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International Comparison of education systems: A European model
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Anders J. Hingel
DG Education and Training
European Commission
EUROPEAN STATISTICAL INFRASTRUCTURE FOR COMPARATIVE DATA ON EDUCATION AND TRAINING

1959 Eurostat - European Statistical system
1975 Cedefop
1980 Eurydice
1990 European Training Foundation (ETF)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Lisbon conclusions - Open Method of Coordination – Monitoring progress and performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Objectives in education and training 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>First meeting of the Standing Group on Indicators and benchmarks (25th meeting yesterday!)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Five Benchmark for 2010 in Education and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Development of new indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>CRELL research centre on Lifelong Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Coherent framework of indicators and benchmarks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The development of a comprehensive European tool of indicators and benchmarks to support comparative monitoring of progress and performance of education and training systems in Europe within a Lifelong-learning and worldwide perspective.
# Reference framework of 8 key competencies

**EU Recommendation of the EP and the Council (Dec. 2006)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication in the mother tongue</td>
<td>PISA, PIRLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication in foreign languages</td>
<td>SURVEYLANG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math, science and technology competence</td>
<td>PISA, TIMSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital competence</td>
<td>SITES, PIAAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning to learn competences</td>
<td>« LtoL »</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and civic competences</td>
<td>ICCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of initiative and entrepreneurship</td>
<td>CREATIVITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural awareness and expression and expression</td>
<td>CREATIVITY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Monitoring and Analysing Progress

FIVE EUROPEAN BENCHMARKS FOR 2010

10% Early school leavers (young people)
20% less low performers in reading literacy (15 years old)
15% more new Math, Science and Technology graduates
85% Upper secondary graduates (young people)
12.5% Lifelong learning participation (adults)

SIXTEEN CORE INDICATORS

1. Participation in pre-school education
2. Special needs education
3. Early school leavers
4. Literacy in reading, maths and science
5. Language skills
6. ICT skills
7. Civic skills
8. Learning to learn skills
9. Upper secondary completion rates of young people
10. Professional development of teachers
11. Higher education graduates
12. Cross-national mobility of students
13. Participation of adults in lifelong learning
14. Adults’ skills
15. Educational attainment of the population
16. Investment in education and training

And other objectives:
- 90% participation in pre-school education
- Mastering at least two foreign languages
- Significant yearly increase of investment in human resources
Annual Progress Report

1. Making lifelong learning a reality
2. Developing school education
3. Developing vocational education and training
4. Developing higher education
5. Key competences for lifelong learning
6. Improving equity in education and training
7. Employability
8. Investment in education and training
Progress of performance
Five European Benchmarks for 2010

Progress towards meeting the 5 benchmarks (EU average)

- MST graduates
- Lifelong learning participation
- Early school leavers
- Upper secondary completion
- Low achievers in reading

(Performance below 0 indicates getting worse)

Year
2010 benchmarks = 100
Coherent framework of indicators and benchmarks

Data sources

LFS  
UOE  
CVTS 3  
AES  
ICT survey

Attainment, participation  
Mobility, financing, graduates  
VET  
Self reported skills (adults)  
Self reported ICT skills

PISA survey  
TALIS survey  
PIAAC survey

Maths, reading, science skills  
Teacher professional dev.  
Adult skills

ICCS survey

Civic skills

Surveylang  
LtoL survey

Language skills  
Learning to learn skills
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers professional development</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic skills</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language skills</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult skills</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning to Learn</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Secondary analysis of international survey data - many needs!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tracking and disparities</th>
<th>Teacher/trainer support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction time / homework</td>
<td>Investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-economic background</td>
<td>Migrant background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student motivation</td>
<td>Informal learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender differences</td>
<td>Special education needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School autonomy</td>
<td>Student assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School evaluation</td>
<td>School climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School resources</td>
<td>Adult learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support of parents</td>
<td>ICT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Education and Training
post 2010 work programme

Future Coherence of the
framework of indicators and benchmarks

Next step:
Commission Communication (end 2008)

« An updated strategic framework for European cooperation in Education and Training »
Thank you for your attention!


Building on 50 Years of International Comparisons

IEA’s TIMSS & PIRLS
A Bridge to School Improvement

Michael O. Martin and Ina V.S. Mullis, Executive Directors
TIMSS & PIRLS International Study Center
Boston College

Comparaison Internationale des Systèmes Éducatifs:
Un Modèle Européen?
Paris, 13 et 14 novembre 2008
What Is IEA?

• IEA - International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement

• IEA is an independent, international cooperative of national research institutions and governmental research agencies

• IEA has been pioneering international student assessment for 50 years

• IEA’s Mission: Provide Internationally Comparable Data of High Quality for Improving Education
What Are IEA’s TIMSS and PIRLS?

*International Assessments of Educational Achievement*

**TIMSS**
- Mathematics and science
- Fourth and eighth grades

**PIRLS**
- Reading
- Fourth grade
Why TIMSS and PIRLS?

- Monitor progress in students’ educational achievement in mathematics, science, and reading over time and across grades
- Provide comparative information about trends in educational achievement across countries in relation to efforts to improve teaching and learning
  - Monitor curricular implementation and effectiveness
  - Identify most promising instructional practices
Trends Over Time

Grade 4
- PIRLS in 2001, 2006, 2011...

