as intersections of self-, peer-evaluation and inspection findings. Measures and activities for improvements were planned for the next school year, matching the third phase of the project (09.2016–08.2017).

## Appendices

Appendix 1 Framework for self-evaluation and peer-evaluation of parental involvement	8
Appendix 2 Self-evaluation report (form)	17
Appendix 3 Peer-evaluation report (form)	18
Appendix 4 Framework for inspection of parental involvement	24
Appendix 5 Inspection report provided to each school in the network (form)	32
Appendix 6 Network inspection report (form)	35
Appendix 7 Questionnaire for interview with principles after self-evaluation and before peer-evaluation	39
Appendix 8 Questionnaire for teachers after self-evaluation and before peer-evaluation	45
Appendix 9 Protocol for observation of peer-review	54
Appendix 10 Questionnaire for peer-evaluation teams	55
Appendix 11 Questionnaire for teachers after peer-evaluation and before inspection	62
Appendix 12 Questionnaire for interview with inspectors before inspection of the network	66
Appendix 13 Protocol for observation of inspection	71
Appendix 14 Questionnaire for interview with inspectors after inspection of the network	72
Appendix 15 Questionnaire for interview with principals after inspection of the network	74
Appendix 16 Questionnaire for teachers after inspection of the network	77
Appendix 17 Questionnaire for interview with inspectors 8 months after inspection of the network	80
Appendix 18 Questionnaire for interview with principals 8 months after inspection of the network	83
Appendix 19 Questionnaire for teachers 8 months after inspection of the network	86
Appendix 20 Questionnaire for parents 8 months after inspection of the network	91

**СОФИЙСКИ УНИВЕРСИТЕТ  
„СВ. КЛИМЕНТ ОХРИДСКИ“**  
Факултет по педагогика



**SOFIA UNIVERSITY  
“ST. KLIMENT OHRIDSKI”**  
Faculty of Education

## **APPENDICES**

## Appendix 1: Framework for self-evaluation and peer-evaluation of parental involvement

Erasmus+ 2014 Key Action 2 (KA2), Strategic Partnerships Project

Project name: Polycentric inspections of networks of schools

Reference number: 2014-1-UK01-KA200-001798

### Framework for self-evaluation and peer evaluation of the quality of parental involvement

*Subject of evaluation:* quality of work with parents at school

*Quality work with parents at school (definition):* **Quality work with parents includes various and effective communications, active participation of parents in school life and parents' participation in decision-making regarding school development in order for school to achieve its educational goals.**

*Standards, indicators and norms (Table 1)*

*Sources of information, methods, instruments*

*Sources:* school management team, teachers, parents, students

*Methods:* discussions/direct meetings, observations, survey of stakeholders' opinion (questionnaires), document analysis (relevant to work with parents)

*Instruments:* minutes (parental and other meetings, observations, etc.), questionnaires, plan for work with parents, other relevant to parental involvement documents (letters, official messages, channels and means for communication)

*Appendices:*

Appendix 1: Questionnaire for self-evaluation of school management team

Appendix 2 : Questionnaire for self-evaluation of teachers

Appendix 3: Questionnaire for parents

Erasmus+ 2014 Key Action 2 (KA2), Strategic Partnerships Project

Project name: Polycentric inspections of networks of schools

Reference number: 2014-1-UK01-KA200-001798

Appendix 4: Questionnaire for students

Appendix 5 : Self-evaluation report (form)

Appendix 6: Peer-evaluation report (form)

*Period of self-evaluation:* information for the previous school year till the beginning of peer evaluation - 09.2014 – 12.2015 г.

Table 1

Standards	Indicators	Evidences	Sources of information	Norms Minimal requirements and levels*
<p><b>1. School-parents communication supports the educational process and students' progress</b></p>	<p>1.1. School uses various forms of communication with parents</p> <p>1.2. Communication goes both ways</p>	<p>Information, consultations, adequate reactions</p> <p>Written forms: electronic diary student's notebook, official letters, notebooks for feedback, information panel, school site, class diary, class site, e-mails, and text messages.</p> <p>Oral forms: individual meetings, consultations, parents meetings, meetings with School boards, meetings with class-based parents' groups, reception hours of teachers and the head teacher</p> <p>School receives positive feedback from parents (written and oral),</p>	<p>Documentation and other types of sources</p> <p>Questionnaires for parents, students, teachers and school management team</p> <p>Schedule for consultation hours</p> <p>Different meetings</p>	<p><b>Standard 1 is accomplished in case indicators 2 and 3 are achieved at least at medium level</b></p> <p>Levels of achievement – see the text after the table</p>

	<p>1.3. School-parents communication is based on a mutual respect and trust</p> <p>1.4. The school has developed a system for dealing with complaints and signals</p>	<p>awards for partnership, etc.</p> <p>Number of complaints filed at school, at Regional Inspectorate and the Ministry of Education. Parents seek assistance for handling with different problems.</p> <p>Timely responses by the school, dealing with a problem at school level</p>	<p>minutes</p> <p>Records</p> <p>Questionnaires</p> <p>Documents, written answers, questionnaires</p>	
<p><b>2. Parents participate actively in school life</b></p>	<p>2.1. Parents attend school activities.</p> <p>2.2. Parents actively participate in different school activities/initiatives</p> <p>2.3. Parents initiate school activities</p>	<p>Attainment levels – list of participants, pictures, sustainability and increase in number of parents participating at school activities.</p> <p>Donations, voluntary work, participation at open classes, at additional activities, project work (documentation)</p> <p>Meeting protocols, products of cooperative activities between school and parents</p>	<p>Documents</p> <p>Questionnaires</p>	<p><b>Standard 2 is accomplished if indicators 1 and 2 are achieved at least at medium level</b></p> <p>Levels of achievement – see the text after the table</p>
<p><b>3. School-parents interaction</b></p>	<p>3.1. Parents ensure students' presence at class and at</p>	<p>Observations, questionnaires,</p>	<p>Questionnaires</p>	<p><b>Standard 3 is accomplished if indicators 1 and 3 are</b></p>

<p><b>contributes to students' progress and to the sustainability of students' success</b></p>	<p>school activities</p> <p>3.2. Parents provide needed textbooks and other educational supplies</p> <p>3.3. School provides conditions for an adequate interaction with parents</p> <p>3.4. Parents are satisfied by the support provided by the school, by the progress and sustainability of success of their children</p>	<p>documents, interviews.</p> <p>Number of students' absence decreases.</p> <p>Percentage of students' drop-out rates decreases</p> <p>Number of students that don't do their homework decreases</p> <p>Individual consultations for students and parents contribute to students' progress</p> <p>Accessibility of pedagogical specialists out of formal hours for consultations</p> <p>Timely feedback for student's development (difficulties, progress, results)</p> <p>School offers various and adequate to parents' and students' expectations activities outside classroom and school.</p>	<p>Observations</p> <p>Documentation</p> <p>Talks, meetings</p> <p>School for parents</p>	<p><b>achieved at least at medium level</b></p> <p>Levels of achievement – see the text after the table</p>
--	---	---	---	---

		School refers students to relevant specialists (special educators, social services, child protection services, etc.) when needed.  Work done by the school counsellor		
<b>4. Parents participate in setting priorities for school development</b>	4.1. Parents' active class-based groups and the school board initiate and implement activities for school development.  4.2. Parents participate in development of school strategy	Meetings notes (class-based parents groups, school board, pedagogical council) regarding different activities – school curriculum, school education profiles, material support of school, teaching materials (textbooks and others), different school activities  Parents participation at pedagogical council when school strategy is discussed	Documents  Questionnaires	<b>Standard 4 is accomplished if indicator 1 is achieved at least at medium level</b>  Levels of achievement – see the text after the table

### Norms for self-evaluation of parental involvement

#### 1) Evaluation whether indicators for different quality standards have been achieved and to what degree/level

#### Levels of achievement of indicators:

- Indicator is not achieved if there is no compliance between the opinion of different respondent groups
- Indicator is achieved to a medium degree if there is a discrepancy between the opinions of different respondent groups or the compliance is below 60%

- Indicator is achieved to a high degree if the compliance between different respondent groups and other sources of information is above 60%

## 2) Evaluation whether the quality standards are achieved and to what degree

### Minimum requirements:

Standard 1 is accomplished in case indicators 2 and 3 are achieved at least at a medium level

Standard 2 is accomplished in case indicators 1 and 2 are achieved at least at a medium level

Standard 3 is accomplished in case indicators 1 and 3 are achieved at least at a medium level

Standard 4 is accomplished in case indicator 1 is achieved at least at medium level

### Ratings:

- Standard is not accomplished if the minimum indicators are not achieved
- Satisfactory – only minimum indicators are achieved
- High – more than the minimum indicators are achieved
- Excellent – all indicators are achieved

## 3) Evaluation of quality of school work with parents – overall statement

School work with parents is of a satisfactory quality if standard 2 and 3 are achieved (minimum standards)

### Ratings:

- Low quality – if standard 2 and 3 are not accomplished
- Satisfactory – if only standard 2 and 3 standards are accomplished
- High – if more than the minimum standards are accomplished at least at satisfactory level
- Excellent – all standards are accomplished

## Appendix 2: Self-evaluation report (form)

### REPORT – ANALYSIS FOR SCHOOL SELF-EVALUATION ON PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT (school year )

#### INTRODUCTION

Sources of information used for the preparation of the report: questionnaires for different stakeholders, documents for different activities that are relevant to parental involvement, meetings, conversations, etc.

Information about the number of respondents that were surveyed within the school (teachers, parents, students, management team), total number of respondents, % of respondents of the total number of each group in the school, demographic characteristics, difficulties during the survey implementation.

#### I. FINDINGS

##### *STANDARD 1*

##### **School-parents communication supports the educational process and students' progress**

.....  
.....  
.....

**STANDARD 2**

**Parents participate in school life**

.....

.....

.....

**STANDARD 3**

**School-parents interaction contributes to students' progress and to the sustainability of students' success**

.....

.....

.....

**STANDARD 4**

**Parents participate in setting priorities for school development**

.....

.....

.....

## **II. SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS**

**Strengths**

**Areas that need improvement**

**Level of compliance between the opinions of school management team, teachers, parents and students**

**Final conclusion about the quality of work with parents in the school**

### III. Plan for improvement and development

Areas that need improvement	Activities for improving work with parents	Deadline	Responsible person	Resources

Date: .....

School principal : .....

Accepted at Pedagogical council meeting on :..... (date)

**Appendix 3: Peer-evaluation report (form)**

**REPORT - ANALYSIS**  
**FOR SCHOOL PEER-EVALUATION ON PARENTAL INVOLVEMENTS**  
**(school year)**

**Evaluated school:**

**Peer-evaluation period: (from-to)**

**Peer-evaluation team: (data)**

**Participants from the school: (data)**

**I. FINDINGS**

***STANDARD 1***

**School-parents communication supports the educational process and students' progress**

.....  
.....  
.....

**STANDARD 2**

**Parents participate in school life**

.....

.....

.....

**STANDARD 3**

**School-parents interaction contributes to students' progress and to the sustainability of students' success**

.....

.....

.....

**STANDARD 4**

**Parents participate in setting priorities for school development**

.....

.....

.....

