

Polycentric inspections of networks of schools

Extended summary Erasmus+ KA2 proposal (including description of 4 cases)

Context/background of the project

The McKinsey report (2010) sparked a debate in many European countries about how well-performing systems can improve from good to great. Although the report is contested (see Coffield, 2012), it showed how many countries have managed to secure a level of education where all children have access to schools and perform at a level of achievement in Mathematics and Literacy that allows them to progress to tertiary and higher education and qualify for the labor market.

However, although significant improvements have been made in many European countries over the last five years, many countries still need substantial improvements to meet the 2020 benchmarks from the EU strategic framework for Education and Training. The 2013 monitor in Education and Training (2014) for example shows that still more than 5,5 million citizens leave school prematurely, only 35,7% attain tertiary education, and the level of qualifications and skills often don't meet the demands of the labor market. Education outcomes need to be improved according to the 2013 monitoring report, and schools need to continuously improve their provision and quality of teaching to meet these goals.

Research (e.g. Duke, 2008) also shows that schools that are not constantly working on improvements eventually perform less well as they fail to respond to ever changing circumstances. Schools need to engage in a continuous process of learning how to do better, how to ensure higher levels of achievement with their students and how to improve their education to allow their students to be ready for the 21st century.

Inspectorates of Education are considered to have an important role in driving school improvement. Their high stakes inspection frameworks and targets have motivated schools to implement improvements on the inspection standards; often within strictly monitored trajectories. Our previous work for example shows how school inspections set expectations on 'good education' for schools and their stakeholders which act as strong determinants of improvement actions in schools; principals and schools feel pressure to respond to these prompts and improve their education (Gustafsson et al, submitted).

These inspection prompts and pressures are considered to be particularly relevant for the improvement of failing schools as the inspection standards and consequences act as a strong motivation and direction for change, bringing stakeholders in and outside of the school together and aligning their activities around a common set of externally set standards. These mechanisms are however expected to be less relevant and effective in the improvement of schools above the inspection target. These schools are functioning relatively well and a strong focus on the inspection standards will enforce tunnel vision and prevent these schools from thinking about opportunities to improve outside of the inspection framework.

Improving from good to better requires schools to look outside of the box and find new ways to improve their education. This requires more localized processes of change and innovation, where stakeholders work together in strong supportive and high trust networks to define the problems they need to solve (e.g. low student achievement in a particular area), and trial and test solutions for these problems with all stakeholders involved (Gilbert, 2012; Hargreaves, 2012; Fullan, 2007; Rittel and Webber, 1973; Ferlie e.a., 2011).

School inspections are however ill equipped to contribute to such innovative and localized problem solving, because their centralized top down approach (see O'Day, 2002) enhances and legitimizes a 'one size fits all' strategy for success to national standards, encourage risk averse behavior in schools and window-dressing of successful rituals. Also inspection feedback is often distant (in time) from the

behavior the feedback is related to and therefore does not contribute to the trialing and testing of new solutions.

Many countries recognize the need to reshape their inspection systems and redefine the role of Inspectorates of Education to better fit localized decision-making and local structures and networks for improvement. These models are described as polycentric school inspections.

Polycentric school inspections evaluate and assess the quality and functioning of networks of schools and/or their stakeholders, with the purpose of validating and supporting improvement at the local level.

Examples of such approaches:

- agenda (e.g. standards) for inspection is (also) set by schools and stakeholders with the purpose of analyzing, validating and disseminating good practices of how to improve student achievement (describing why the good practice worked for the host school, how the host school created process knowledge -‘this is how we did it’-, and making explicit the theory underpinning practice -‘these are the principles underpinning why we did it and what we did’-)
- inspection frameworks include standards on effective cooperation between schools/stakeholders
- inspection schedule includes visits to all schools/stakeholders at the same time
- inspection feedback is given to all schools/stakeholders in an open forum and agreements are made about a shared agenda for change