Grade 8

Grade 12
- TIMSS Advanced in 1995, 2008...
Benefits of TIMSS and PIRLS

- Focuses on the quality of educational achievement internationally
  - Provides international benchmarks describing levels of student proficiency
- Provides policymakers with strategic contextual information
  - Can monitor reforms over time
- Fosters capacity building in a collaborative environment
IEA’s Curriculum Model: An Educational Perspective on Educational Issues

National, Social, and Educational Context

Intended Curriculum

School, Teacher and Classroom Context

Implemented Curriculum

Student Outcomes and Characteristics

Attained Curriculum
What Data Are Collected?

**Intended** Curriculum
- Participating countries, curriculum experts
- Routinely published in Encyclopedia

**Implemented** Curriculum
- Teachers and principals of participating students
- The students themselves

**Attained** Curriculum
- The mathematics, science, and reading tests
- Routinely published in International Reports
Comprehensive Content Coverage

TIMSS 2007 Mathematics

Grade 4 – 179 items (192 score points)
- Number (50%)
- Geometric shapes and measures (35%)
- Data display (15%)

Grade 8 – 215 items (238 score points)
- Number (30%)
- Algebra (30%)
- Geometry (20%)
- Data and chance (20%)
Comprehensive Content Coverage

TIMSS 2007 Science

Grade 4 – 174 items (194 score points)
- Life science (45%)
- Physical science (35%)
- Earth science (20%)

Grade 8 – 212 items (240 score points)
- Biology (35%)
- Chemistry (20%)
- Physics (25%)
- Earth science (20%)
Scope of TIMSS 2007

Total Assessment Time

Grade 4 - 8½ hours
Grade 8 - 10½ hours

Assessment Time per Student

Grade 4 - 72 Minutes (two 36-minute sessions with break)
Grade 8 - 90 Minutes (two 45-minute sessions with break)

Booklet Design (14 booklets)

Two blocks per session
Two math and two science blocks per student
Mathematics and Science Cognitive Domains – TIMSS 2007 Grades 4 & 8

Reasoning (20-30%)
- Analyze, integrate/synthesize, generalize, hypothesize/predict, draw conclusions, justify, solve non-routine problems and conduct investigations

Applying (35-40%)
- Compare/contrast, model, represent, use relationships and concepts to solve problems

Knowing (30-40%)
- Recall, recognize, classify, define, measure
Comprehensive Coverage

PIRLS 2011 Framework – Grade 4

Purposes for Reading
- Reading for Literary Experience (50%)
- Reading to Acquire and Use Information (50%)

Processes of Comprehension
- Retrieve explicitly stated information (20%)
- Make straightforward inferences (30%)
- Interpret and integrate ideas and information (30%)
- Examine and evaluate textual elements (20%)
Scope of PIRLS 2011 Assessment

Reading Comprehension Assessment

- 10 Passages
  - 5 literary, 5 informational
- 130 Items (approx.)
  - 50% constructed response

New Initiatives

- Web-based reading
- prePIRLS
Scope of PIRLS 2011 Assessment

Total Assessment Time
- 6 hours, 40 minutes

Assessment Time per Student
- 80 minutes (two 40-minute sessions with break)

Booklet Design (13 booklets)
- Two passages, one per session
Comprehensive Background Information About Contexts for Teaching and Learning

Questionnaires:

• Country – intended curriculum
• Student – home and classroom experience
• Teacher – implemented curriculum, education and preparation, instructional practices
• School – climate, resources, composition
• Parent (PIRLS) – early literacy activities, home resources, parental attitudes toward reading
Ensuring Comparative Validity in TIMSS and PIRLS

- Are the tests appropriate?
- Are target populations comparable?
- Was sampling conducted properly?
- Are translations comparable?
- Were the tests administered appropriately?
- Was scoring done correctly?
- Are the data comparable?
Widespread Participation

TIMSS 2007 Grade 8
- 50 Countries
- 242,000 Students

TIMSS 2007 Grade 4
- 37 Countries
- 183,000 Students

PIRLS 2011 Grade 4
- 55 Countries (expected)
- 300,000 Students (approx.)
What Has Been Learned...

Different countries use different approaches but an effective educational system always requires enormous effort

- High percentages of students completing high school, and taking advanced courses
- Students ready to learn
- A rigorous and progressive curriculum
- Resources for facilities and materials
- Well-prepared teachers
- Education valued by society
PIRLS & TIMSS in 2011

A Unique Opportunity for International Assessment at the Fourth Grade

IEA’s PIRLS and TIMSS international assessments both will be conducted in 2011, providing countries with:

- At fourth grade, one comprehensive assessment of three essential subjects – reading, mathematics, and science
- At eighth grade, the fifth TIMSS mathematics and science assessments, the latest in a series that has been conducted every 4 years since 1995
- For both grades, a rich array of contextual background information for improving teaching and learning
PISA assessments of student skills
Seeing education systems through the prism of international comparisons


Andreas Schleicher
Head, Indicators and Analysis Division
OECD Directorate for Education

In the dark...
...all students, schools and cultures look the same...