## **II. SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS**

**Strengths**

**Areas that need improvement**

**Level of concurrence between the opinions of school management team, teachers, parents and students**

**Final conclusion about the quality of parental involvement in the school**

- **Degree to which standards are achieved**
- **Quality of school work with parents**
- **Adequacy of the planned measures and activities for improvement**

## **III. RECOMENDATIONS**

- **What to be continued and supported as a good practice in school work with parents**
- **What to be improved and developed**
- **On what support from the network school can rely on for the implementation of the planned improvements**

**Date: .....**

**Signatures of peer-evaluators: .....**

## **IV. SCHOOL PRINCIPAL COMMENTS**

- **Which recommendations he/she accepts and which he/she disagrees with**

**I made myself acquainted with this report :**

**Principal: (name and signature)**

## APPENDIX

### TO PEER-EVALUATION REPORT ON PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT

**Evaluation of indicators and standards in the Framework for self-evaluation and peer-evaluation  
and a overall evaluation of quality of school work with parents**

SUMMARY INFORMATION GATHERED THROUGH PEER EVALUATION PROCESSES

Standards and indicators	School self-evaluation*	Evaluation of peer-evaluators* *	Comments ***
<b>Indicator 1.1.</b> School uses various forms for communication with parents			
<b>Indicator 1.2.</b> Communication goes both ways			
<b>Indicator 1.3.</b> School-parents communication is based on a mutual respect and trust			
<b>Indicator 1.4.</b> The school has developed a system for dealing with complaints and signals			
<b>Standard 1. School-parents communication supports the educational process and students' progress</b>			
<b>Indicator 2.1.</b> Parents attend school activities			
<b>Indicator 2.2.</b> Parents actively participate in different school activities/initiatives			
<b>Indicator 2.3.</b> Parents initiate school activities			

<b>Standard 2. Parents participate actively in school life</b>			
<b>Indicator 3.1.</b> Parents ensure students' presence at class and at school activities			
<b>Indicator 3.2.</b> Parents provide needed textbooks and other educational supplies			
<b>Indicator 3.3.</b> The school provides conditions for an adequate interaction with parents			
<b>Indicator 3.4.</b> Parents are satisfied with the conditions for support, by the progress and the sustainability of their students			
<b>Standard 3. School-parents interaction contributes to students' progress and to the sustainability of students' success</b>			
<b>Indicator 4.1.</b> Parents' active class-based groups and the school board initiate and implement activities for school development			
<b>Indicator 4.2.</b> Parents participate in development of school strategy			
<b>Standard 4. Parents participate in setting priorities for school development</b>			
<b>Summary evaluation for the quality of school work with parents</b>			

\* **School self-evaluation, stated in self-evaluation report, summarized information from three different sources (inputs – processes – outputs)**

- whatever is planned for the work with parents is also stated at school year plan and school development strategy (input);
- activities done in the field of parental involvement – they are described and an evaluation is carried out so it can be said to what extent the planned activities have been implemented in practice (absolutely, only partially, on top of the plan, reasons) (processes);
- stakeholders' opinion for the activities – parents, students, teachers, school management team, parents' and students' satisfaction by the partnership with the school (outputs).

Bases on the three sources of information the school formulates an evaluation for the achievement of each indicator and standards in the framework and a final summary evaluation for the quality of school work with parents.

**\*\*Evaluation of peer-evaluation team, stated in the peer-evaluation report, is based on 3 sources of information:**

- school self-evaluation report and a critical analysis of the information it presents;
- direct impressions from evaluation visit at the school and the information gathered through the discussions with school management team and representatives of teachers, students and parents (class-based parents groups, school board) in order to verify and supplement the information given in the self-evaluation report.

For each indicator and each standard the peer-evaluation team assesses to what degree it is achieved and states some arguments to support the evaluation, pointing out the relevant sources of information. Based on this procedure a final summary evaluation is made for the quality of school work with parents according to the norms from the Framework for self-evaluation and peer-evaluation.

While evaluating each indicator and standard and while stating the final summary evaluation, the peer-evaluators should consider school self-evaluation and it's compliance to the information obtained during the school visit.

While stating the final summary evaluation, the peer-evaluators should consider the factors of external context that the evaluated school works within (students' characteristics, parents' characteristics, school budget, traditions, community and municipal support, etc.)

**\*\*\* Comments**

In this column peer-evaluation team can present short information that clarifies or underlines their judgments as well as some consideration taken into account (environmental factors, etc.)

## Appendix 4: Framework for inspection of school-parents interaction

Erasmus+ 2014 Key Action 2 (KA2), Strategic Partnerships Project  
Project name: Polycentric inspections of networks of schools  
Reference number: 2014-1-UK01-KA200-001798

Signed: 03.2016

**VANYA KASTREVA,**  
**HEAD OF REGIONAL**  
**INSPECTORATE OF**  
**EDUCATION --**  
**SOFIA-CITY**

### Framework for inspection of network of 10 Sofia schools on ‘School work with parents’

*Subject of evaluation:* quality of school work with parents

*Quality of school work with parents (definition):* **The school has a deep and complex understanding of its’ responsibility in interacting with parents by means of well established school system for partnership, applying various forms of communication and involvement of parents in every planned school activity, encouraging their initiative to achieve successfully the educational goals, to develop students’ interests and abilities as well as to improve teachers’ professional competencies for effective partnership with parents.**

*Standards, indicators, norms and scale (Table 1)*

*Inspection methods:* check-up of mandatory and other types of school documentation, discussions with school principal, deputy principals, teachers, school counselor/psychologist, students, parents.

*Sources of information:* School and other types of documentation, school principal, deputy principals, teachers, school counselor/psychologist, students, parents. For all standards and indicators as universal sources of information will be used:

1. Schools' self-evaluation reports on school work with parents
2. Peer-evaluation reports of school work with parents
3. Discussions with school principals, deputy principals, teachers, psychologists/school counselor, students, parents, school board.

*Inspection data gathered for the period: 16.09.2014 – 29.01.2016*

Table 1

Standards	Indicators	Sources of information	Norms and scale
<p><b>1. Inclusion of parents in school life through a developed system for school partnership</b></p>	<p>1. The school includes parents in preparation and update of school development strategy</p> <p>2. On yearly basis (at the beginning of school year) a parents' opinion inquiry is implemented so the school's Year plan could be prepared.</p> <p>3. School board applies</p>	<p>1. School development strategy</p> <p>2. School board meetings minutes</p> <p>3. Minutes of Pedagogical council meetings</p> <p>4. Questionnaires for parents.</p> <p>1. School year plan for school years 2014/2015 and 2015/2016.</p> <p>2. Questionnaires for parents.</p> <p>3. Minutes of meetings with parents and parental class teams</p> <p>4. Registers of incoming/outgoing mails.</p> <p>1. Minutes of the Assembly of parental</p>	<p><b>Standard 1 is accomplished in case indicators 1 and 3 are accomplished.</b></p> <p><b>Levels of performance:</b></p> <p><b>Unsatisfactory– minimum indicators are not accomplished</b></p> <p><b>Good – only minimum indicators are accomplished</b></p> <p><b>Very good – more than minimum indicators are accomplished</b></p> <p><b>Excellent – all indicators are accomplished</b></p>

	<p>mechanism for popularization of its initiatives and for reporting to parents and teachers on different forms of support it has provided. School board chairman participates in the work of Pedagogical council.</p> <p>4. The school develops and supports students' self-governing bodies as a bridge for interaction with parents.</p>	<p>community/ School Board.</p> <p>2. Minutes of Pedagogical council meetings.</p> <p>3. School board charter.</p> <p>1. Plan for the work of Students Council/ Parliament.</p>	
<p><b>2. Implementation of various forms of communication with parents for their involvement in all planned school activities for achieving educational goals</b></p>	<p>1. The school informs parents for school curriculum and school syllabus.</p> <p>2. The school creates and develops conditions for integration of children with learning difficulties</p>	<p>1. Parental meetings minutes.</p> <p>2. School/ class internet sites.</p> <p>3. 'Open doors' day at school</p> <p>4. Groups for electronic communication.</p> <p>1. Documents that can prove the provision of supporting environment: principal's order for creating a team for support of education of students with special needs; individual</p>	<p><b>Standard 2 is accomplished in case indicators 1, 2, 3 and 4 are accomplished.</b></p> <p><b>Levels of performance:</b></p> <p><b>Unsatisfactory– minimum indicators are not accomplished</b></p> <p><b>Good – only minimum indicators are accomplished</b></p> <p><b>Very good – more than minimum indicators are accomplished</b></p>

	<p>3. Parents ensure students' attendance at school and the necessary textbooks and other study materials.</p> <p>4. The school applies a mechanism for informing parents about their children's success, learning difficulties and problems at school.</p> <p>5. The school systematically and by using different forms presents students' achievements in different areas to the parents.</p>	<p>educational programs; provided support by 'resource teacher'/center; work of school counselor/psychologist with parents of children with learning difficulties</p> <p>1. Class registers. 2. Students' registers. 3. Electronic register.</p> <p>1. Class registers. 2. Students' registers. 3. Electronic register. 4. Second Class lesson/hour – consultation of parents/ head teacher order for consultation schedule. 5. Notification letters for parents. 6. Working hours and consultation hours of school head teacher.</p> <p>1. Open doors day 2. School/class internet sites.</p>	<p><b>Excellent – all indicators are accomplished</b></p>
--	---	--	---

	6. The school has a developed mechanism for dealing with complaints and signals.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. School newspaper.</li> <li>4. Joint parental meetings.</li> <li>5. Mass-media and other forms of mass-communication.</li> <li>6. Deeds and awards.</li> <li>1. Register of incoming mail.</li> <li>2. Register of outgoing mail.</li> <li>3. Principal's orders.</li> </ul>	
<b>3. Encouragement of parents' initiative in interacting with the school for development of students' interests and abilities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The school applies various forms for motivating parents in order to create effective partnership that will contribute to the development of students' interests and abilities.</li> <li>2. The school applies a system for studying parents' opinion about the implementation of different extracurricular activities that will develop interests and abilities of their children and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. School/class internet site.</li> <li>2. Protocols of parental meetings.</li> <li>3. Documents for School Board initiatives.</li> <li>1. Questionnaires for parents and other forms of research.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Standard 3 is accomplished in case indicators 2 and 3 are accomplished.</b></p> <p><b>Levels of performance:</b></p> <p><b>Unsatisfactory– minimum indicators are not accomplished</b></p> <p><b>Good – only minimum indicators are accomplished</b></p> <p><b>Very good – more than minimum indicators are accomplished</b></p> <p><b>Excellent – all indicators are</b></p>

	<p>will prevent school drop-out.</p> <p>3. Parents participate in school provided extracurricular activities.</p> <p>4. Parents initiate and implement activities for development of students' interests and abilities.</p>	<p>1. Pictures.</p> <p>2. Publications and video materials in the media.</p> <p>1. Questionnaires for parents and other forms of research.</p> <p>2. Publications and video material in the media.</p>	<p><b>accomplished</b></p>
<p><b>4. Development of teachers' professional competencies for effective interaction and communication with parents.</b></p>	<p>1. The school plans and implements internal and external or the school forms for in-service training of teachers on topics related to interaction and partnership with parents.</p> <p>2. The school motivates and supports pedagogical staff to participate in in-service training within the framework</p>	<p>1. Documents for research of teachers' and other staff needs of qualification</p> <p>2. School plan for qualification activities .</p> <p>3. Documents that verify the participation of pedagogical staff participation in different qualifications.</p> <p>1. Documents about studying teachers' and other staff needs of qualification</p>	<p><b>Standard 4 is accomplished when indicators 1 and 4 are accomplished.</b></p> <p><b>Levels of performance:</b></p> <p><b>Unsatisfactory– minimum indicators are not accomplished</b></p> <p><b>Good – only minimum indicators are accomplished</b></p> <p><b>Very good – more than minimum indicators are accomplished</b></p>