Social network theory and complexity theory suggest that these newer, polycentric inspection models, are effective when they 1) facilitate the creation of effective networks of schools and stakeholders (to overcome isolation of schools) and 2) disseminate and validate context-specific information to/within networks of schools. Such an approach would involve connecting stakeholders in and across schools who can have a role in effective school improvement (e.g. through an open forum of feeding back inspection results and setting up target agreements between stakeholders), and analyzing, validating and disseminating good practices (describing why the good practice worked for the host school, how the host school created process knowledge -‘this is how we did it’-, and making explicit the theory underpinning practice -‘these are the principles underpinning why we did it and what we did’).

Objectives of the project

These polycentric models of school inspections need to be further investigated to ensure their effectiveness in motivating further improvement of low and already well performing schools, and to understand if and how they can be transferred to other education contexts and systems. We therefore aim to:

Develop and test these polycentric models of school inspections and specifically look at the mechanisms and context of their impact, to answer the following questions:

- What role can school inspectors have, and which working methods can they use in enabling/facilitating improvement/innovation and complex problem solving in networks of teachers and schools?
- What roles and working methods of Inspectorates of Education are effective in promoting improvement/innovation and complex problem-solving in schools?
- How are these roles and working methods related to the structure and context of the education system in which they function; how can they be transferred to other contexts and systems?

Number and profile of participants

The project includes participants from four different countries who will work together in describing and testing out new polycentric models of school inspections. A preliminary scoping exercise as part of the development of the proposal indicated that examples of such polycentric school inspections have been

developed in the Netherlands, England and Northern Ireland and will be developed in Bulgaria; they are currently being implemented in small scale settings in these countries and will be evaluated in this project on their merits to address the key challenges in the EU strategic framework (particularly in driving up student achievement and decreasing the percentage of early school leavers) in these four countries. We will use a comparative realist approach in analyzing the examples from these four countries; such an approach allows us to understand the mechanisms and conditions of impact of polycentric inspections and to understand how such inspection models can successfully be transferred to other EU countries that need to improve their outcomes to meet the EU headline targets.

In each of the four cases, Inspectorates of Education inspect a network of schools and include indicators in their framework on how schools are working together to support school to school improvement and/or provide inclusive education to children with special needs and/or learning disabilities. The countries vary in the extent to which these methods and frameworks are fully developed and implemented (Bulgaria starting to develop such models, England and the Netherlands pilot testing aspects of a polycentric approach and Northern Ireland fully integrating inspections and school to school improvement and evaluations):

Participants from each country include Inspectorates of Education responsible for the development and implementation of these inspection models, Networks of school alliances that will be inspected; and researchers who will bring in research evidence to test out the effectiveness of these models in motivating improvement of networks of (well performing) schools. The combination of these three partners in each country will allow for a strong R&D network that can iteratively build and test out new innovative models of school inspections with greater impact.

The Netherlands

In the Netherlands, a new vision for more differentiated inspections ('Toezicht 2020') is being developed which specifically aims to include local stakeholders and local information systems in the inspection data collection. The Dutch Inspectorate of Education aims to (more) purposefully build on local self and peer evaluation structures, both on the school governing board and school level. These changes are also instigated by changes in legislation which require a set of schools to work in partnerships to provide inclusive education for all children (also children with disabilities) under 76 new (primary) education authorities. Each new education authority now governs a set of regular and special needs primary schools and has to ensure smooth cooperation between these schools in the provision of care and high quality education to each individual pupil.

As a result, the Inspectorate of Education now needs to inspect the quality and functioning of chains of schools. A new inspection framework, ('toezichtkader voor samenwerkingsverbanden'; inspection framework for cooperative chains'), describing the quality of partnerships of schools and additional sanctions for educational authorities in charge of partnerships of schools, has been developed for this purpose. This case study will look at 'Steunpunt Onderwijs Enschede' (SPOE), an education authority comprised of 43 regular primary schools and 2 special needs schools who have agreed on common structures and arrangements for education and care to students both within and across schools (see SPOE.nl). This education authority will be inspected by the Dutch Inspectorate of Education during the course of our project. The case study will be coordinated by the UT and the letter of intent in appendix 1 describes the cooperation between these partners.