But with a little light....
In the dark...
...all students, schools and education systems look the same...

But with a little light....
...important differences become apparent....

There is nowhere to hide.
How the global talent pool has changed
Measuring improvement in a changing world
A world of change in baseline qualifications

Approximated by percentage of persons with high school or equivalent qualifications in the age groups 55-64, 45-55, 45-44, and 25-34 years

1. Excluding ISCED 3C short programmes
2. Year of reference 2004
3. Including some ISCED 3C short programmes
4. Year of reference 2005

PISA
OECD’s three-yearly global assessments...

... examine the performance of 15-year-olds in key subject areas as well as a wider range of educational outcomes

- Including students' attitudes to learning and their learning behaviour

... collect contextual data from...

- students, parents, schools and systems...

... in order to identify policy levers shaping learning outcomes

Coverage

- Representative samples of between 3,500 and 50,000 15-year-old students drawn in each country
- Most federal countries also draw state-level samples
What can PISA contribute

- Comparative assessments of learning outcomes...
  - Can show what is possible in education and thus help optimise existing policies and to reflect on a more fundamental transformation of the paradigms and beliefs underlying current policies
  - Can help setting policy targets in terms of measurable goals achieved by other systems and help to establish trajectories for reform
  - Can assist with gauging the pace of educational progress and help reviewing the reality of educational delivery at the frontline
  - Can support the political economy of reform
Deciding what to assess...

looking back at what students were expected to have learned

...or...

looking ahead to how well they can extrapolate from what they have learned and apply their knowledge and skills in novel settings.

For PISA, the OECD countries chose the latter.

How the demand for skills has changed

Economy-wide measures of routine and non-routine task input (US)

(Levy and Murnane)
Average performance of 15-year-olds in science: extrapolate and apply

Strengths and weaknesses of countries in science relative to their overall performance

France

Science competencies

Science knowledge

Overall science score

Identifying scientific issues

Exploring phenomena scientifically

Using scientific evidence

Knowledge about science

Earth and space

Living systems

Physical systems

OECD (2007). PISA 2006 – Science Competencies for Tomorrow’s World, Figure 2.13
Strengths and weaknesses of countries in science relative to their overall performance

Czech Republic

Scientific competencies:
- Identifying scientific issues
- Explaining phenomena scientifically
- Using scientific evidence
- Knowledge about science

Scientific knowledge:
- Earth and space
- Living systems
- Physical systems

Overall science score:
- France = 495
- Czech Republic = 512

Large proportion of top performers:
- These students can consistently identify, explain and apply scientific knowledge, link different information sources and explanations and use evidence from these to justify decisions, demonstrate advanced scientific thinking in unfamiliar situations.

Large proportion of poor performers:
- These students often confuse key features of a scientific investigation, apply incorrect information, mix personal beliefs with facts in support of a position.

OECD (2007), PISA 2006 – Science Competencies for Tomorrow’s World, Figure 2.13
PISA OECD Programme for International Student Assessment
French presidency of the European Union, 13 Nov 2008

Average performance of 15-year-olds in science – extrapolate and apply

Low average performance
Large socio-economic disparities
High average performance
Large socio-economic disparities

High average performance
High social equity

Low average performance
High social equity

Strong socio-economic impact on student performance
Socially equitable distribution of learning opportunities

High science performance
Low science performance

Israel
Portugal
Russia
Spain
Greece

Luxembourg
Slovak Republic
Iceland
Latvia
Croatia
Sweden
Denmark
France
Poland
Hungary
Austria
Belgium
Ireland
Czech Republic
Switzerland
Macao-China
Germany
United Kingdom
Korea
Japan
Australia
Slovenia
Netherlands
Liechtenstein
New Zealand

High average performance
High science performance

Low average performance
School performance and socio-economic background

**Germany**

- Student performance and students' socio-economic background within schools
- School performance and schools' socio-economic background
- Student performance and students' socio-economic background

**Finland**

- Student performance and students' socio-economic background within schools
- School performance and schools' socio-economic background
- Student performance and students' socio-economic background

Schools proportional to size

Disadvantage  PISA Index of socio-economic background  Advantage
PISA 2006: Science Competencies for Tomorrow's World, Figure 4.2a.

Immigrants and science performance

Native students  
First-generation students  
Second-generation students

OECD average = 500

Public and private schools

Government schools  
Government dependent private  
Government independent private

Private schools perform better  
Public schools perform better

Luxembourg  
Japan  
Italy  
Switzerland  
Finland  
Denmark  
Czech Republic  
Sweden  
HUNGARY  
Portugal  
United States  
Netherlands  
Slovak Republic  
Korea  
Ireland  
Spain  
Canada  
Mexico  
New Zealand  
Germany  
OECD  
United Kingdom
Variation in student performance

OECD (2004), Learning for tomorrow’s world: First results from PISA 2003, Table 4.1a