	<p>of different national programs, projects and good practices exchange regarding school-parent interaction.</p> <p>3. The school cooperates with parents for development of pedagogical staff's competencies for career orientation of students.</p> <p>4. The school initiates and implements activities for application of pedagogical staff's skills and knowledge so that parental community could be involved in school life and becomes an active school partner.</p>	<p>2. Project documents.</p> <p>3. Documents that verify the participation of pedagogical staff participation in different qualifications.</p> <p>1. Lesson plans and thematic schedule of class lessons</p> <p>2. Documents of school counselor/psychologist.</p> <p>3. Questionnaires for parents and students.</p> <p>1. Open lessons.</p> <p>2. Exchange of good practices.</p> <p>3. School for parents.</p>	<p><b>Excellent – all indicators are accomplished</b></p>
			<p><b>School-parents interaction is of high quality in case standards 2 and 3 are accomplished.</b></p>

			<p><b>Quality levels</b></p> <p><b>Low quality – standard 2 and 3 are not accomplished.</b></p> <p><b>Good quality – standard 2 and 3 are accomplished.</b></p> <p><b>Very good quality – more than standard 2 and 3 are accomplished.</b></p> <p><b>High quality – all standards are accomplished.</b></p>
--	--	--	---

## **Appendix 5: Inspection report provided to each school in the network (form)**

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE  
**REGIONAL INSPECTORATE OF EDUCATION – SOFIA-CITY**

Sofia 1303, 17 Antim I Str. , tel.:9356050, fax:9883937, e-mail: rio\_sofia\_grad@mon.bg, www.rio-sofia-grad.com

---

### **Erasmus+ 2014 Key Action 2 (KA2), Strategic Partnerships Project**

**Project name:** Polycentric inspections of networks of schools

**Reference number:** 2014-1-UK01-KA200-001798

#### **APPROVED:**

**VANYA KASTREVA,  
HEAD OF RIE –  
SOFIA-CITY**

№

Incoming. № .....

#### **WRITTEN STATEMENT**

For implemented inspection by ..... - senior expert in ..... .at  
...../school/, district .....

At ....., based upon order № ..... issued by head of RIE – Sofia-city,  
following the activities within ‘Polycentric inspection of networks of schools’ project, an  
inspection was made at ....., area .....

Inspection topic: school-parents interaction.

Inspection subject: quality of school’s work with parents.

Type of inspection: thematic

Aim of inspection: indentifying the level of quality of school-parents interaction.

Inspection methods:

- check of obligatory school and education documentation;

- discussions with school principal, deputy principals, school counselor/psychologist, parents, Boards of trustees, students

## **FINDINGS**

**Standard 1: Inclusion of parents in school life through a developed system for school partnership** (following the indicators in the inspection framework).

.....  
.....

Level of performance : .....

**Standard 2: Implementation of various forms of communication with parents for their involvement in all planned school activities for achieving educational goals** (following the indicators in the inspection framework).

.....  
.....

Level of performance: .....

**Standard 3: Encouragement of parents' initiative in interacting with the school for development of students' interests and abilities** (following the indicators of inspection framework ).

.....  
.....

Level of performance:.....

**Standard 4: Development of teachers' professional competencies for effective interaction and communication with parents.** (following the indicators of inspection framework ).

.....  
.....

Level of performance: .....

**Overall judgement on quality of school-parents interaction**

.....  
.....

Level of fulfillment:.....

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. School implements/improves and develops approaches, practices, and mechanisms for improving quality of interaction with parents.

2. A need for support by the network for the school is needed for implementation of planned improvements.

**FOR THE SCHOOL:**

**PRINCIPAL OF** .....

...../signature/

...../name and surname/

**SENIOR EXPERT AT** .....

...../ signature /

...../name and surname /

## Appendix 6: Network inspection report (form)

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE  
**REGIONAL INSPECTORATE OF EDUCATION – SOFIA-CITY**

Sofia 1303, 17 Antim I Str., № 17, tel.:9356050, fax:9883937, e-mail: rio\_sofia\_grad@mon.bg, www.rio-sofia-grad.com

---

### Erasmus+ 2014 Key Action 2 (KA2), Strategic Partnerships Project

**Project name:** Polycentric inspections of networks of schools

**Reference number:** 2014-1-UK01-KA200-001798

**Incoming. №**

### APPROVED:

**VANYA KASTREVA,  
HEAD OF RIE –  
SOFIA-CITY**

**TO  
VANYA KASTREVA  
HEAD OF RIE  
SOFIA-CITY**

## REPORT

from ..... – .....

*About: inspection at ..... for testing of model for polycentric inspection of network of schools on standard 'School-parents interaction'*

**DEAR MRS. KASTREVA,**

Following your order No ....., between ..... an inspection at 10 schools in Sofia was implemented by 5 senior experts from REI, to test a model for polycentric inspection on school-parents interaction.

Inspection included a check of mandatory school, educational and other types of documentations and discussions with schools' principals, deputy principals, school counselorspsychologists, parents, Board of trustees, and students.

During the inspection schools presented self-evaluation reports (including plan with measures for improvement of their work with parents) and peer-evaluation reports (with added measures for improvement based on peer-evaluation recommendations).

Written statements with inspection findings are prepared for each school in the network as sollows: .....

**Inspection findings** for the network as are follows:

Standard 1: **Inclusion of parents in school life through a developed system for school partnership** (following the indicators in the inspection framework).

.....  
.....

Level of performance : .....

Standard 2: **Implementation of various forms of communication with parents for their involvement in all planned school activities for achieving educational goals** (following the indicators in the inspection framework).

.....  
.....

Level of performance: .....

Standard 3: **Encouragement of parents' initiative in interacting with the school for development of students' interests and abilities** (following the indicators of inspection framework ).

.....  
.....

Level of performance:.....

Standard 4: **Development of teachers' professional competencies for effective interaction and communication with parents.** (following the indicators of inspection framework ).

.....  
.....

Level of performance: .....

**Overall judgement on quality of school-parents interaction** and network functioning for improvement of schools' and network activities:

.....

**Level of concurrence between schools' self-evaluation, peer-evaluation, and inspection.**

.....

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. Schools implement, improve and develop approaches, practices, and mechanisms for improving quality of interaction with parents.
2. A need for support by the network for the schools is needed for implementation of planned improvements.

**Sincerely,**

.....

## **Appendix 7: Questionnaire for interview with principles after self-evaluation and before peer-evaluation**

### **QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SCHOOL PRINCIPALS**

**(after self-evaluation and before peer-evaluation)**

*Dear colleague.*

*This interview is part of research activities within ‘Polycentric inspection of school networks’ project, in which your school participates.*

*The purpose of the interview is to obtain information about school principals’ opinion at a certain stage of project activities – after school self-evaluation and before peer-evaluation between schools in the network.*

*Questions included refer to your understandings and expectations about:*

- *School network developed within the project – it’s up to date functioning and future development.*
- *The way peer-evaluation will affect the cooperation between schools within the network and the network itself.*
- *The way peer-evaluation could be used in the process of inspection of individual schools that will be implemented by Sofia the Regional inspectorate of education.*

*Data obtained by the interview will be used for project research purposes only. Results will be analyzed and presented in summary and will not be personalized.*

*Thank you for your cooperation!*

### **Defining the network**

*Structure of the network*

Who is part of this network, and what is the purpose of the network?

How did you join the school network in Sofia?

Why did you join the network? What were your expectations for your participation in it?

Why do individual actors want to be part of the network?

Does the network have clear vision and goals which are supported by all its members?

How do you define your/your school role in the network? What are the different roles and responsibilities of actors in the network; who is responsible for the functioning of the network?

How, and on what topics do actors in this network cooperate? What type of knowledge do they exchange?

What arrangements have been made in the network regarding the decision-making process and cooperation mechanisms?

Does the size of the network (number of partners) affect it's functioning and in what way?

What role does geographical/moral/cultural proximity play in the functioning of the network?

In what way were teachers in your school informed about the participation of the school in the network?

What do teachers in your school think about the network? How does the participation of the school in the network influence teachers work?

Do you think that the management structure of the network is suitable?

Is attention being paid to both the management of the network, and management in the network?

Is the network appropriately resourced to do its work?

Does the network have both the internal and the external legitimacy it requires?

How flexible is the network in redefining its purpose and members?

Is the network divided into sub-networks with specific responsibilities?

Are there opportunities for career and professional development in the network?

How has the network changed over time? And why? What caused the change?

### *Relationships and collaboration*

Did schools from the network work together before the network establishment? How does this affect the cooperation between them and between others participants in the network?

Are all the members similarly engaged with the network, or are there members who 'set the tone'?

Who is trusted/distrusted and why?

Who is the 'go to point' for specific type of knowledge?

What is the position of the Inspectorate in the network?

If you had to draw out the position of each member within the network, what would that look like (e.g. is there one partner central in the network, who is on the boundary)?

Are all members' perspectives taken into account when making decisions and is there a shared belief in the collaboration process?

Is the network/relationship structure evolving as expected and contributing positively to the work of the network?

### **Network-level outcomes**

Is the work of your school affected in the following areas?

- Students' achievements
- Raising students' attainment rates
- Students' drop-out rates
- Better students' transfer to a next level and stage of education
- Inclusive education and working with children with special education needs
- Parental involvement
- Parents' satisfaction with the provided education
- Continuous training and qualification of teachers
- Sharing of know-how (good practices) and resources in the network
- School competency to self-evaluate its activities
- Other .....

How is the work of your school influenced by the network?

What are the advantages and disadvantages for your school from its participation in the network?

How effective is the network in your opinion?

### **Evaluation practices of/in the network**

#### *Peer-evaluation network*

What do you think about peer-evaluation framework for schools in the network? (criteria, standards, procedures)

To what extent does the framework for peer-evaluation include standards to evaluate network-level outcomes or to evaluate collaboration between schools?

Are there criteria to come to an overall judgment on the effectiveness of the network, or of schools/service providers within the network? What are these criteria?

To what extent do schools/actors in the network have a role in informing the peer-review framework, or in bringing in topics for inspection or peer- reviews?

Who decides on whether the network, or school within the network is effective/good?

How were the standards/criteria for peer review developed and what informed them (e.g. research, legislation, other accountability/monitoring frameworks)?

#### *Peer-evaluation process*

How is assessment data from school self-evaluation communicated? To whom and with whom?

Who decides on how to act on self-evaluation findings and whom these findings will be presented to?

To what extent does peer-evaluation framework takes into account school self-evaluation results?

In what way your school participated in developing school visits schedule and procedure for peer-evaluation within the network? (gathering information, data analysis, formulating summarized evaluation)

#### *Embedding in regulatory context and clarity of formal responsibilities and roles*

Who is responsible for which part of the evaluation and improvement process (standard-setting, design and implementation of measures, collecting and analyzing findings, making judgments and deciding on actions)?

What is the regulatory/legislative context of the framework? Does it support school peer-evaluation or the forming of networks? How? Does it support involvement of schools/actors in the network or other stakeholders to decide on the standards in the framework for peer-evaluation?

