

Peer Review Report

Name of peer reviewee institution 2014-2017

Finland Jokilaaksojen koulutuskuntayhtymä

Spain Escola Oficial de Idiomas de Ourense

Greece Youth and Lifelong Learning Foundation

Turkey Karesi Halk Egitimi Merkezi ve Aksam Sanat Okulu

***Authors: Susanna Hjulberg & A-L
Pitkäaho-Pussila, A. Yeliz Aldemir &
Mustafa Canseven, Eleni Lianou &
Anastasios Dimopoulos***

Released by: 24 April 2015

Contents

1. Data Sheet
2. Description of the institution
3. Peer Review procedure
 - 3.1. Purpose/targets of the peer reviews
 - 3.2. Methods for collecting data and sources
4. Assessment of quality areas
 - 4.1. Course plan
 - 4.2. Course implementation
 - 4.3. Course evaluation
 - 4.4. Assessment of Quality Areas
5. Annexes
 - 5.1. Agenda of peer visit
 - 5.2. Interview guidelines for peer visit

[h.1fob9te](#)
[h.3dy6vkm](#)

1. Data Sheet

1) Contact information

Name of the institution Escola Oficial de Idiomas de Ourense
 Address Paseo Mestre Vide, 10 32004 Ourense
 Telephone, fax, e-mail Phone: 00 34 988 366073 Fax 00 34 988 366184

Contact persons	Name	Contact (e-mail)
Director	Nancy Casielles	ncasielles@edu.xunta.es mailto:ncasielles@edu.xunta.es mailto:ncasielles@edu.xunta.es
Peer Review Facilitator	Ana Ramos	ramosmoro@edu.zunta.es mailto:ramosmoro@edu.zunta.es mailto:ramosmoro@edu.zunta.es
Other persons responsible	Ana Rodicio Laura Iglesias	abrodicio@edu.zunta.es mailto:abrodicio@edu.zunta.es laura.iglesias@edu.zunta.es mailto:laura.iglesias@edu.zunta.es mailto:laura.iglesias@edu.zunta.es

2) Aims and purpose of the Peer Review

The aim of this Peer Review Practice is to have an independent opinion from our peers and colleagues on the organisation, implementation and assessment of the courses offered by our institution. Our peers will attend and assess a course titled “Improving Oral Skills in English” aimed at intermediate level students.

This practice will be one of four carried out by the Strategic Partnership 2014-1-FI01-KA204-000816 “Quality Management and Peer Review in Practice”, under the framework of EU Programme Erasmus +.

3) External organisation

- Single Peer Review
- Reciprocal Peer Review
- Peer Review in a Network

4) Internal organisation for the conduct of the Peer Review (Describe who is responsible for which tasks)

Nancy Casielles, as director of our institution and permanent peer within the scope of our strategic partnership, will supervise and support the whole process of Peer Review in Spain.

She will be assisted by **Ana Belén Rodicio**, head of the English department, and Laura Iglesias, head of studies of our school in Ribadavia.

Ana Ramos, teacher of English, will be the facilitator in our institution. Her role will be to help our group achieve its objectives and to make sure all the group's needs and resources are provided for. She will coordinate the teaching team in the process of defining the curriculum and the implementation of the course. She will also select and invite interviewees and stakeholders.

Camino Linares-Rivas, Matthew Loboy, José Nemesio Martínez and **Mercedes Varela** will be the teachers in this course.

Alicia del Río and **Isabel Salanova**, both English teachers, will be in charge of planning the stay of our peers in Ourense: accommodation, meals, entertainment, etc.

Nieves Honrado will make sure that the group has all the equipment and supplies necessary for the course and for the peer review practice: computers, printers, furniture, paper, pens, folders, post-its, toner, ink-cartridges, etc.

5) Overview of the procedure and time schedule

Activity

Self-evaluation	December 2014 – March 2015
Self-report	March 20, 2015 – at the latest
Preparation of Peer Visit	January – April 2015
Peer Visit	April 21 – 24, 2015
Peer Review Report	May 15, 2015
Action Plan and Improvements	July 15, 2015

6) Scope of the Peer Review

Peer Review will be carried out on a specific course offered by the English Department. The name of this course is *Improving Oral Skills in English*.