OECD (2007), Learning for tomorrow’s world: First results from PISA 2006, Table 4.1a
**OECD's PISA framework for assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Domain 1</th>
<th>Domain 2</th>
<th>Domain 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Individual learner</td>
<td>Outputs and Outcomes impact of learning</td>
<td>Policy Levers shape educational outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Instructional settings</td>
<td>Quality and distribution of knowledge &amp; skills</td>
<td>Individ attitudes, engagement and behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Schools, other institutions</td>
<td>Quality of instructional delivery</td>
<td>Teaching, learning practices and classroom climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Country or system</td>
<td>Output and performance of institutions</td>
<td>The learning environment at school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social &amp; economic outcomes of education</td>
<td>Structures, resource alloc and policies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pooled international dataset, effects of selected school/system factors on science performance after accounting for all other factors in the model**

- School principal's positive evaluation of quality of educational materials (gross only)
- Autonomy (resources) (gross and net)
- Promote science learning (gross and net)
- (gross and net)
- Schools (gross and net) but no system-wide effect
- One additional hour of
- Measured effect

Effect after accounting for the socio-economic background of students, schools and countries

OECD (2007), PISA 2006 - Science Competencies from Tomorrow's World, Table 6.1a
Future challenges

- Planned assessments
  - Learning outcomes at school 2009, 2012, 2015, 2018
  - Adult competencies 2011
- Broadening the range of competencies covered
  - Intra-personal dimensions
  - Inter-personal dimensions
- Measuring growth in learning outcomes
- Connecting learning outcomes with teaching policies and practices
- Bridging the gap between formative and summative assessments
  - Computer-delivered dynamic assessment tools
  - Adaptive assessment
  - Feeding student solution strategies back to learners and teachers.

Thank you!

- [www.oecd.org](http://www.oecd.org); [www.pisa.oecd.org](http://www.pisa.oecd.org)
  - All national and international publications
  - The complete micro-level database
- email: pisa@oecd.org
- Andreas.Schleicher@OECD.org

... and remember:
Without data, you are just another person with an opinion
Testing times
Changes to national testing in England

Lorna Bertrand
International Evidence Manager
Department for Children, Schools and Families

Guiding principles

Our system of testing and assessment should:

• Give parents the information they need to compare different schools, choose the right school for their child and then track their child’s progress.

• Enable head teachers and teachers to secure the progress of every child and their school as a whole, without unnecessary burdens or bureaucracy.

• Allow the public to hold national and local government and governing bodies to account for the performance of schools.
National testing in England pre-Oct 2008

**Key Stage 1**

- Teacher assessments in reading, writing, speaking and listening, mathematics and science.
- Tasks and tests in reading, writing and mathematics.
- Schools publish their Key Stage 1 performance data.
- DCSF publishes national summary Key Stage 1 results but not school-level data.

**National testing in England pre-Oct 2008**

**Key Stages 2 and 3**

- Tests in the core subjects of English, mathematics and science, and teacher assessments in core subjects at Key Stage 2, and in core and foundation subjects at Key Stage 3.
- Schools report teacher assessments alongside test results.
- No moderation arrangements for teacher assessments at these Key Stages as externally-marked tests provide the basis for assessing all pupils in the country on a consistent basis.
Age 16 and beyond

- General Certificate of Secondary Education (GCSE) and Advanced level (A level) qualifications are internationally respected qualifications at the heart of our assessment system at 16 and after.

- The GCSE is currently the principal means of assessing standards at the end of compulsory schooling at age 16.

What has changed?

- Ending of Key Stage 3 testing regime in secondary schools with immediate effect.

Maintaining accountability

- Every parent will receive regular reports on their child’s progress in years 7, 8 and 9 (KS3).
- Will continue to provide Key Stage 3 test papers to any schools that want to use them internally.
- Will ensure that schools properly focus in Year 7 and 8 on the progress of those children who did not reach the expected standard at Key Stage 2, with effective one-to-one tuition and catch-up learning.
- Will introduce an externally marked test, with a sample of pupils to measure national performance, so that the public can hold government to account.

Impact on international comparisons studies

- Potential for a strengthened evidential role
  - TIMSS Grade 8 cohort = end of Key Stage 3
  - But is it an effective measure of England’s national curriculum?
  - Further exploration required.
- Schools might find participation more attractive
  - Improved sample response rates.
Assessment of student skills in Denmark

Steen Harbild
Chief adviser - Ministry of Education
Paris, 13 November 2008
The Danish Folkeskole
- primary and lower secondary schools

- Pre-school class - 1st to 9th form - 10th form
- An undivided and comprehensive school system
- Teaching - not pupil - differentiation
- Ongoing evaluation of students’ learning outcomes
- Academic skills - social development
- The class teacher
- Teaching methods and materials
- School-home cooperation

- The national school system / the local municipal school
- Centralization / decentralization
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>New government&lt;br&gt;PISA 2000 (reading)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>New political agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>New Act of the Folkeskole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>OECD review + recommendations&lt;br&gt;National follow-up&lt;br&gt;EVA reports&lt;br&gt;PISA 2003 (maths)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>New government – “New goals”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Globalisation strategies&lt;br&gt;New Council + Agency for evaluation …</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>PISA 2006 (science)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Follow-up report - the OECD recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>PISA 2009 (reading)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Denmark’s PISA results in 2000, 2003, and 2006
2004

June: OECD review of national policies for education
- Strengths and weaknesses - 35 recommendations

September: National follow-up with central stakeholders
- Intense debate

November: National evaluations of teaching differentiation and of internal evaluation

December: PISA 2003
OECD review 2004

Strengths:

Among the strengths, the experts identified the commitment of the State and municipalities to education, evidenced for example by generous staffing and adequate premises and equipment.