#### **Potential dysfunctional effects of polycentric inspections of networks (transition costs)**

##### *Groupthink*

How free are you as a network member to express different views, or develop different practices?

##### *Transaction costs*

What new managerial/quality assurance/centralized roles, procedures have been established?

Which network-related activities and meetings have been scheduled? To what extent have network-related activities been integrated into existing school-level practices/workload?

Has the establishment of the network created additional workload, and what does that exist of? And if yes, is it supported financially or in other ways? Does it contribute to school-level/network-level outcomes?

How has the process of peer-evaluation impacting on workload?

##### *Single partners protecting their own independence and identity*

Is there any part of your service provision or expertise that you would not want to share with other partners in the network? If so, why not?

How has the process of peer-evaluation impacting on this?

### *Competition between partners in the network*

Is there some level of competition between partners in the network (e.g. in attracting students, teachers, resources)

How has the process of peer-evaluation impacting on this?

### *Power struggle*

Does membership of the network lead to conflict? Has your membership of the network resulted in any conflict situations emerging? And if so, what? How is being resolved, do you expect it to be resolved?

Who sets the agenda of the network? How will peer-evaluation impact on this? In what way?

### *Degrading of services*

Have you changed the level of your provision as a result of being a member of the network? And if so, how? E.g. have you limited your offer of services, or expanded it?

How will peer-evaluation process impact on this, especially on working with parents?

### *Diffusion of roles and responsibilities*

What are your responsibilities in terms of network-level outcomes and what are responsibilities of others? How clear is that for clients or users of the network-level outcomes?

How will peer-evaluation process impact on this?

### *Decreased motivation to collaborate, partners leaving the network*

Do all the partners participate equally in the network?

How will peer-evaluation process impact on this?

### *Knowledge is not equally shared between partners*

What knowledge is shared between partners, how often, how, between whom?

Do all partners have equal access to network-related information (refer to specific network-level outcomes)? And if not, why not?

How will peer-evaluation process impact on that?

### *Openness to external stakeholders and transaction costs in negotiation competing agendas of different stakeholders.*

Who are relevant external stakeholders for the network?

What are their expectations of the network?

Do external stakeholders have a shared understanding or goal of/for the network?

How do you address a situation where there are competing goals for the network?

How will peer-evaluation process impact on this?

### **External context of the network**

#### *Resources*

Do schools and the network receive enough resources to provide a good level of education and evaluate and improve (network-level) outcomes? If not, how does this influence the education you provide?

Who provides these resources? How are resources allocated within and across schools (who decides)?

Are there enough teachers, and are you content with the initial teacher training?

#### *Socio-economic*

Can you describe the socio-economic characteristics of the students / region the network is in?

Are there students from (different ethnic) minority backgrounds?

How is school work affected by: students with low socio-economic background, students with different ethnic and others minorities, students with special educational needs, students raised by single parents or by extended family?

Has number of students been going up or down for the past several years? (at school, in the neighborhood, in the city)

#### *Support from community*

Are there positive relationships developed with local authorities during the past time (municipality and Regional inspectorate of education)?

Do you receive adequate support from the municipality and the inspectorate?

Are there sufficient external community services provided for schools and students by other agencies?

Which partners support the network to improve? How/why?

## **Appendix 8: Questionnaire for teachers after self-evaluation and before peer-evaluation**

### **QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS**

**(after self-evaluation and before peer-review)**

*Dear colleague,*

*This questionnaire is part of research activities within ‘Polycentric inspection of school networks’ project in which your school participates.*

*The purpose of the questionnaire is to obtain information about teachers’ opinion at a certain stage of project activities – the beginning of the second stage.*

*Please, share your opinion on the questions bellow and the experience of your school in its participation in the project.*

*This questionnaire is anonymous and results will be analyzed and presented in a summary and will not be personalized.*

*Thank you for your cooperation!*

1. Are you aware of the fact that your school participates in Erasmus+ project ‘Polycentric inspections of school network’?

Yes

No

I’m not sure

2. Are you aware of the fact that your school is part of a school network of 10 schools in Sofia, which partner in the project?

Yes

No

I’m not sure

3. Do you know which other school in Sofia are part of the project network?

Yes

I don't have such information

I'm not sure

4. Does your school cooperate with other schools in the network regarding other activities/projects?

Yes, currently

Yes, some time ago

I don't have such information

5. In what way were you informed about your school participation in the project network?

Personally by the school headmaster

At a pedagogical council

I was not informed

Other.....

6. Are you familiar with the goals of school network that your school participates in?

Yes

No

Partially

Please, state these goals in the way you understand them.

.....

7. On what topics schools in the network cooperate? What knowledge and experience they share? (*mark any answer valid for your school*)

Parental involvement

Working with children with special educational needs

Teacher in service training

Extracurricular activities

Assessment of students' achievements at the beginning of school year (development and application of standardized tests for 4<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> grade for subjects that will be part of

national assessment)

School self-evaluation

School peer-evaluation within the network

Inspection of school of the network

Others (please, describe).....

8. What part of the pedagogical specialists in your school is engaged with school's activities on the project?

School management team and a large part of my colleagues

School management team and some part of my colleagues

School management team and only a small number of my colleagues

Only school management team

9. To what extend school personnel is engaged in the project activities?

Very high

High

Medium

Low

It's not engaged

I can't say

10. Is personnel's opinion taken into account when school activities on the project are planned and implemented?

Yes, always

Sometimes

No, never

I can't say

11. In your opinion, are your school activities positively influenced by the participation in the network? Please state in which areas and to what extent.

	Very high	High	Medium	Low	Not influenced
Students achievements					
Raising students' attainment rates					
Students' drop-out rates					
Better realization of students in next education stage and level					
Inclusive education and working with children with special educational needs					
Parental involvement					
Parents' satisfaction with the provided education					
Continuous training and qualification of teachers					
Sharing know-how (good practices) and resources within the network					
School competency to self-evaluate its activities					
Others (please, describe)					

12. In your opinion, in what way is school work influenced by its participation in the network?

Mostly positive

It has its positive and d negative effects

Mostly negative

School work is not influenced

13. In your opinion, what are the advantages/benefits and disadvantages/limitations for your school due to its participation in the network and in the project?

*(State your answer in a free form)*

14. Are you familiar with the framework for self-evaluation and peer-evaluation of schools' work with parents, developed within the project?

Yes, partially

No

15. What do you think about the framework for school self-evaluation and peer-evaluation (criteria, standards, procedures?)

I absolutely approve it

I approve it in some parts and elements (please, be more specific).....

I don't approve it

I'm not familiar with the framework

16. In your opinion, for what the framework for self-evaluation and peer-evaluation could be useful? (mark every valid answer)

It can be useful for a diagnosis of school work with parents

It can be useful for improving school work with parents

It's not useful

Other (please, specify) .....

17. Are you aware of the fact that there is a forthcoming peer-evaluation of schools in the network on parental involvement area, based on the developed Framework?

Yes

No

18. Does the network provide support to individual schools for the forthcoming peer-evaluation?

Yes

No

I can't say

19. In your opinion, is the self-evaluation on parental involvement, conducted in your school, related to the forthcoming peer-evaluation?

Yes, data from school self-evaluation will be taken into account during the peer-evaluation

Those two are not related

I can't say

Other (please, specify) .....

20. Is the opinion of school personnel taken into account when the forthcoming peer-evaluation is planned and implemented?

Yes

No

I can't say

21. Are results from school self-evaluation for working with parents being distributed and discussed in the school?

Results were presented to the personnel (meetings, pedagogical council) but were not discussed

Results were presented to the personnel and we had the opportunity to discuss them in details

Such presentation and discussions are scheduled

No presentation and discussion are scheduled

Other (please, specify).....

22. Have the results of self-evaluation on parental involvement been presented to the parents?

Results were presented to the parents (school board, parents' bodies in each class) but were not discussed with them

Results were presented to the parents and were discussed with them

Such presentation and discussions are scheduled

No presentation and discussion are scheduled

Other (please, specify).....

23. Who decides how to act based on the conclusions of self-evaluation of parental involvement?

School management team

School management team makes a discussion for the possible measures and takes the final decision

Options are discussed and the final decision is taken with a consensus by the pedagogical council

Other (please specify).....

24. Do you think that self-evaluation that was implemented in your school on parental involvement is good for the school and for the improvement of its activities?

Yes, absolutely

To a large extent

Somewhat

To a small extent

It's not useful

25. Did you participate in school self-evaluation on parental involvement in your school?

Yes, as a respondent (I filled in a teacher questionnaire)

Yes, in the organization and implementation of different activities (questionnaires for parents, students, etc.)

Yes, in gathering and analysis of data

Other (please specify).....

No

26. Does school participation in the network created additional workload for you?

Yes (please, specify).....

No

27. How do you evaluate the use of time and human resources for the implementation of school self-evaluation on parental involvement in your school?

High costs, but really big benefits

High costs, but small benefits

Acceptable costs

Low costs with small benefits

Low costs with big benefits

Other (please specify)

28. In your opinion is there a competition between schools in the network and if so – in what way it presents itself?

Yes (please, specify).....

No

29. Do you think that your colleagues' motivation for school participation in the network and in the project is decreasing? (in comparison with the beginning of the project)

Yes

No

It's hard to tell

30. If you marked "Yes" to the previous question how do you think it will influence the forthcoming peer-evaluation in the network?

.....

31. Does the school has enough resources to provide a good level of education and to improving its results (including at network level)

Yes, absolutely

To some extent

No

I can't say

32. How the presence of students from the following groups influences school work?

	We don't have such students	It impacts the work significantly	It impacts the work somewhat	It doesn't impacts the work
--	-----------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------------

With low socio-economic status				
From ethnic and other minorities				
With special educational needs				
Raised by single parents or extended family				

33. Do you think that the school has built good partnerships with ....(mark all the valid answers)

School board

Municipality

NGOs

Cultural institutions

Universities

Business organizations

Regional inspectorate of Education

Others (please, specify).....

**Please, fill in the following information about yourself**

*You are a teacher at school No.:*

2, 12 , 26 , 44 , 51 , 56 , 104, 120 , 145 , 171

*Gender:*

Male

Female

*You are a teacher at:*

Primary level

Lower secondary level

Upper secondary level

*You serve as a class tutor:*

Yes

No

## **Appendix 9: Protocol for observation of peer-review**

### **MINUTES**

#### **From peer-evaluation**

*of ..... (school)*

*Date: .....*

*Peer-evaluation team: .....*

1. School preparation for peer-evaluation.
2. Evaluation team preparation for peer-evaluation.
3. Discussions with students, parents, and teachers – approaches, discussed questions, atmosphere, questions' relevance to the peer-evaluation framework.
4. Atmosphere during peer-evaluation.
5. Requests for additional documents and artifacts to be presented.
6. Feedback at the closer of the visit.
7. Duration.