However, the school as a whole will be reviewed, specially its organisational and managing approaches.

7) Quality Areas

Course plan

Course implementation

Course evaluation

8) List of Peers with names and contact information, e.g. 2 peers per country

	Name	Institution	E-mail
Peer Coordinator	Anna-Liisa Pitkäaho-Pussila	Jokilaaksojen koulutuskuntayhtymä	annukka.pitkaaho@jedu.fi o:annukka.pitkaaho@jedu.fi mailto:annukka.pitkaaho@jedu.fi
Peer	Susanna Hjulberg	Jokilaaksojen koulutuskuntayhtymä	susanna.hjulberg@jedu.fi o:susanna.hjulberg@jedu.fi mailto:susanna.hjulberg@jedu.fi
Peer	Anastasios Dimopoulos	Youth and Lifelong Learning Foundation	sdekalam@sch.gr mailto:sdekalam@sch.gr
Peer	Eleni Lianou	Youth and Lifelong Learning Foundation	elenlianou@sch.gr mailto:elenlianou@sch.gr
Peer	Yeliz Aldemir	Karesi Halk Egitimi Merkezi ve Aksam Sanat Okulu	ayseyelizaldemir@hotmail.com mailto:ayseyelizaldemir@hotmail.com
Peer	Mustafa Canseven	Karesi Halk Egitimi Merkezi ve Aksam Sanat Okulu	karesihem@hotmail.com

9) Signatures of the Peers

Anna-Liisa Pitkäaho-Pussila

Susanna Hjulberg

Eleni Lianou

Anastasios Dimopoulos

Peer Review Tool-box_08

5 / 15

Peer Review Report



Yeliz Aldemir

Mustafa Canvensen

2. Description of the institution

□ Description of the institution

The Escola Oficial de Idiomas de Ourense (EOI) is a public school overseen by the Department of Education, Culture and University Studies.

It was created in 1987 and it currently provides foreign language training to nearly 4,000 students, mainly adults and with a majority of female students. The languages taught at the school are: English, French, German, Portuguese, Italian, Chinese and also Galician, our regional language.

Our school is located in a city called Ourense, in a province also called Ourense, and in Galicia, a peripheral region in Northern Spain. Ourense is an inner province with no direct access to the coast. The city of Ourense has a population of about 110,000 and accounts for 30% of the province's population. It is located on both banks of the River Miño at an elevation of 128 m above sea level. We have a mild climate with abundant rainfall, mild winters, with temperatures rarely falling below 0°C and very warm summers.

One of our functions as a high-quality public school of languages is to provide our community with evaluation and certification in foreign languages. We provide Certificates of Attainment of levels A2, B1, B2 and C1 (CEFR) in the languages that are taught at our educational centre. For this reason, we are especially interested in improving assessment processes, including peer assessment.

The key persons involved in this peer review project are highly-qualified and experienced language teachers. Some of them are veteran teachers and members of the school management board. Some are native speakers of the language they teach and were brought up in other European/American/Asian countries. Some have spent years teaching in other countries abroad and so they have already worked in different educational systems. All of them regularly take part in teacher training courses, conferences, European projects, etc. They all show enthusiasm and wish to improve their assessment practices in order to achieve excellence in the evaluation processes.

Our English courses are the most popular ones in the school, with over 2,800 students. We teach all levels, from elementary to advanced, but most of the students are enrolled in intermediate level courses. This is the reason why we have chosen to have one of our intermediate English courses evaluated. We have decided to focus on a course that is designed to improve the oral skills of 15-20 students. We will use a regular classroom, with the same equipment as any other classroom in the school.

Our school has:

19 Classrooms

1 Library

1 Teachers' room

1 Language lab

1 Computer room

1 Kitchen

Peer Review Report

1 Conference room

1 Administration office

1 Janitors' room

2 Managers' offices (Principal / Head of Studies/ Administrator + Vice principal)

Our institution has a school council which is composed of 14 members, 4 of which are appointed by the Administration (principal, administrator, head of studies and local council representative) and 10 have been elected by their peers: 5 teachers and 5 students. We could have representatives of parents and non-teaching staff, but there were no candidates from these sectors in the past elections.