Northern Ireland

In Northern Ireland, schools have been working in networks for some time now and the Education and Training Inspectorate (ETI) has developed area-based evaluations to support the work of such networks. An example of such a network is the West Belfast Partnership Board's Education and Training forum. They have initiated a strategic networked alliance, called the Area Learning Community (ALC), consisting of all post primary school principals and all relevant educational stakeholders, including the

Northern Irish Inspectorate (ETI). These principals and their stakeholders have agreed on protocols for sharing performance data and school to school support, aligned to and agreed upon with the district inspector (ETI). The central question underlying these protocols, school to school support and district inspections are 'How do we improve the quality of education not only in individual schools but for the entire community? Both the work of the Area Learning Community, as well as area based inspections and inspection reports have this question as their starting point. This case study will include the Northern Irish Education and Training Inspectorate and the Area Learning Community. The case study will be coordinated by Dublin City University (DCU). The letters of intent 'West Belfast Partnership', 'West Belfast Area Learning Community', and 'CMSS' describes the cooperation between these partners.

England

England has seen a number of changes over the last couple of years with the aim of establishing a 'self-improving education system'. Changes include the establishment of teaching schools, national leaders of education, the academisation of schools and increasing numbers and sizes of aggregations of schools in federations and chains, and school improvement partnerships in England. An example of such a school evaluation and improvement partnership is the *NAHT school review process*, an initiative from NAHT (National Association of Head Teachers). The model develops constructive peer inspections led by school leaders, using a framework designed for the project. The process of completing the review allows for input from both the school and the review team and the final report also allows an opportunity for the school leader of the reviewed school to reflect their perspective on the process. Reviews take place in clusters of 3 schools which are identified by NAHT; however it is the intention to recruit at least one school in an existing chain for the next stage of the project, to be included in this research.

The introduction of school to school evaluation and improvement networks, such as the *NAHT school review process*, have had many consequences for the role of Ofsted (Hargreaves, 2011; Hill, 2010), and have led to a number of (proposed) changes, such as the revision of inspection arrangements to assess a school's involvement in partnership working to promote learning, and inspecting all schools in a federation at the same time. This case study will include a network of schools (recruited by NAHT) who will take part in the *NAHT NAHT school review process*, and who will have had (and continue to have) national Ofsted inspections. The case study will be coordinated by the Institute of Education (IOE). The letter of intent 'NAHT' describes the cooperation between these partners.

Bulgaria

School inspections have changed dramatically in Bulgaria the last couple of years. Since 2013, the Bulgarian Ministry of Education implemented and tested a new model for school inspections in 1000 schools. National standards and instruments for inspection were introduced and tested by Regional Inspectorates and selected schools with the purpose of improving the quality of education in schools, and supporting school improvement.

For the purpose of this project, 10 schools in the region of Sofia have been recruited who will implement the English NAHT model of peer (head teacher) led external evaluations and school to school improvement and who will be inspected by the Sofia Inspectorate of Education during the course of our project. The case study will be coordinated by Sofia University and will include the network of 10 schools and the Sofia Inspectorate of Education. The letter of intent in appendix 4 describes the cooperation between these partners.

Description of activities

We have outlined a detailed schedule of activities (see table 1) in four different phases. Each phase includes research and development activities, evaluation and dissemination. The four phases are:

- Phase 1: mapping four existing examples of polycentric school inspections
- Phase 2: literature review and ex ante evaluation
- Phase 3: scoping good examples across Europe (survey and document analysis of SICI profiles)
- Phase 4: studying impact of 4 examples of polycentric inspections

In the *first phase* we will undertake a realist-informed literature review on typologies of governance and inspection systems to develop key indicators of polycentric inspection models. These indicators will be used to map out the four cases in our project.