## Appendix 10: Questionnaire for peer-evaluation teams

### QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PEER-EVALUATION TEAM MEMBERS

#### After peer-evaluation and before inspection

*Dear colleagues,*

*The present questionnaire is a part of the research activities within the ‘Polycentric inspections of network of schools’ project in which your school participates.*

*The purpose of the questionnaire is to obtain information from network participants at a certain stage of the project implementation – after the peer-evaluation of schools and before the inspection of the network.*

*Questions included here refer to your opinion about:*

- *The way peer-evaluation was done and how it will affect the cooperation among schools in the network and the network itself.*
- *The way peer-evaluation could be used during the inspection of the schools in the network.*
- *The way inspections will influence the cooperation among schools in the network.*
- *The way inspections will be influenced by the work of the network and the self-evaluation and peer-evaluation implemented in it.*

*Please respond to the questions by stating your answers in free form.*

*The data obtained through this questionnaire will be used for research purposes of the project only. The results will be analyzed and presented in general and won’t be personalized.*

*Thank you for your cooperation!*

You are:

School principal

A member of the peer-evaluation team (please, state your position at school).....

#### **I. After peer-evaluation**

#### **B. Evaluation practices of/in the network**

*Framework and procedure for peer-evaluation*

After the peer-evaluation what is your opinion about the framework that was used for the evaluation process?

What do you think about the procedure of the peer-evaluation?

In what way you as a school head teacher or as a member of the evaluation team prepared yourself for the peer-evaluation of the other schools?

In what way you and the other colleagues in your school prepared yourself for the evaluation of your school??

What else could have been done for the preparation of your school and the network for the peer-evaluation?

Do you think that during the peer-evaluation all participants in the network were included in the process to the same degree?

### *Evaluation process/inspection visit and follow-up*

To what extent do you think your school self-evaluation was taken into account during the process and within the conclusions of the peer-evaluation?

How the peer-evaluation was done in your school? Are there parts or elements of it that you think as mostly positive and others that you consider as mostly negative? Please, be specific.

Did you encounter any difficulties during the peer-evaluation of the other schools? If yes, please be specific and state them clearly.

Do you believe the feedback you received from the peer-evaluation to be useful?

Do you plan any changes and improvements in your school regarding work with parents as a result of the peer-evaluation and the feedback you received?

Do you have any ideas about future development of network cooperation as a result of the peer-evaluation?

How do you plan to disseminate the feedback from the peer-evaluation and who do you plan to inform about it?

Do you plan to or have you already informed parents about the results of the peer-evaluation? If yes – in what way?

In what way do you think the recommendations of the peer-evaluation should be implemented at network level?

In what way do you expect the results of the peer-evaluation to influence the preparation and the delivery of the envisaged inspections in the network?

During the peer-evaluation process what do you think was the role of the Sofia University partners?

What benefits for your school you would state as a result of its participation in the peer-evaluation within the network? Do you see any negatives as a result of this participation?

What benefits for you as a manager and as a professional do you see as a result of your participation in the peer-evaluation? Are there any negatives?

### **C. Effects and benefits of peer-evaluation within the network**

*As a result of the peer-evaluation:*

Have your opinion about the freedom to state different points of view within the network changed? In what way? Which elements of peer-evaluation contributed to such a change?

Will new role (management, quality management) and procedure appear in the school and in the network?

What activities on network level would you suggest to be planned? How you will integrate them in your school activities?

Is there any change in your readiness to share experience and expertise with other network participants? If yes – why and in what way? How you will implement such a change?

Is there any change in your feelings about the competition between network partners (for example – in attracting students, teachers and/or resources)? To what factor do you contribute such a change?

Did new conflict situations occur in the network and/or the school? If yes – what types of conflicts? How do you plan to solve them? Do you expect them to be solved?

Do you foresee any changes in the way the school works as a whole due to its participation in the network? If yes – in what areas and in what way?

What good practices you would integrate in your school and how?

How do you see your responsibilities for the results on network level and what are the responsibilities of the other partners?

Have your opinion about the equivalent participation of all network partners changed?

Do you think that at this stage there are partners that would leave the network and why?

Do you think that the access to information for all partners about the network (regarding the specific results on network level) will change?

### **D. External context**

Which factors of the school external context were taken into account for the peer-evaluation? To what extend?

Are there any other external factors that should have been taken into account for the peer-evaluation? State them and say why should they be taken into account?

Did lack of resources for the network make peer-evaluation more difficult? In what way and in what areas?

Are there any conclusions and recommendations from the peer-evaluation that will support the school when dealing with external factors?

Did you have any support from the local authorities during the peer-evaluation? Did you need such a support? IN what elements and moments of peer-evaluation did you need it?

Are there any conclusions from the peer-evaluation that will support the school to improve its interaction with the local authorities?

## **II. Before the inspection**

### **B. Inspection practices of/in the network**

#### *Inspection framework*

Are you familiar with the Inspection framework, its standards and what will be evaluated during the inspection?

To what extend schools and other network participants played a role in the development of the inspection framework and in defining the topic/object of inspection?

Are you aware how the standards and criteria for inspection are developed and on what ground they are based (for example – research, legal norms, other similar frameworks for monitoring and inspection)?

In your opinion, to what extend the inspection framework includes standards for evaluation of results on network level or for evaluation of cooperation between schools?

Does the framework includes criteria that will provide an opportunity for a complete estimation of the network effectiveness and for the estimation of the effectiveness of each separate school in the network? Which are those indicators? How do you decide whether the network is effective or ineffective (which are the main indicators and criteria for evaluating its effectiveness)?

What are the relations between the standards for inspecting and evaluating a separate school and for inspecting the network?

#### *Inspection process, visits and follow-ups*

Is there a support (cooperation) between schools when preparing for the inspection? What type of support and in which areas?

Were your school's self-evaluation and peer-evaluation influenced in any way by the upcoming inspection? How and in what areas?

To what extend do you expect the inspection in your school to take into account school self-evaluation and peer-evaluation made in the network? Which of these two do you think should have a larger weight for the inspection – self or peer-evaluation?

Did you participate in any way in the development of the plan for the inspection visits?

Did you participate in any way in the defining of the documents and information that school should present to the Inspectorate before the visit?

Do you plan to make the inspection report public? How will you do it and who will have access to the report?

### *Embedding in regulatory context and clarity of formal responsibilities and roles*

What is the regulatory/legislative context of the inspection in framework? Does it support inspections or the forming of networks? How? Does it support involvement of schools/actors in the network or other stakeholders to decide on the standards in the framework?

### **C. Impact of polycentric inspection**

Are there differences in how single schools generally prepare for single school inspections versus polycentric inspection when you are part of a network? What are these differences? In what areas?

What do you think the benefits and difficulties of polycentric inspections of the network will be? For whom?

What influence this type of inspection you expect to have upon your school, upon the network and upon other interested parties (parents, students, local authorities)?

Which elements of polycentric inspection do you think will actually have any impact?

Do you expect any consequences of the polycentric inspection for your school and for the network as a whole? What consequences and in what areas do you think will occur?

### **F. Potential dysfunctional effects of polycentric inspection of the networks (transition costs)**

#### *Groupthink*

Do you expect the inspection process to influence your level of freedom to express different opinion in the network? If yes – in what way?

#### *Transaction costs*

Did you created any new management roles or procedures in your school or in the network related to the upcoming inspection? What roles and why did you created them?

Are any additional school or network activities planned with regard to the upcoming inspection? If yes – how did you integrated them in school work? Did this increase school personnel workload?

*Single partners protecting their own independence and identity*

Is there any part of your service provision or expertise that you would not want to share with other partners in the network regarding the future inspection? If so, why not?

*Competition between partners in the network*

Is there some level of competition between partners in the network (e.g. in attracting students, teachers, resources) related to the inspection?

*Power struggle*

Does future inspection lead to conflict situations? If yes – what are they? How are such situations resolved, do you expect them to be resolved?

Who sets the agenda/action plan for the network when it comes to the inspection?

How the inspection will influence this?

*Degrading of services*

Do you think that the inspection will influence work with parents in your school and in the network as a whole?

Do you think that the inspection will influence education services that school and the network provide?

*Decreased motivation to collaborate, partners leaving the network*

In your opinion how the inspection process will influence the equivalent participation of partners in the network and is there some chances any of the partners to leave the network?

*Knowledge is not equally shared between partners*

How do you think the inspection will be influenced by the level of information sharing within the network?

How the inspection will influence the level of information sharing within the network?

*Less weight placed on single school inspections*

Do you think that the upcoming inspection of the schools in the network will change in any way the significance of single school inspections?

*Single schools hiding behind the brand of the network/activities of the network (gaming, making sure low level performing schools are not inspected)*

How the network prepares for the inspection? Do you change your practices in a way to maximize the evaluation of the inspection? Do you create new protocols or procedures which will be evaluated positively?

Which are some of the practices in the network that you would not want to present to the Inspectorate? Are there any specific aspects of the network that you would not want the Inspectorate to know about?

How will this influence the inspection process?

## **F. External context of the network**

### *Resources*

Do you expect the inspection to take into account the levels of resource provision when making inspection conclusions?

### *Socio-economic*

To what extent do you expect inspection to consider socio-economic conditions of the network and socio-economic conditions of each separate school?

### *Community support*

Do you expect the inspection to influence the support you receive from the community – as a school and as a part of a network?

## **Appendix 11: Questionnaire for teachers after peer-evaluation and before inspection**

### **QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS**

**(after peer-evaluation and before inspections of schools in the network)**

*Dear colleague.*

*This questionnaire is part of research activities within “Polycentric inspection of school networks”, in which your school participates*

*The purpose of the questionnaire is to gather information about school headmasters’ opinion at a certain stage of project activities –the second stage.*

*Please, share your opinion on the questions bellow and the experience of your school in its participation in the project.*

*This questionnaire is anonymous and results will be analyzed and presented in summary and will not be personalized.*

*Thank you for your cooperation!*

1. Are you aware that a peer-evaluation of work with parents in your school was done as a part of the activities on the ‘Polycentric inspections of school network’ project?

Yes

No

2. Did you participated in peer- evaluation of the schools in the network

Yes (please, state your role) .....

No

3. Are results from school peer-evaluation of parental involvement being distributed and discussed in the school?

Results were presented to the personnel (meetings, pedagogical council) but were not discussed

Results were presented to the personnel and we had the opportunity to discuss them in details

Such presentation and discussions are scheduled

No presentation and discussion id scheduled

Other (please, specify).....

4. Have the results of peer-evaluation on of parental involvement been presented to the parents?

Results were presented to the parents (school board, parents' bodies in each class) but were not discussed with them

Results were presented to the parents and were discussed with them

Such presentation and discussions are scheduled

No presentation and discussion id scheduled

Other (please, be specific).....

5. Do you think that peer-evaluation of your school of parental involvement is good for the school and for the improvement of its activities?

Yes, absolutely

To a large extent

Somewhat

To a small extent

It's not useful

I can't say

6. How do you evaluate the use of time and human resources for the implementation of school peer-evaluation of parental involvement in your school?

High costs, but really big benefits

High costs, but small benefits

Acceptable costs

Low costs with small benefits

Low costs with big benefits

Other (please specify)

7. Do you think that your colleagues' motivation for school participation in the network and in the project is going down (compared to the beginning of the project)?

Yes

No

It's hard to tell

8. Does your school plans any changes in its work with parents as a result of the participation in the network?

Yes

No

I don't know

9. Do you think that good practices for parental involvement in other schools in the network could be integrated in your school?

Yes

I'm not familiar with such practices

I can't say

Other (please, specify).....

10. Are you aware of the fact that there is an upcoming inspection of parental involvement in your schools as a part of the activities on the project "Polycentric inspections of school network"?

Yes

No

11. In what way were you informed about the upcoming inspection of your school?

Personally by the principal

At pedagogical council meeting

I am not informed

Other (please, specify).....