The experts also identified frequent opportunities for parental choice, dedicated teachers as well as confident and happy students.
Weaknesses:

Among the weaknesses, the experts identified the lack of a strong culture of student evaluation as well as a lack of adequate feedback on student performance.

There was also an absence of school self-appraisal and not enough sharing of good practice. In addition, schools did not pay adequate attention to early reading problems, and schools also failed to counter the efforts of home disadvantage.

The experts identified an ambivalent attitude to school leadership as well as an over-restrictive teachers’ contract.
Government initiatives from 2005

“Reforming the Folkeskole”:

• More lessons in key subjects
• More focus on integration of ICT
• Improved teacher training programme
• Strengthened in-service training of teachers and school leaders
• Raising the academic level in reading, science, mathematics and English
• Focus on history teaching
• Bilingual children
• Inclusion and special needs education.
Government initiatives – 2)

- Better preparation of the children for schooling
- Tailoring the present 10th form subject range
- Promotion of an evaluation culture
- Student plans
- Compulsory leaving examinations
- Documentation of the Folkeskole’s results
- A new council for evaluation and quality development
- Strengthened municipal monitoring of schools
- More documentation and use of best practice.
National tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
<th>8.</th>
<th>9.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Danish / reading</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics/chemistry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish as a second language (opt.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National tests

• Compulsory

• Computer-based
• Adaptive
• No two students receive the exact same test

• The test results – and test items - are confidential
• No ranking
• The parents are informed in writing about the results

• The test is one of many pedagogical tools
• A national evaluation portal for teachers with inspiration for better evaluation in the individual subjects and examples of good practice
Danish follow-up report in April 2008
- on the basis of the OECD review and the 35 concrete recommendations

1. Learning standards, evaluation of student performance and school effectiveness
2. Roles and competences of school leaders
3. Pre- and in-service professional development of teachers
4. The collective agreement regulating the roles and hours of teachers
5. Opportunities for bilingual and special needs students
6. Other necessary actions.
Ministry of Education
Denmark

www.uvm.dk
International comparison of education systems: a European model?

Workshop 1
International comparison of compulsory education
Paris 13 November 2008

What role could the European community and the European countries play to fuel the reflection in the field of international survey of pupils’ assessment?

Pierre Vrignaud
Professor of Psychology
Université de Paris Ouest
As regard pupils’ assessment many European countries:

- Have a long tradition of research and development
- Have established departments or organizations dedicated to national assessment since a long time
- Have participated - sometimes from the beginning - to the work of IEA and then OECD
Between national and international survey what could be the place of European Community to fuel the reflection in this field?

• Let evolve the international surveys to the best practices and the state-of-the-art methodology
• Encourage and develop cross-national projects aiming at innovative approaches
Forewarning

• I shall limit my reflection to international literacy surveys (IALS, ALL, PISA, PIAAC)
• The concept of literacy introduced an innovation in the definition of the skill to be assessed
  – From curricula based skills (IEA) to a broad skill necessary “to achieve one’s goals, to develop one’s knowledge and potential, and to participate in society.“ (OECD) that should be the output of compulsory education
A quick glance at history

- More than fifty years of international surveys on pupils’ skills aim at developing a real know how in this field
  - IEA work was really pioneering work
- Since about twenty years (IALS and then PISA) the complexity of the assessment and the need for reliability leads to a design considered as optimal and that has been becoming a kind of dogma
A general question

• What is the impact of globalization (more and more participating countries) and of the pressure put by the political decision-maker and media on the design of international pupils’ and adults’ skills surveys?
Are the International Surveys at the state of the art?


- These surveys are in general well constructed but several points need further development in particular the issues of equivalence and translation.

- Take insufficiently into account the most recent knowledge.
Two main issues

• Is the measurement model reductionist?

• Is the cultural/linguistic bias identification reliable?
Is the measurement model reductionist?

• The choice of the Item Response Modeling (IRT) introduce many constraints on the measure and its interpretation:
  – Unidimensionality
  – Results limited to a league table
  – Skill allowing poor interpretation
  – An old model that has not so much evolved
Drawbacks of an unidimensional model

– Conduct to the dropping of item that didn’t fit the model while these items can convey many interesting information for the comparison between countries

– Even after dropping of items this model doesn’t really fit the data since some studies (Goldstein) have demonstrated that the data were at least bidimensionnal
Caution about what multidimensionnality means

• The international survey are using several scales (Prose, document, etc.) to report the results

• The use of such scales is not supporting multidimensionnality from our point of view

• The distinction between the scales is not actually supported by the data (very high correlations between scales)
  – For example the correlations between the PISA’s scale are very close to .90
Should the measurement model evolve?