In the *second phase* we will enhance our literature review by looking at studies on the mechanisms of impact of inspection systems similar to the four cases in our project. We will include studies on social networks for complex problem solving and knowledge exchange, processes of institutionalization (e.g. through coercive isomorphism, mimetic processes and normative pressures (Meyer & Rowan 1977; Powell 2007; Scott 2008) and effective governance of schools. The literature review allows us to learn about potential mechanisms of impact in the four cases and supports our study of their actual impact in phase 4.

In a *third phase* we will include a survey amongst members of SICI to learn about other examples of polycentric school inspections across Europe, using the set of indicators developed in phase 1. We will also analyze the profiles from all these countries, which are published on the SICI website to triangulate our survey results. The survey and analysis of inspection profiles aims to map out the extent to which European Inspectorates of Education enable and facilitate innovation and complex-problem solving in schools and promote improvement of well performing schools. We will specifically look at roles of and working methods of Inspectorates of Education in using localized and context-specific approaches to inspection of schools that allow schools to innovate and improve their practices (in a network with stakeholders) beyond a standardized national framework.

In a *fourth phase*, we will test the impact of the polycentric inspection models in our four cases. We will collect social network data through interviews, observations and document analyses. The qualitative social network data will be used to explain the context in which polycentric inspections have an impact on the improvement of well performing schools in school to school improvement networks, the changes in roles of inspectors in inspecting such networks, and the type of knowledge they generate, validate and disseminate in inspecting such networks. Social network analyses allows us to examine changes in interactions and knowledge exchange between schools, stakeholders and school inspectors/evaluators before, during and after an inspection/evaluation visit. Changes in interactions and knowledge exchange help us understand how networks 1) provide opportunities for knowledge transfer and development of new knowledge between individuals and levels in organisations, and as such 2) facilitate sustainable and system-wide school improvement. We will compare and contrast these qualitative data to the results of our previous LLP study on the impact of school inspections (ISI-TL) to compare and contrast the impact and the mechanisms of polycentric inspections to the traditional centralized inspection models that we studied in that project.

Throughout the project we will disseminate good examples and evidence from each phase, and evaluate the extent to which project outcomes have been reached. The project outline in table 1 provides a detailed overview of all these activities.

Methodology to be used in carrying out the project

The project will include an R&D iterative approach of mapping four existing examples of polycentric inspections, evaluating them according to the literature and other examples across Europe, and testing their impact on improvement and innovation of networked school alliances.

In the study we will use a case study approach to collect qualitative social network data about the knowledge exchange and interactions between schools and inspection organizations before, during and after an inspection visit and to learn about the role of school inspectors and the working methods they use, how these methods impact on improvement of schools and facilitate innovation or create competence traps through the setting of standards and the dissemination of knowledge. This approach allows us to

explicitly study multi-actor and multi-level networks, interacting groups of activities, sequences of knowledge exchange and cyclical associations of cause and effect. This approach enables us to look beyond one shot rational cause and effect relations which only limitedly explain the impact of school inspections, and which are not considered to be relevant when looking at polycentric models of school inspections.

Description of the results and impact envisaged

The results are outlined in table 1 and include:

- Four scientific papers describing: 1) the indicators of polycentric inspections; 2) four case examples (detailing working methods and roles of polycentric inspections); 3) summary of a literature review describing types of polycentric inspections and evidence of their mechanisms of impact on innovation and improvement of schools; and 4) the impact of polycentric inspections on school improvement in our four case examples;
- written and video narratives explaining indicator sets and examples of four polycentric inspections;
- surveys to map ‘polycentric-ness’ of Inspectorates of Education across Europe (in English, Dutch, German, French, Spanish and Bulgarian);
- protocols for qualitative data collection;
- a website with narratives, indicator map, literature review, evidence of impact, and survey and protocols for data collection (in English, Dutch, German, French, Spanish and Bulgarian);
- presentations to SICI annual assembly;
- presentations of scientific papers at the European Association for Research on Learning and Instruction (EARLI) and the European Conference on Educational Research (ECER).
- Massive Open Online Course (MOOC) about polycentric inspections and localized innovation and school improvement;
- International symposium on self-improving education systems.