12. In your opinion, is the peer-evaluation of parental involvement, conducted in your school, related to the forthcoming inspection of your school on the same topic?

Yes, data from peer-evaluation will be taken into account during the inspection

Those two are not related

I can't say

Other (please, be specific).....

13. What do you think would be the benefits of the inspection of the school as a part of the school network within the project?

Please, state your opinion .....

14. Are there any differences in the way your school usually prepares for an inspection and the way this preparation happens now, when the inspection will be done in a network of schools?

Please, state your opinion .....

15. Do you expect any consequences from the inspection for your school and for the network itself? What type of consequences? About what they will present themselves.

Please, state your opinion .....

**Please, fill in the following information about yourself:**

*You are a teacher at school No.:*

2 , 12 , 26 , 44 , 51 , 56 , 104 , 120 , 145 , 171

*Gender:*

Male

Female

*You are a teacher at:*

Primary level

Lower secondary level

Upper secondary level

*You serve as a class tutor:*

Yes

No

## **Appendix 12: Questionnaire for interview with inspectors before inspection of the network**

### **QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INSPECTORS from Sofia Regional Inspectorate of Education (RIE) (before inspection of the network)**

*Dear colleague,*

*This interview is part of research activities within 'Polycentric inspection of school networks' project, in which Regional Inspectorate of Education Sofia-city participates.*

*The main objective of the interview is to obtain information about inspectorate experts' opinion at a certain stage of project activities – before polycentric inspection of network of schools, established for the project purposes.*

*This interview is intended for experts from the inspection team that will implement inspection of the network of schools on parental involvement topic.*

*Data obtained through this interview will be used for project research purposes only. Results will be analysed and presented in a summary and will not be personalized.*

*Thank you for your cooperation!*

#### **A. Defining the network**

*Structure of the network*

How did RIE Sofia City join the school network in Sofia? Who is part of this network, and what is the purpose of the network?

How did RIE-Sofia choose the schools for participation in the network and what principles for this choice were applied?

What were your expectations for your participation in the network and in the project?

Why do individual actors want to be part of the network?

Does the network have clear vision and goals which are supported by all its members?

What are the different roles and responsibilities of actors in the network; who is responsible for the functioning of the network?

How, and on what topics do actors in this network cooperate? What type of knowledge do they exchange?

What arrangements have been made in the network regarding the decision-making process the cooperation mechanisms?

Does the size of the network (number of partners) affect its functioning and in what way?

What role does geographical/moral/cultural proximity play in the functioning of the network?

Do you think that the management structure of the network is suitable?

Is attention being paid to both the management of the network, and management in the network?

Is the network appropriately resourced to do its work?

Does the network have both the internal and the external legitimacy it requires?

How flexible is the network in redefining its purpose and members?

Is the network divided into sub-networks with specific responsibilities?

Are there opportunities for career and professional development?

How has the network changed over time? And why? What caused the change?

#### *Relationships and collaboration*

Are all the members similarly engaged with the network, or are there members who ‘set the tone’?

Who is trusted/distrusted and why?

Who is the ‘go to point’ for specific type of knowledge?

What is the position of the Inspectorate in the network?

If you had to draw out the position of each member within the network, what would that look like (e.g. is there one partner central in the network, which is on the boundary)?

Are all members’ perspectives taken into account when making decisions and is there a shared belief in the collaboration process?

Is the network/relationship structure evolving as expected and contributing positively to the work of the network?

#### *Legislative position of the network*

Is there legislation underpinning the establishment of the network? If so, which legislation?

What is the current national policy on school networks?

## **B. Network-level outcomes**

How is the work of different partners impacted by the network?

How effective is the network in your opinion?

## **C. Defining the network to inspect**

How was it decided to inspect this network and specific timing of inspection?

Who from the network (which actors, stakeholders, other service providers) is involved in the network inspection, what is their role?

Are there other stakeholders who should be, or are, involved in the inspections, perhaps on a more ad hoc basis?

What has been RIE Sofia involvement with this network from the beginning of the project?

## **D. Evaluation practices**

### *Inspection framework*

What does the framework for inspections look like, which standards are included and what is evaluated?

How were the standards/criteria for peer review/inspection developed and what informed them (e.g. research, legislation, other accountability/monitoring frameworks)?

To what extent do schools/actors in the network have a role in informing the inspection framework, or in bringing in topics for inspection?

To what extent does the framework include standards to evaluate network-level outcomes or to evaluate collaboration between schools/service providers?

Are there criteria to come to an overall judgement on the effectiveness of the network, or of schools/service providers within the network? What are these criteria?

How do you decide if the network is effective or ineffective (e.g. what are norm indicators, criteria for assessing effectiveness)?

What is the relation between the inspection standards to evaluate single schools versus the standards to evaluate the network?

### *Inspection visit and follow-up*

How was the inspection team formed? Based on what grounds? How was its composition defined?

How do inspectors prepare the polycentric inspections?

Which data is collected and analysed prior to the visit? How is the schedule for the inspection visit informed, and what does it look like (which types of data collection and with whom)?

To what extent does the framework take into account school self-evaluation and peer review? In what way?

How are the schools/other actors (and potentially other stakeholders) involved in setting the agenda for inspection visits, in generating and collecting and interpreting evaluation data and in making judgements based on data?

How will inspection assessments be communicated and to whom?

Are there consequences for the 'polycentric inspection' (both formal as well as informal, as well as consequences enforced by the Inspectorate and other stakeholders in the system)? Is there any follow-up to the 'polycentric inspection', that Inspectorate will plan after the polycentric inspection?

What type of inspection feedback do you plan to give to the schools and to the network and how it will be done?

How/who decides on how the network should act on inspection findings and how should this be communicated to the Inspectorate?

Does the Inspectorate collaborate/liaise with other partners to ensure the network improves? How, what does this look like?

#### *Embedding in regulatory context and clarity of formal responsibilities and roles*

Who is responsible for which part of the evaluation and improvement process (standard-setting, design and implementation of inspection measures, collecting and analysing findings, making judgements and deciding on actions)? To which extent are these responsibilities set in legislation or otherwise regulated or negotiated?

What is the regulatory/legislative context of polycentric inspections? Does it support such types of inspections? How? Does legislation supports involvement of schools/actors in the network or other stakeholders to decide on the standards in the framework?

Are there enough resources to implement 'polycentric inspection'? Do you expect the Inspectorate will be sufficiently resourced in the future to implement these types of inspections?

#### **E. Impact of polycentric inspection (positive and negative)**

Do you think that there are differences in the way schools in the network prepare for polycentric inspection compared to the traditional inspections?

Do you think 'polycentric inspection' have an impact on the functioning of individual schools and of the network in general, and on this network specifically? Do you have any evidence or specific examples supporting your answer?

Do you think ‘polycentric inspection’ have had any dysfunctional effects on schools and the network? Please provide examples.

Which type of inspection feedback is used for improvement/drives improvement most? (single school and network-level inspection feedback)?

#### **F. External context**

Do you plan to take into account the contextual factors of the network and the individual schools? If yes, which factors you will consider during the inspection and in what way?

What other contextual factors do you recognize as influential for the network in a positive and negative way?

Which partners support and/or pressurize the network to improve, how/why?

## **Appendix 13: Protocol for observation of inspection**

### **MINUTES of observation of inspection**

*School: .....*

*Date: .....*

*Inspection team: .....*

1. Levels to which inspection framework and procedure are followed
2. Preparation of school for the inspection
3. Discussions with students, parents, and teachers – approaches, questions, atmosphere
4. Overall atmosphere of inspection, inspectors' approaches
5. Documentation check
6. Providing feedback at the closure of school visit
7. Duration

## **Appendix 14: Questionnaire for interview inspectors after inspection of the network**

### **QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INTERVIEW WITH INSPECTORS**

**from Sofia Inspectorate of Education**

**after inspection of the network**

*Dear colleague,*

*This interview is part of research activities within ‘Polycentric inspection of school networks, project in which Regional Inspectorate of Education Sofia-city participates.*

*The purpose of the interview is to obtain information about inspectorate experts’ opinion at a certain stage of project activities – after polycentric inspection of network of schools, created for the project objectives.*

*This interview is intended for experts from the inspection team that took part the inspection of network of schools on parental involvement topic.*

*Main focus of this interview is to obtain information about:*

- *Expected effects of inspection on the network of schools.*
- *The way the inspection was influenced by the fact that it is done in a network of schools.*
- *The way the inspection was done as a preparation, procedures and results.*

*Data obtained through this interview and will be used for project research purposes only. Results will be analyzed and presented in summary and will not be personalized.*

*Thank you for your cooperation!*

### **C. Evaluation practices**

*Inspection visit and follow-up*

1. Was the preparation for the inspection of the network of schools enough? Would you change anything now if you have a chance?
2. How the inspection went in different schools regarding your planned inspection technology?
3. To what extent did you take into account school self and peer-evaluation during the inspection?
4. How were the schools/other actors (and potentially other stakeholders) involved in setting the agenda for inspection visits, in generating and collecting and interpreting evaluation data and in making judgments based on data?
5. How will inspection assessments be communicated and to whom?

6. Do you think that inspection of network of schools supports the creation of ownership over the inspection conclusions?
7. Are there consequences for the 'polycentric inspection' (both formal as well as informal, as well as consequences enforced by the Inspectorate and other stakeholders in the system)?
8. Is there any follow-up to the 'polycentric inspection', either by the Inspectorate or other partners in the system?

#### **D. Impact of 'polycentric inspection' (positive and negative)**

1. How did schools/the network prepare for 'polycentric inspection'? Are there differences in how different schools within the network prepare for 'polycentric inspections'? Are there differences with how single schools generally prepare for single school inspections versus polycentric inspections?
2. Do you think 'polycentric inspection' have an impact on the functioning of individual schools and of the network in general, and on this network specifically? Do you have any evidence or specific examples supporting your answer?
3. After the polycentric inspection, do you think it have had any dysfunctional effects in:
  - a. Motivating (schools within the) network to develop 'groupthink'
  - b. Are current dominant practices in the network set by the external inspection/accountability framework?
  - c. Increasing transaction costs within the network
4. Which type of inspection feedback is used for improvement/drives improvement most? (single school/network-level inspection feedback)?

#### **E. External context**

1. Did you take into account the contextual factors of the network? To what extent and which factors?
2. What other contextual factors do you think should have been taken into account during the inspection?

## **Appendix 15: Questionnaire for interview with principals after inspection of the network**

### **QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INTERVIEW WITH PRINCIPALS**

#### **After inspection of the network**

*Dear colleague,*

*This interview is a part of the research activities within the 'Polycentric inspections of network of schools' project in which your school participates.*

*The main objective of interview is to obtain information from network participants at a certain stage of the project implementation – after the inspection of the network.*

*Questions refer to your opinion about:*

- *The way inspection was done in your school and in the network.*
- *The way inspection will affect the cooperation among schools in the network and the network itself.*
- *The way inspections will influence the cooperation among schools in the network.*
- *The way inspections took into consideration the results of self- and peer-evaluation of schools in the network and in your school in particular*

*The data obtained through this interview will be used for research purposes of the project only. The results will be analyzed and presented in summary and won't be personalized.*

*Thank you for your cooperation!*

#### **B. Evaluation practices of/in the network**

##### *Inspection framework*

1. After the inspection what is your opinion about the framework that was used during the inspection process in your school and in the network?
2. Were you prepared for the inspection? What else could have been done in order to prepare your school for the inspection as a part of the network?