- IRT models are today more than fifty years old
  - Rasch’s seminal work 1960
  - Birnbaum’s paper 1958
- Other approaches allowing multidimensionality are available
  - Structural Equation Modeling
  - Multilevel Modeling
Should the algorithm evolve?

- The EM algorithm (Rubin et al.) 1977
- The use of plausible values 1980
- The algorithm used is not completely unbiased
  - The format of the exercises (testlets: several questions on the same text) introduces a dependency between items
  - An appropriate algorithm as well as a software for testlets has been proposed by Wainer
Identification of cultural/linguistic biases

• To compare implies to ensure equivalence between the different linguistic/national versions of the test

• Identification of biased items (Differential Item Functioning) is henceforth crucial to ensure equivalence
Some problems for identification of biased items

- In the IALS survey, secondary analysis of the French data have demonstrated that some wrongly translated items were not detected by the methods used.
- The methods used have been developed for the comparison of groups sharing a common national/linguistic context – i.e. Gender, SES,..
Issues needing to be clarified

• The method used for detecting biased items are perhaps not robust when working on different linguistic version of a test (Sireci)
• The number of groups (countries) implied in the comparison process is far higher than the number of groups usually studied (about ten or less)
What role can European community plays to support innovation?

• Several European countries have a long tradition of pupils’ assessment surveys

• European community offers the opportunity to develop innovative projects to test new approaches and design for a between countries comparison of pupils’ skills
An illustrative example

• The use of national reading tests for international comparisons: Results from a feasibility study.
  – Socrates contract n° 98-01-3PE-0414-00.

• Forewarning:
  – Limited aims
  – Need to be refined
Aim of the feasibility study

- Test a framework designed to compare reading literacy in the different countries using national tests
- Compare different anchoring methods
  - a vocabulary test already adapted in the participating countries
  - Bilingual pupils
- Check the data analysis method adapted to the data collection design
Main questions:

- To which extent are the different national tests measuring the same concept?
- Are the item taxonomies in the different countries comparable?
- Can we get a way to compare subjects and groups cross nationally using our national tests?
Data treatment

• A multidimensional method (Principal Components Analysis)

• An algorithm adapted to the data collection design (structural missing values):
  – NIPALS : Nonlinear Iterative Partial Least Squares (Hermann Wold)

• Possibility to handle missing data without estimating plausible values or discarding incomplete observations or variables
What we learned from feasibility study

- The vocabulary subtest presented a rather high relationship with reading test.

- Linking through vocabulary subtest and through bilinguals showed very similar results.

- The data were bi-dimensional.
References of the report

Other examples

• A study continuing the preceding one (2004):

Culturally Balanced Assessment of Reading (C-BAR). (pp. 51-57). European network of policy makers for the evaluation of education systems. Paris MEN/DEP Édition. Site http://cisad.adc.education.fr/revap

• A study about the Skills in English (2004):

The assessment of pupils’ skills in English in eight European countries. (pp. 67-77). European network of policy makers for the evaluation of education systems. Paris MEN/DEP Édition. Site http://cisad.adc.education.fr/revap
Conclusion

• Between national and International pupils’ assessment surveys there is a place for European projects

• Let’s go!
Thanks for your attention
Dans cet atelier, nous avons traité la question de l'évaluation des acquis des élèves au sein des comparaisons internationales de l'enseignement obligatoire.

Je n'ai pas la prétention de rendre compte de toute la richesse et de la diversité de ce qui s'est dit dans l'atelier, puisque six interventions ont occupé pratiquement tout le temps qui nous était imparti, et qu'il n'en est que peu resté pour discuter.

Je vais donc dire quelques mots sur les interventions, avant d'aborder trois points qui ont été évoqués dans les interventions ou au cours des quelques discussions, et je me permettrai, sur ces points, d'avancer un certain nombre d'idées qui n'ont pas toujours été évoquées dans l'atelier, mais qui me paraissent importantes.

1. Si je résume très rapidement les interventions,

- c’est d’abord Anders HINGEL qui nous a fait un catalogue du dispositif des "benchmarks" – terme difficilement traduisible en français – et des indicateurs retenus par l'Union européenne dans le cadre de la méthode ouverte de convergence.

Les projets en la matière sont nombreux, et l'ambition est de couvrir avec des indicateurs fondés sur les enquêtes de l'OCDE et de l'IEA et, à défaut, sur des travaux de l'Union, tous les domaines relevant des compétences-clés retenues par les ministres européens.

- puis, Michael MARTIN, et Andreas SCHLEICHER nous ont respectivement rappelé ce qu'étaient les programmes d'enquêtes de l'IEA – à qui personne ne contestera la paternité des enquêtes comparatives des acquis des élèves – et de l'OCDE. Nous n'avons pas approfondi les différences entre les méthodes des enquêtes conduites par les deux organisations, mais ces différences sont importantes : pour l'IEA, les protocoles tiennent compte des objectifs des curricula aux différents niveaux scolaires des pays enquêtés, alors que l'OCDE s'intéresse moins aux résultats en termes de connaissances des élèves, qu'à leur capacité à se servir de ce qu'ils ont appris et à leur comportement en matière d'apprentissage.