We aim to have an impact on local/regional, national and European target groups:

- Target groups on the local and regional level are the network of schools, their stakeholders and school inspectors in the four case studies in our project. We expect these stakeholders to develop more effective inspection models and to scale up these models; i.e. models that contribute to innovation and improvement of well performing schools and that will enhance sustainable and long term system wide improvement (from good to great).
- National policymakers and national stakeholders (e.g. representatives of primary and secondary schools, teachers and head teachers, school boards) in the countries in our project are expected to benefit from the knowledge from our project in their activities and provision of school improvement support to well performing individual schools, and networks of schools. In the Netherlands, the council of Primary Schools has for example support teams that work with failing schools to improve on the inspection indicators. The results from our project can enable this organisation to additionally develop a support package for well performing schools.
- European: Inspectorates of Education and SICI are expected to use the knowledge from our project to develop their own inspection work. The website allows them to get in touch with colleagues who have experience in developing such models and to exchange practices.

Potential longer term benefits

Our project intends to have a sustainable and systemic impact on Inspectorates and key policy-makers in Education across Europe in their activities of improving school inspections that benefit lifelong learning and a knowledge economy. Our project will have a sustained impact as a result of our project activities to create a strong community of practice of key stakeholders (national Inspectorates of Education, SICI, OECD, researchers). Creating such a strong community of practice ensures the development, sharing and dissemination of good practice after the duration of this project. Long term continuation of researchers in this area and development of instruments is additionally enabled through participation of the researchers

in a new Special Interest Group on ‘Educational Evaluation, Accountability and School Improvement’ of the European Association of Research in Learning and Instruction (EARLI). Translating our results in French, German and Spanish (and making them available in the language of partner countries: English, Dutch and Bulgarian) allows organizations from across Europe and the world to easily access our project findings and use them for their own purposes.

Table 1. Project outline

Phase	Activities	Type of activity ¹	Partners involved ²	Months	Performance indicators for intellectual outputs	Evaluation (who will evaluate, when and how will results feed back to consortium?) > how to measure qualitative impact? (e.g. change in inspection models across Europe?)
1. Describing four cases of polycentric school inspections	Project meeting to outline phase 1	M1	Research partners (London meeting)	M1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Scientific paper describing the indicators of polycentric inspections, and 4 case examples (detailing working methods and roles), published in an evaluation journal and/or book - Four written and video narratives explaining indicator set and examples of four inspections which will be published on project website (in English, Dutch, German, French, Spanish and Bulgarian) - Website incorporating these narratives which will be visited by 50 people every month in year 1, linked to the SICI website 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The website will include a brief pop up questionnaire which will ask visitors about their background (e.g. academic/school/inspection), and how useful and insightful the information provided is to them and suggestions for improvement. - Coordinator will provide information on quantitative performance indicators to external evaluator (visits per month to the website, outcome of the questionnaire. - External evaluator will have access to raw data and will evaluate if the summary narratives provide a valid and reliable description of the working methods and roles and a generalizable answer to the research questions. The evaluator will use the quantitative performance indicators and evaluation of narratives to write a phase 1 evaluation report. - Project consortium will discuss phase 1 evaluation report to take remedial actions when outcomes have not been achieved.
	Need analyses to develop key indicators of polycentric school inspections	E1	All (London meeting)	M1		
	Literature review polycentric school inspections	O1-A1	Research partners	M1-M3		
	Developing key indicators of polycentric school inspections	O2-A1	All	M4		
	Mapping 4 cases on indicators of polycentric school inspections	O3-A1	All	M5		
	Online project meeting to discuss 4 cases	M2	All	M6		
	Reporting of results: scientific paper	O4-A1	Research partners	M7		
	Translation of written narratives in German, Spanish, French	O5-A1	All and subcontract	M8		
	Develop website	O6-A1	All and subcontract	M9		
	Discussion of indicators and 4 cases of polycentric inspections with national stakeholder groups in each separate country	E2	Research partners, Inspectorates, network of schools, 4 meetings in 4 separate countries	M9		
	Reporting of results: written narrative of 4 cases on website	O7-A1	All	M9		
	Reporting of results: video narrative of 4 cases on website	O8-A1	All	M10		
	Develop and incorporate evaluation pop up survey in website (asking visitors about their background (e.g. academic/school/inspection), and how useful and insightful the information provided is to them and suggestions for improvement)	A1	Coordinator	M9		
	Collect key statistics from website	A2	Coordinator	M9		
Write phase 1 evaluation report	A3	Coordinator and external evaluators	M10			
Discuss phase 1 evaluation report and take remedial actions, outline phase 2 (online meeting)	M3	Research partners and evaluators	M10			