##### *Inspection visit and follow-up*

3. To what extent do you think your school self-evaluation and peer-evaluation were taken into account during the process and within the conclusions of the inspection?
4. How the inspection was done in your school? Are there parts or elements of it that you think as mostly positive and others that you consider as mostly negative?

5. Are you satisfied with the extent to which you were included in the preparation and the delivery of the inspection in your school? What about the inspections in other schools in the network? Please, state clearly in what areas and how you were involved?
6. What type of feedback (strengths and weaknesses) you received from the inspection?
7. After the inspection did you receive feedback concerning cooperation among schools and other partners within the network and its results? In what way? Do you plan any future changes in your work in the network as a result of this feedback?
8. How do you disseminate or plan to disseminate inspection evaluation and to whom?
9. Is it clear for the school and for the network who is responsible for the implementation of the inspection recommendations especially the ones concerning the network itself ?

### **E. Impact of polycentric inspection**

1. After the inspection what do you think are the benefits and pitfalls of polycentric inspection; e.g. of inspecting network of schools, and of sharing inspection responsibilities with network of schools?
2. What are ways to improve this type of inspections and what changes to this inspection model are planned/needed?
3. What is the impact of this inspection on individual schools, the network and potentially other stakeholders (specifically for this network)? How do you know? What's the evidence of impact?
4. Are there differences in how single schools generally prepare for single school inspections versus polycentric inspection?
5. What elements/aspects of polycentric inspection will have an impact upon the school and the network?
6. Do you think that the polycentric inspection influence ownership of findings from the network inspection?
7. Do you expect any consequences from 'polycentric inspection'? What are they?
8. Do you expect support from the Inspectorate in order to ensure that schools/school networks improve? How?
9. What are potential unintended consequences of polycentric inspections/inspections of networks?

### **C. Potential dysfunctional effects of polycentric inspection of the network (transition costs)**

As a result of the inspection:

1. Have your opinion about the freedom to state different points of view within the network changed? In what way? Which elements of inspection contributed to such a change?
2. Will new role (management, quality management) and procedure appear in the school and in the network?
3. What activities on network level would you suggest to be planned? How you will integrate them in your school activities?

4. Is there any change in your readiness to share experience and expertise with other network participants? If yes – why and in what way? How you will implement such a change?
5. Is there any change in your feelings about the competition between network partners (for example – in attracting students, teachers and/or resources)? To what factor do you contribute such a change?
6. Did new conflict situations occur in the network and/or the school? If yes – what types of conflicts? How do you plan to solve them? Do you expect them to be solved?
7. Do you foresee any changes in the way the school works as a whole due to its participation in the network? If yes – in what areas and in what way?
8. How do you see your responsibilities for the results on network level and what are the responsibilities of the other partners?
9. Have you chosen to specialize in offering specific services as a result of being a member of the network and as a result of the inspection
10. Have your opinion about the equivalent participation of all network partners changed?
11. Do you think that at this stage there are partners that would leave the network and why?
12. Will there be a change in the type of experience shared between network partners and the way it is shared as a result of the polycentric inspection?
13. Do you think that the access to information for all partners about the network (regarding the specific results on network level) will change?

#### **D. External context**

1. Which factors of the school external context were taken into account for the inspection? To what extend?
2. Are there any other external factors that should have been taken into account for the inspection? State them and say why should they be taken into account?
3. Did lack of resources for the network make inspection more difficult? In what way and in what areas?
4. Are there any conclusions and recommendations from the inspection that will support the school when dealing with external factors?
5. Did you have any support from the local authorities during the inspection? Did you need such a support? In what elements and moments of the inspection did you need it?
6. Are there any conclusions from the inspection that will support the schools and network to improve their interactions with the local authorities?

## Appendix 16: Questionnaire for teachers after inspection of the network

### QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS

(after inspection of the network)

*Dear colleague,*

*This questionnaire is part of research activities within 'Polycentric inspections of network of schools' project in which your school participates.*

*The purpose of this questionnaire is to obtain information about your opinion concerning your school's participation in the project at a certain stage of the project implementation – after the inspection of the network.*

*The data obtained through this questionnaire will be used for research purposes of the project only.*

*Thank you for your cooperation!*

1. Are you aware that inspection on parental involvement at your school was done as part of activities in 'Polycentric inspections of network of schools' project?

Yes

No

2. Did you participate in inspection of your school in the network?

Yes

No

3. If you have participated in the meeting with inspectors, how do you think inspection went (approach, inspectors' attitude, communication atmosphere)?

4. Have inspection findings about parental involvement in your school been disseminated and discussed?

Results were presented to the personnel (meetings, pedagogical council) but were not discussed

Results were presented to the personnel and we had the opportunity to discuss them in details

Such presentation and discussions are to be made

No presentation and discussions are planned

I don't know

Other .....

5. Have the results of inspection in parental involvement been presented to the parents at your school?

Results were presented to the parents (school board, parents' comities in each class) but were not discussed with them

Results were presented to the parents and were discussed with them

Such presentations and discussions are planned

No presentation and discussion id scheduled

I don't know

Other (please, be specific).....

6. Do you think that the inspection of your school on parental involvement and recommendations made after it are good for the school and for the improvement of its activities?

Yes, absolutely

To a large extent

Somewhat

To a small extent

It's not useful

I can't say

7. How do you evaluate the use of time and human resources for the implementation of inspection parental involvement in your school?

High costs, but really big benefits

High costs, but small benefits

Acceptable costs

Low costs with small benefits

Low costs with big benefits

Other (be specific)

8. Do you think that your colleagues' motivation for school participation in the network and in the project is decreasing (in comparison to the beginning of the project)?

Yes

No

It's hard to tell

9. Does your school plans any changes in its work with parents as a result of the inspection?

Yes

No

I don't know

10. What do you think are the benefits of the inspection of the school as a part of the school network within the project?

(please, state you opinion) .....

11. Are there any differences in the way your school usually prepares for an inspection and the way this preparation happened when the inspection was done in a network of schools?

Please, state your opinion .....

12. Do you expect any consequences from the inspection for your school and for the network itself? What type of consequences?

Please, state your opinion .....

**Please, fill the following information about yourself**

*You are a teacher at school No.:*

2 , 12 , 26 , 44 , 51, 56, 104 , 120 , 145 , 171

*Gender:*

Male

Female

*You are a teacher at:*

Primary level

Lower secondary level

Upper secondary level

*You serve as a class tutor:* Yes No

## **Appendix 17: Questionnaire for interview with inspectors 8 months after inspection of the network**

### **QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INTERVIEW WITH INSPECTORS**

#### **8 months after the network inspection**

*Dear colleague,*

*This interview is part of research activities within 'Polycentric inspection of school networks' project, in which Regional Inspectorate of Education Sofia-city participates.*

*The purpose of this interview is to obtain information from network participants about the results and effects of the polycentric inspection of the network and about the activities the network and Regional Inspectorate in Education have undertaken so far.*

*This interview is for experts from the inspection team implemented the inspection of network of schools on parental involvement topic.*

*Please share your opinion and the Inspectorate's experience on the questions below and be honest and objective.*

*Data obtained through this interview will be used for project research purposes only. Results will be analyzed and presented in summary and will not be personalized.*

*Thank you for your cooperation!*

#### **B. Defining the network**

How do you evaluate the functioning of the network 8 months after the end of polycentric inspection? What positive and negative changes you see?

Did your working relations with schools in the network changes as a result of cooperation within the framework of the project? If yes – in what way?

Do you plan any activities for working and support of the network? Please, be specific?

#### **C. Evaluation practices**

*Inspection visit and follow-up*

Have you followed up to what extent and in what way your recommendations from the polycentric inspection have been implemented by the schools and the network so far? If yes – what are the results? If not – why?

Do you have any observations about what kind of good practices schools in the network have exchanged so far as a results of polycentric inspection? Give some specific sexamples? Ig this hasn't happen – what do you think are the causes?

Have you given support to the network and individual schools for the implementation of measures for improvement as a response of your recommendations? Please, specify.

Are there consequences for the 'polycentric inspection' (both formal as well as informal, as well as consequences enforced by the Inspectorate and other stakeholders in the system)?

Do you plan any follow-up to the 'polycentric inspection', either by the Inspectorate or other partners in the system?

What activities you used to disseminate the results and your experience regarding testing the polycentric inspection model? With whom and how you shared these? Please, be specific.

Does the Inspectorate cooperate with other partners to ensure the improvement of the network? How does this partnership looks like?

#### *Embedding in regulatory context and clarity of formal responsibilities and roles*

What do you think are the opportunities for the integration of polycentric inspection in the present framework for school inspection in Bulgaria at this particular time?

Are there enough resources for the implementation of the polycentric inspection? Do you expect the Inspectorate to have enough resources in the future to implement such type of inspections?

#### **D. Impact of 'polycentric inspection' (positive and negative)**

Do you think 'polycentric inspection' had an impact on the functioning of individual schools and of the network in general, and on this network specifically? Do you have any evidence or specific examples supporting your answer?

Are there any new or improved practices in the school network as a result of the polycentric inspection?

Do you think 'polycentric inspections' have had any dysfunctional effects about the network or individual schools?

What practices and activities of the Inspectorate contributed to these positive or dysfunctional effects type of inspection feedback you provided to each individual school and to the network as a whole after the inspection of the network?

Which type of inspection feedback is used for improvement/drives improvement most? (single school and network-level inspection feedback)

Do you think that other Regional Inspectorates of Education would be interested in the implementation of polycentric inspection model in their work? If yes – in what way you would support them?

In your opinion to what extent there is a tendency in practice for cooperation of different educational institutions in a network and decentralization of management of educational system so more decision to be made at local level?

#### **D. External context of the network**

In your opinion to what extent the implementation of the Inspectorate's recommendations after the polycentric inspection was supported or prevented by the impact of external factors? Provide some examples.

## **Appendix 18: Questionnaire for interview with principals 8 months after inspection of the network**

### **QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INTERVIEW WITH PRINCIPALS**

#### **8 months after network inspection**

*Dear colleague,*

*This interview is a part of the final research activities within the “Polycentric inspections of network of schools” project in which your school participates.*

*The purpose of this interview is to obtain information from network participants about the results and effects of the polycentric inspection of the network and the activities that your school and the network have undertaken so far.*

*The data obtained through this interview will be used for research purposes of the project only. The results will be analyzed and presented in summary and won't be personalized whole.*

*Thank you for your cooperation!*

#### **B. Defining the network**

*Relationships and collaboration*

Does the network structure and cooperation changed for the past two and a half year after it has been created? If yes – in what way?

Do you think that your colleagues' motivation for participation in the network has dropped (in comparison with the beginning of the project)? If yes – why?

What network-related activities, meetings you have planned? How will they be integrated into existing school-level practices/workload?

#### **C. Evaluation practices of/in the network**

*Evaluation process/inspection visit and follow-up*

How did you disseminate and discussed the results of the polycentric inspection of parental in your school? To whom these results were given and how were they discussed?

Have the results of the polycentric inspection of the school been presented to the parents of your students? How and in with what communication channels? Do you have any feedback form parents and what does it state?

Is it clear for the school and for the network who is responsible for the implementation of the

inspection recommendations especially the ones concerning the network?

Who decides on the ways the network should react to the conclusions of the inspection and how this reaction should be presented to the inspectorate?