Statistical Information on institution

Overall data	Total	Female	Male
Number of teachers	56	44	12
Number of other staff	10	7	3
Number of students	3719*	2530	1189

* These statistics do not show the students who will enrol in the second semester

3. Peer Review procedure

3.1 Purpose/targets of the Peer Review

Peer Review is a form of external evaluation with the aim of supporting the reviewed educational institution in its quality assurance and quality development efforts. Peers are external, but work in a similar environment and have specific professional expertise and knowledge of the evaluated subject. They are independent and "persons of equal standing" with the persons whose performance is being reviewed. This peer review has been done by attending and assessing a course titled "Improving Oral Skills in English".

The aim of the peer review is to give a method to do the quality assessment and development for organising courses as well as to improve teaching in general in the Escola Oficial de Idiomas de Ourense.

3.2 Methods for collecting data and sources

Preliminary meeting: Interview Minutes and Guidelines for Analysis

Interview: administration, teachers, students and staff

Observing: the abovementioned English language course and a French language course

Evaluation meeting

Feedback and discussion with the education provider

Attach Agenda for the Peer Visit in Annex.

4. Assessment of Quality Areas

Please describe the results of the Peer Review in continuous text (only illustrative use of tables).

Each quality area and criterion must be assessed separately (max. 1 page per criterion).

For each quality area, the description should address the criteria (and the individual indicators, if possible) specifying the quality areas. This is the main part.

Recommendations for the assessment procedure:

1. All relevant information gleaned during the Visit (based on interview minutes, observation charts etc.) should be sorted according to its relevance 1) to the quality area and 2) the criteria. Findings should then be analysed and categorised as examples of strengths or areas for improvement. It may not always be easy to attribute findings to one of the two categories, and individual Peers may also have different views. Differences should be recognised and discussed thoroughly.
2. For each criterion, the strengths and areas of improvement should be summarised.
3. Then the whole Quality Area should be assessed on the basis of the assessment of the strengths and areas of improvement on the level of the criteria. Sources of evidence should also be recorded briefly in peer review criteria forms.
4. After each Quality Area has been assessed in this way, it should be relatively easy to provide an overall assessment of the quality areas reviewed, to give oral feedback to the VET provider, and to fill in the Peer Review Report.

4.1 Quality Area 1: COURSE PLAN

Indicator: Goals of the course and establishing the course plan

Strengths and areas of improvement by criterion
(criterion and evaluation are enclosed)

The course was planned by the teachers, and the students had answered a survey beforehand about what they wanted to learn in this English language course. Teaching was divided among four teachers to get different points of view of the teaching. The course plan had been done months before the actual course began, and it contained the goals, results, action, and timetable.

There have been enough resources to do the course planning; both human and technical resources. The course planning has been done together in meetings by the teachers, and every teacher has prepared the lessons in their own time. For this course, extra financial resources have not been appointed.

Strengths:

- motivated teachers and staff
- team work
- long professional experience in teaching English
- high level of preparing and planning courses

Improvements:

- financial resources for the teachers to plan courses, but this does not depend on the EOI, but rather on the administration.
- arranging time resources, so that the planning is done within the working hours, but this does not depend on the EOI, but rather on the administration.

4.2 Quality Area 2: COURSE IMPLEMENTATION

Indicator: Course implementation, programme and content

Strengths and areas of improvement by criterion
(criterion and evaluation are enclosed)

The students learned and participated, so the teachers thought that the content was suitable. Class time was limited, so the teachers could not go through everything they considered necessary. This English course's content was suitable, because students learned from each other about stereotypes, culture, etc., and they got to know each other by using English skills they have learned.

The content was perfectly organised and intercultural, which encouraged the students to cooperate and collaborate. E.g. food sector discussions were very good. The content of the course was supported with non-verbal elements.

The teaching brought students together and gave information about many things. Students realized that they have to use English in everyday life more. Mixing groups was a good idea both in and out of the classes. Students were pleased to meet new people and made new

friends. It would have been better to give more time for the students to be interactive with each other, even if there had been fewer written exercises.