¹ An - PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITIES
On/An - INTELLECTUAL OUTPUTS/ACTIVITIES
Mn - TRANSNATIONAL PROJECT MEETINGS
En - MULTIPLIER EVENTS
Cn - LEARNING/TEACHING/TRAINING ACTIVITIES
n - number of the activity

² All = research partners, Inspectorates, network of schools and evaluators; Inspectorates and network of schools invest their own days, only travel/accommodation/subsistence to multiplier events will be reimbursed.

2. Literature review for ex ante evaluation	Literature review on the mechanisms of impact of school inspections from phase 1	O9-A1	Research partners	M11-M12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Literature review which will rate studies on the mechanisms and conditions of impact of polycentric inspections on year of publication, MMRS scale and reliability and validity of data collection - Website incorporating the literature review which will be visited by 50 people every month in year 2, linked to the SICI website - Publication of scientific paper in an ISI peer reviewed journal - Presentations at EARLI and ECER 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Coordinator will provide information on quantitative performance indicators to external evaluator - External evaluator will evaluate structure and extensiveness of literature review and accuracy of set of indicators and write up improvement suggestions in a phase 2 evaluation report. - Project consortium will discuss phase 2 evaluation report and take remedial actions when outcomes have not been achieved.
	Workshop to discuss literature review and development of 4 cases of polycentric school inspections	E3	All (Dublin meeting)	M13		
	Publication of literature review on website	O10-A1	Research partners (and subcontract)	M14		
	Publication of scientific paper, including summary of the literature review	O11-A1	Research partners	M14		
	Presentation of scientific paper at EARLI and ECER	E4	Research partners	M24		
	Collect key statistics from website	A4	Coordinator	M15		
	Write phase 2 evaluation report	A5	Coordinator and external evaluators	M15		
	Discuss phase 2 evaluation report and take remedial actions, outline phase 3 (online meeting)	M4	Research partners and external evaluators	M16		
3. Scoping good examples of school inspections across Europe	Developing survey (using indicator map from phase 1)	O12-A1	All	M17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reliable and valid survey to map 'polycentric-ness' of Inspectorates of Education across Europe (in English, Dutch, German, French, Spanish and Bulgarian, and pilot tested in four countries) - Publication of map on project website (in English, Dutch, German, French, Spanish and Bulgarian) - Project website visited by 50 people every month in year 3 of the project - Project website linked to the SICI website - Presentation at SICI annual assembly for 30 people - One scientific paper about European landscape of polycentric school inspections, published in ISI peer reviewed journal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The website will include a brief pop up questionnaire which will ask visitors about their background (e.g. academic/school/inspection), and how useful and insightful the information provided is to them and suggestions for improvement. - Coordinator will provide information on quantitative performance indicators and results of online survey to external evaluator - External evaluator will evaluate validity, reliability and quality of summaries of polycentric inspections (= extent to which summaries provide an adequate overview of polycentric inspections in Europe and include examples of tools and methods that can be used by other Inspectorates) and availability to other Inspectorates, and write a phase 3 evaluation report. - Project consortium will discuss phase 3 evaluation report and take remedial actions when outcomes have not been achieved.
	Translating survey in German, French, Spanish	O13-A1	All and subcontract	M18		
	Administering short survey amongst SICI members (online and during annual meeting)	O14-A1	All research partners	M19-M20		
	Analysis of profiles on SICI website according to indicator set	O15-A1	Research partners	M19-M20		
	Map Inspectorates across Europe on indicator map	O16-A1	Research partners	M21		
	Develop interactive map of 'polycentric-ness' of Inspectorates of Education across Europe who are members of SICI (allowing viewers to select profiles of Inspectorates of Education according to key indicators and view tools and methods of polycentric inspections)	O17-A1	All and subcontract	M22-M23		
	Online meeting to discuss map	M5	Research partners and external evaluators	M23		
	Translate interactive map in German, French, Spanish, Bulgarian and Dutch	O18-A1	All and subcontract	M24		
	Reporting of results: scientific paper on map of 'polycentric-ness' of Inspectorates of Education	O19-A1	Research partners	M24		
	Presentation at the SICI annual assembly about interactive map	E5	Research partners	M25		
	Collect key statistics from website	A6	Coordinator	M25		
	Write phase 3 evaluation report	A7	Coordinator and external evaluators	M25		
	Discuss phase 3 evaluation report and take remedial actions, and outline phase 4 (meeting)	M6	Researchers and evaluators (Amsterdam meeting)	M25		
	4. Studying impact of polycentric school inspections	Develop protocol for qualitative data collection and analysis	O20-A1	Research partners		
Data collection and analysis		O20-A2	Research partners	M25-M30		
Meeting to discuss qualitative data and share good practice		E6	All (Sofia meeting)	M30		