#### **D. Impact of polycentric inspection**

Do you think that the polycentric inspection of your school on parental involvement and recommendations made were helpful for the school and for the improvement of its work?

Did you work upon the recommendations formulated by the Regional Inspectorate of Education after the polycentric inspection – at your school and on network level? If yes – give some examples. If not – state the reasons why.

Did you receive any support from the Inspectorate in order to implement the recommendations? How?

In your opinion does the quality of work with parents changed in some way as a results of the polycentric inspection and the measures applied within the school since April 2016 till now? Do parents participate more actively in school activities, does the cooperation with them improve? Please, provide examples.

As a results of the polycentric inspection, was the work of your school affected in the following areas?

- Students' achievements
- Raising students' attainment rates
- Students' drop-out rates
- Better students' transfer to a next level and stage of education
- Inclusive education and working with children with special education needs
- Parental involvement
- Parents' satisfaction with the provided education
- Continuous training and qualification of teachers
- Sharing of know-how (good practices) and resources in the network
- School competency to self-evaluate its activities
- Other .....

Do you consider any changes in the services offered by the school as a result of the inspection and being part of the network? If yes – in what field and how?

Do you think that the cooperation of your school in the network was and still is beneficial for your school improvement? Give some examples.

What good practices from other schools in the network your school is going to integrate/ adapt or has already adapted and how? Please give some examples.

Do you think other schools would be interested in implementation of polycentric model of inspection in their practices? If yes – in what way you would support them?

In your opinion to what extent there is a tendency in practice for cooperation of different educational institutions in a network and decentralization of management of educational system so more decision to be made at local level?

### **C. Potential dysfunctional effects of polycentric inspection of the network (transition costs)**

Did network structure and cooperation changed as a result of the polycentric inspection? If yes – how?

Have your opinion about the freedom to state different points of view within the network changed? In what way? Which elements of inspection contributed to such a change?

Did new role (management, quality management) and procedure appear in the school and in the network?

Is there any change in your readiness to share experience and expertise with other network participants? If yes – why and in what way? How you will implement such a change?

Is there any change in your feelings about the competition between network partners (for example – in attracting students, teachers and/or resources)? To what factor do you contribute such a change?

Did new conflict situations occur in the network and/or the school? If yes – what types of conflicts? How do you plan to solve them? Do you expect them to be solved?

Was there a change in the type of experience shared between network partners and the way it is shared as a result of the polycentric inspection?

Do you think that the access to information for all partners about the network (regarding the specific results on network level) changed?

Have your opinion about the equal participation of all network partners changed?

How do you see your responsibilities for improvement of the results on network level and what are the responsibilities of the other partners?

Have you chosen to specialize in offering specific services as a result of being a member of the network and as a result of the inspection?

### **D. External context**

In your opinion to what extent the implementation of the Inspectorate recommendations after the polycentric inspection was supported or prevented by the impact of external factors? Give some examples.

Do you receive enough support from local authorities and other partner for the implementation of any planned improvements?

Which partners support or put pressure over the network to improve (as whole and as a result of the polycentric inspection), why and how?

## **Appendix 19: Questionnaire for teachers 8 months after inspection of the network**

### **QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS**

#### **8 months after the inspection of the network**

*Dear colleague,*

*This questionnaire is part of final research activities within 'Polycentric inspection of school networks' project in which your school participates.*

*The purpose of the questionnaire is to obtain information about the polycentric inspection of your school and its results so far..*

*Please, share your opinion on the questions bellow and the experience of your school in its participation in the project.*

*Your answers are anonymous and results will be analyzed and presented in summary.*

*Thank you for your cooperation!*

1. Are you aware that in April 2016 an inspection on parental involvement topic in your school was done as a part of the activities on the 'Polycentric inspections of school network' project?

- a) Yes
- b) No

2. Did you participated in the polycentric inspection of your school?

- a) Yes, I participated in the meetings with inspectors of Sofia Regional Inspectorate of Education
- b) Yes, in other activities regarding the inspection

Please, specify .....

- c) No

3. Are you familiar with the report about your school prepared by the Regional Inspectorate of Education with the results of the polycentric inspection?

- a) Yes

6) No

4. How were the results from polycentric inspection on parental involvement in your school distributed and discussed in the school?

a) Results were presented to the personnel (meetings, pedagogical council) but were not discussed

b) Results were presented to the personnel and we had the opportunity to discuss them in details

c) I don't know

d) Other .....

5. Have the results of inspection on parental involvement topic been presented to the parents?

a) Results were presented to the parents (school board, parents' bodies in each class) but were not discussed with them

b) Results were presented to the parents and were discussed with them

c) No presentation and discussion id scheduled

d) I don't know

e) Other (please, be specific).....

6. Do you think that the inspection of your school on parental involvement and recommendations made after it are good for the school and for the improvement of its activities?

a) Yes, absolutely

b) To a large extent

c) Somewhat

d) To a small extent

e) It's not useful

f) I can't say

7. Does your school plans any changes in its work with parents as result of the inspection recommendations?

a) Yes

- b) No
- c) I don't know

8. Are any measures/actions taken according to the recommendations of the Inspectorate in result of the polycentric inspection of your work with parents?

- a) Yes, at school level. Please, provide some examples .....
- b) Yes, at network level. Please provide some examples .....
- c) No. Please state the reasons why .....
- d) I don't know

9. Have the Inspectorate provided any support about the implementation of the polycentric inspection recommendations on parental involvement?

- a) Yes, at school level. Please, provide some examples .....
- b) Yes, at network level. Please provide some examples .....
- c) No.
- d) I don't know

10. What do you think are the benefits of the inspection of the school as a part of the school network within the project?

Please, share your opinion .....

11. How do you evaluate the work with parents at your school as a result of the polycentric inspection that was made and the measures sthe chool have implemented since April 2016?

- a) It's getting better
- b) No measures for improvement have been implemented
- c) No change, our work with parents is good enough
- d) No change, our work with parents is not good
- e) It's getting worse
- f) I can't say
- g) I don't have information about that

12. In your opinion, are your school activities positively influenced by the polycentric inspection?

Yes/No (multiple choice possible)

- Students achievements
- Raising students' attainment rates
- Students' drop-out rates
- Better realization of students in next education stage and level

- Inclusive education and working with children with special educational needs
- Parental involvement
- Parents' satisfaction by education provided
- Continuous training and qualification of teachers
- Sharing know-how (good practices) and resources within the network
- School competency to self-evaluate its activities
- Others (please, describe)

13. Do you think that the cooperation of your school with other schools in the network as part of the 'Polycentric inspection of networks of schools' project is good for the improvement of school activities?

- a) Yes, absolutely
- b) To a large extent
- c) Somewhat
- d) To a small extent
- e) It's not useful
- f) I can't say

14. Do you think that your colleagues' motivation for school participation in the network and in the project is decreasing (in comparison to the beginning of the project)?

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) It's difficult to tell

15. What good practices from other schools in the network your school will adapt or has already adapted and how? Please, share some examples.....

16. In your opinion to what extend there is a tendency in practice for cooperation of different educational institutions in a network and decentralization of management of educational system so more decision to be made at local level?

Please, give your answer in a free form .....

17. Do you think other schools would be interested in implementation of polycentric model of inspection in their practices?

- a) Yes

If yes – in what way you would support them? .....

b) No

c) I can't say

19. In your opinion to what extent the implementation of the Inspectorate's recommendations after the polycentric inspection was supported or prevented by the impact of external factors? Give some examples.

**Please, fill in the following information about yourself**

*You are a teacher at school No.:*

2 , 12 , 26 , 44 , 51, 56, 104, 120 , 145, 171

*Gender:*

Male

Female

*You are a teacher at:*

Primary level

Lower secondary level

Upper secondary level

*You serve as a class tutor:*

Yes

No

## **Appendix 20: Questionnaire for parents 8 months after inspection of the network**

### **QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PARENTS**

#### **8 months after polycentric inspection**

*Dear parent,*

*The purpose of this questionnaire is to study your opinion and satisfaction from your interaction with the school, the possible ways for parents' participation in school life and the way school contributes for the improvement and development of your children.*

*For each question and statements in the questionnaire, please choose the answer which most truly reflects your opinion by checking the proper box. You can share your opinion in free form to the open questions.*

*Your answers are anonymous and the results will be used for improving school work.*

*Thank you for your participation!*

1. Are you informed that self-evaluation, peer-evaluation and inspection about parental involvement were made in your school in 2016 as part of the 'Polycentric inspection of networks of schools' project activities ?

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) In some ways. Please,specificy.....

2. Did you participate in your school self-evaluation by filling in a questionnaire in January 2016?

- a) Yes, online on school site
- b) Yes, on paper
- c) No

3. Did you participate in a meeting with representatives of evaluation teams from other schools in the network as part of peer-evaluation of your schools, made as part of 'Polycentric inspection of networks of schools' project in March 2016?

- a) Yes

b) No

4. Did you participate in April 2016 in a meeting with experts from Sofia Regional Inspectorate of Education as part of the inspection of parental involvement in school as part of the 'Polycentric inspection of networks of schools' project?

a) Yes

b) No

5. Are you familiar with conclusions in self-evaluation report about parental involvement in your school?

a) Yes, from school internet site

b) Yes, from parental meeting with the school class tutor

c) Yes, from School Board

d) No

e) Other.....

6. Are you familiar with conclusions in peer-evaluation report about parental involvement in your school?

a) Yes, from school internet site

b) Yes, from parental meeting with the class tutor

c) Yes, from School Board

d) No

e) Other.....

7. Are you familiar with the inspection report about parental involvement in your school?

a) Yes, from school internet site

b) Yes, from parental meeting with the class tutor

c) Yes, from School Board

d) No

e) Other.....

8. Do you know what measures school has implemented or plans to implement for the improvement of parental involvement as a result of school self-evaluation, peer-evaluation and inspection on this topic?

- a) Yes, from school internet site
- b) Yes, from parental meeting with the class tutor
- c) Yes, from School Board
- d) No
- e) Other.....

9. How do you evaluate school's work with parents for the past one year?

- a) It's getting better
- b) No change, work with parents is good enough
- c) No change, work with parents is not good
- d) It's getting worse
- e) I can't say

10. What activities school has organized together with parents for the past one year?

Please, give some examples.....

11. Do you think that the inspection of your school on parental involvement topic is good for the school and for the improvement of its activities?

- a) Yes, absolutely
- b) To a large extent
- c) Somewhat
- d) To a small extent
- e) It's not useful
- f) I can't say

**Please, fill in the following information about yourself:**

*Gender:*

Male

Female

*Age:*

- up to 30 years old
- 31 – 40 years
- 41 – 50 years
- 51 – 60 years
- Over 60 years

*How many kids from your family go to this school?*

- One
- Two
- Three and more

*At what level is/are your child/children: (more than one answer is possible)*

- Primary (I-IV grade)
- Lower secondary (V-VII grade)
- Upper secondary (VIII-XII grade)

*Your education:*

- Primary
- Secondary
- University degree

*Are you a member of the parents' board of your child's class?*

- Yes, at the moment
- Not now but I was a member in previous years
- No, never

*Are you a member of the School board/Public council of the school?*

- Yes
- No

*Are you a member of the school Board of trustees?*

- Yes, at the moment
- Not now but I was a member in previous years
- No, never

*School:*

2 nd

12 th

26 th

44 th

51

56 th

104 th

120 th

145 th

171