Strengths:

- experienced, motivated, and competent teachers
- native language teachers
- native assistant teachers in advanced level
- flexibility; different kinds of teaching methods
- high level of teaching

Improvements:

- adjust the content to the time limit, because the students were not homogeneous or intermediate level as planned. Maybe this is the reason, why the material planned for the course was a little bit too much for this purpose.
- provide sufficient time to communicate using English language skills, but this would have required a longer course.
- focus on the students' interactivity more by mixing the groups of different nationalities and requiring students to speak English also with their fellow-countrymen.
- The Administration requires the official teacher to stay in the class, but the co-operation between the native assistant teacher and official teacher during the lessons could be more versatile.

4.3 Quality Area COURSE EVALUATION

Indicator: Course monitoring and evaluation

Strengths and areas of improvement by criterion
(criterion and evaluation are enclosed)

The teachers, in their first meeting concerning this English course, decided to make adjustments to meet the survey results. They have never had international student groups for short term lessons, and they were intrigued by the challenge. Normally, the students are not given questionnaires but instead, the exam results are regarded as feedback. But in this English course they faced the opportunity to evaluate the teaching process through questionnaires.

The teachers do not collect feedback from the students in general, but sometimes they might ask for it.

The EOI is a language school and therefore this English language course was appropriate for the school's other activities and in addition to that the school has a professional and motivated staff.

Strengths:

- the questionnaire for this English course is very good and versatile
- both teachers and students opinions were taken into account
- the exam results are taken into account as feedback in general

Improvements:

- the development plan could be a little bit clearer by taking out the most important development points from the minutes and annual reports. That would make the follow up and development procedure easier.

4.4 Overall Assessment

The course plan

The course plan was done in advance and it was executed as planned. The course was designed taking into account the student survey to find out about their needs as users of the English language, in what situations they use it and for what purposes, and the teachers have had a series of meetings. The course plan includes aims, results, contents, activities, and timing. The teachers took into account students' previous knowledge, although they usually do not plan the course with them. This course plan included goals, contents and methodology. The teachers always focus on the language skills of students. Placement tests were not done, but the teachers managed to adjust their teaching extremely well for beginners as well as intermediate students.

Strengths

The Escola Oficial de Idiomas de Ourense has a strong and long experience in teaching English and planning courses. They are highly motivated and they have good teamwork spirit.

Areas of improvement

In the future, it would be easier to plan language courses if feedback were collected from every course and taken advantage of. This would also develop the teaching in general.

The course implementation

The course was planned and implemented according to all the required criteria. The teaching was flexible, so if there were any changes to the course plan, the teachers were able to change it and adjust. The teachers were able to use all the human and technical resources

that the EOI offers. The teaching has been done in teachers' own time, and there were no extra financial resources appointed. The different class sessions had been planned taking into account a variety of language functions and learning strategies that were appropriate at an intermediate and beginner's level.

Strengths

The EOI has very motivated, competent, and experienced teachers and staff. It employs native language teachers, which makes the teaching even more versatile. By using different kinds of teaching methods, in general, they achieve the most competent results.

Areas of improvement

It would have been better to give more time for the students to be interactive with each other, even if there had been fewer written exercises. Students' feedback showed that there was not enough time to do all the tasks given. A 12-hour language course obviously has a very limited scope and must be focused on a manageable number of aims. Therefore it would have been nice, if the EOI would have divided students in a smaller mixed groups in the free time as they did in the first evening dinner.

The course evaluation

The system the EOI was evaluating in this course was rather different from what they usually do at their school. Their regular evaluation is a long process that would not be appropriate for a 12 hour intensive course. The course evaluation for this English course had been thought out in advance. The surveys were prepared in advance by the facilitator and the teaching team. The feedback gathered from two questionnaires was made available to all the partners so that they can use them for peer review purposes. All participants thought that they had learned a lot of English in this very short course. The course has encouraged the students to speak and communicate better in English. Firstly, the EOI asked participants for their opinion when planning the course. Secondly, students took active part in the implementation of the course. So, finally, students' opinions were stated in a questionnaire to assess the results of the course.

Strengths

For this English course the questionnaires were versatile??? and good in overall. In general, the EOI takes the exam results into account as a feedback.

Areas of improvements

In the future, if there were regularly collected feedback from every course and it was adequately taken advantage of, the teaching in general would develop accordingly in light of this information.

5. Annex

- 5.1 Agenda of Peer Visit
- 5.2 Interview Minutes and Guidelines for Analysis
- 5.3 Course assessment and criteria