Je crois que ces différences sont importantes et intéressantes et qu'il faut les conserver, j'y reviendrai.

- ensuite Lorna BERTRAND et Steen HARBILD nous ont fait le point des expériences nationales, en Angleterre – où des évolutions importantes ont lieu en matière d'évaluation et d'utilisation des évaluations – pour la première, et au Danemark, pour le second. Je n'entrerai pas dans le détail et vous renvoie à leurs présentations respectives, mais je crois qu'il est intéressant de noter que ces deux pays ont des expériences extrêmement contrastées, voire quelque peu contradictoires, en matière d'évaluation et d'utilisation des évaluations des acquis des élèves.

- enfin Pierre VRIGNAUD nous a posé des questions scientifiques et techniques et nous a montré que l'on ne prenait pas assez le temps de discuter du fond et de la méthode des enquêtes, que les modèles de mesure utilisés étaient réducteurs, et, qu'en fin de compte, on mesurait « ce qu'on savait mesurer » et on mesurait « là où on savait mesurer », ce qui ne permettait pas de rendre compte de tous les résultats recherchés et pouvait – c'est moi qui l'ajoute – restreindre les ambitions des systèmes éducatifs à ce que l’on sait mesurer.

Il a surtout ouvert des pistes en montrant que l'on pouvait progresser et qu'un champ de recherche était ouvert et devait être approfondi – pourquoi pas par l'Europe, j'y reviendrai aussi – dans le domaine de la mesure en éducation. Il a d'ailleurs cité à ce sujet plusieurs
projets innovants, dont certains ont été financés par l’Union européenne, et que celle-ci pourrait promouvoir dans le domaine de l’évaluation comparative des acquis des élèves.

2. Après ce rappel évidemment trop bref et extrêmement réducteur par rapport à la richesse des interventions, je voudrais aller un petit peu au-delà, en évoquant trois questions qui ont été abordées dans les interventions et dans les quelques discussions ; et les aborder compte tenu du thème, voire de l’enjeu de notre séminaire : quelle place peut jouer, quelle place doit prendre l'Europe, en matière d'évaluation des acquis des élèves ?

- La première question, qui a aussi été évoquée par Norberto Bottani lors de la séance d'hier matin, est qu'à l'heure actuelle, nous avons énormément de données tirées des enquêtes et de nombreuses batteries d'indicateurs. Pour reprendre une expression qu'a utilisée Anders HINGEL, "we have a fantastic amount of data". Mais le problème est, qu'à l'heure actuelle, on tire de cet amas de données – j'utilise à dessein le mot amas – des questions plutôt que des réponses. Il ne suffit pas aux responsables des politiques éducatives de savoir que d'autres pays ont eu des résultats différents des leurs, de repérer leurs points forts et leurs points faibles par rapport aux autres, de percevoir qu'ils ont des marges de progression à explorer ; il leur faut savoir pourquoi, dans quel contexte, tels ou tels résultats ont été obtenus, et il faut être capable de leur proposer des pistes pour explorer les marges de progression mises en lumière.

L'évaluation, la comparaison ne sont pas en elles-mêmes porteuses d'améliorations et il est indispensable que l'on travaille à partir de la masse de données disponible qui, si elle n'est pas analysée et étudiée, risque d'aboutir – comme le disait Norberto BOTTANI hier – à un appauvrissement plutôt qu'à un enrichissement des recommandations qui peuvent être faites aux responsables politiques.


Je ne suis pas convaincu qu'à l'heure actuelle nous exploitions suffisamment les données dont nous disposons, pour répondre valablement à ce type de questions et pour y répondre en termes compréhensibles par les responsables politiques. On a ainsi évoqué dans l'atelier la nécessité de démontrer la valeur ajoutée de ce que nous proposons, et de la démontrer en termes utilisables par les responsables politiques.

Nous avons aussi évoqué, de façon indirecte, une autre question qui avait également été posée par Norberto Bottani hier matin : le risque que ferait courir un monopole des enquêtes.
Certains ont dit que l'on avait sans doute trop d'enquêtes, qu'il fallait les coordonner, mais en même temps, d’autres, voire les mêmes, ont souligné qu’il nous fallait des comparaisons.
internationales, et qu'il aurait fallu que le titre de notre conférence ait eu une «s» à comparaison(s) internationale(s), comme me l’a suggéré Christian FORESTIER.

A ce sujet, Lorna BERTRAND, comme Steen HARBILD nous ont montré, en nous exposant leurs expériences nationales respectives, que le pilotage d'un système éducatif implique de combiner des travaux nationaux et des travaux internationaux. D'autant plus, et je reprends là ce que disait Steen HARBILD, qu’en fin de compte une des seules explications des différences entre les caractéristiques et les résultats de nos systèmes éducatifs nationaux, est l’ethos ou les valeurs de chacun de nos pays.