in four case studies	Report results in scientific paper and on website on impact of polycentric inspections, and changing roles of inspectors	O20-A3	Research partners	M31-M33	of our project - MOOC which includes engaging content on evidence of (mechanisms of) impact of polycentric school inspections and examples from four countries - Project website (including MOOC) visited by 50 people every month in year 3 of the project - Scientific paper of the four inspections, their impact on schools (contribution to localized problem solving and improvement), the mechanisms of impact (coercion, normative pressure, professional) and the context in which they have an impact (role of stakeholders, functioning in education system) published in an ISI peer reviewed journal - Project website linked to the SICI website - Presentation at SICI annual assembly for 30 people - International symposium attended by at least 50 people	- External evaluator will write phase 4 evaluation report in which he/she will report on quality of data collection (validity and reliability), quality of results (are research questions answered), accessibility of results and MOOC - Project consortium will discuss phase 4 evaluation report and take remedial actions when outcomes have not been achieved.
	Develop MOOC	O20-A4	Research partners and subcontract	M31-M33		
	Discussion with national stakeholder groups about impact of four cases and changing role of school inspections in each country	E7	Research partners, Inspectorates, network of schools, 4 meetings in 4 separate countries	M34		
	Presentation at the SICI annual assembly about impact of polycentric inspections, and changing roles of inspectors	E8	Research partners	M34		
	Collect key statistics from website	A8	Coordinator	M35		
	Short survey and interview with inspection organisations and networks of schools and stakeholders they inspect about impact of the project	A9	Research partners	M35		
	Write phase 4 evaluation report	A10	External evaluator	M35		
	Discuss phase 4 evaluation report and take remedial actions to ensure sustainability of project (online meeting)	M7	Research partners and external evaluators	M36		
	Dissemination event - Self Improving Education Systems	E9	All (London)	M36		