A partir de là, c’est un autre champ de recherche que l'Europe doit explorer : comment coordonner et combiner au mieux travaux internationaux et travaux nationaux, et comment confronter les résultats d’enquêtes à la méthodologie et aux objectifs différents ? Etant entendu que ces différences constituent, je crois, une richesse. Dans cet ordre d’idées, il faut aussi s’interroger sur le fait qu’il est sans doute vain de vouloir répondre valablement avec les mêmes outils aux deux grands objectifs des évaluations des acquis des élèves qui sont, d'une part, le pilotage global des systèmes éducatifs, et, d’autre part, le pilotage individuel des progrès de chaque élève ou de chaque établissement.

Le dernier point que je voudrais aborder touche également à la question du développement de la recherche. Il se situe dans le prolongement de ce que nous a dit Pierre VRIGNAUD lors de l'atelier ; dans le domaine de la mesure en éducation, qu'il reste des progrès à faire. On ne peut pas admettre, me semble-t-il, que la mesure en éducation soit le seul domaine dont on puisse dire aujourd'hui que l'on y est au bout des recherches, qu’il n’y a plus de progrès à faire, que tout a été dit et que les méthodes y sont parfaites. Je le dis aussi crûment parce que nous avons entendu de telles affirmations à la suite de l’intervention de Pierre VRIGNAUD. Une telle attitude ne serait pas scientifique, et il y a, à ce sujet aussi, un champ de recherche à approfondir pour l'Europe.

Je conclurai volontiers en disant que l'Europe, qui veut être une économie de la connaissance, ne peut pas laisser vacant le champ des évaluations internationales des acquis des élèves, et ceci sur deux plans au moins : celui de l'approfondissement de ce qu'elles peuvent nous dire en relation avec les politiques éducatives et celui, plus méthodologique, de la technologie des enquêtes et de la mesure en éducation.

Je vous remercie.

Jean-Claude Emin
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Scope

**Education policies**

**Intentions/normative & prescriptive framework**

**Eurydice**

31 countries

**Education levels**

Preprimary → higher education

**Sources**

PISA, PIRLS, TIMMS, …

Empirical questionnaires

Observation in situ

Tests

**Objects**

Learners cognitive processes

Players strategies (trade unions, teachers, etc.)

**Implementation - Results**

Programmes/content

Organisation/structure

Methods

**Scientific literature reviews**

Official admin./doc. & data statistics

**Eurydice**

Education, Audiovisual & Culture Executive Agency
LACK OF INFORMATION
Eurydice CODES

- No regulations  no recommandations
- Local autonomy
- Variable
- Variable duration
Working time
Official definitions of the working time of teachers, primary and general (lower and upper) secondary level (ISCED 1, 2, 3), 2006/07

Teaching hours

Overall working hours

BG, CZ, DK,
DE, EE, FR, LV, LT,
HU, AT, PL, RO, SI, SK

BE, IE, LI

EL, IT, CY,
LU, MT, FI

ES, PT,
UK-SCT, IS, NO, TR

UK-ENG/WLS/NIR

NL

SE

Hours of availability at school
Breakdown of the weekly workload of full-time teachers in hours for primary education (ISCED 1), 2006/07

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Overall working time</th>
<th>Time available at school</th>
<th>Teaching time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BE fr</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK-ENG/WLS/NIR</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teacher education
Level and minimum length of initial teacher education for primary education (ISCED 1), and the compulsory minimum proportion of time spent on professional training, 2006/07

- **ISCED 3 or 4**
- **ISCED 5A**
- **ISCED 5B**
- **Teacher education abroad**
- **Compulsory minimum proportion of professional training**
- **Institutional autonomy**
Status of continuing professional development for teachers in primary and general (lower and upper) secondary education (ISCED 1, 2, 3), 2006/07
Minimum annual time (in hours) that teachers have to spend on continuing professional development, ISCED 1 and 2, 2006/07

### ISCED 1 and 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BE fr</th>
<th>BE de</th>
<th>EE</th>
<th>CY</th>
<th>LV</th>
<th>LT</th>
<th>HU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISCED 1 and 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**No time indications**

BE nl, BG, DE, CZ, IE, FR, LU, NL, SK, SE, IS, LI
Data from international surveys: A useful addition to official Eurydice sources
This statistical material

- compensates for the lack of information in national regulations or legislation, as a result of decentralisation or school autonomy

- enables one to estimate how far a regulation differs from practice in the field or from the situation as perceived by those actively involved
An example of complementary information from Eurydice and PIRLS:
Taught time recommendations and practices
THE LIMITS OF DATA COLLECTION ON TEACHERS AT NATIONAL LEVEL LINKED WITH THE DECENTRALISATION

Figure E4: Distribution of fourth-year pupils in primary education according to the number of hours a week they are taught the language of instruction, compared to the official minimum recommended time, public and private sectors combined, 2000/01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Percentile 10</th>
<th>Percentile 25</th>
<th>Percentile 50</th>
<th>Percentile 75</th>
<th>Percentile 90</th>
<th>Recommended minimum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CY</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Flexible timetable

Sources: Percentile: IEA, PIRLS 2001 database; Recommended minimum: Eurydice, 2000/01.
Figure E4: Distribution of fourth-year pupils in primary education according to the number of hours a week they are taught the language of instruction, compared to the official minimum recommended time, public and private sectors combined, 2000/01
Figure E4: Distribution of fourth-year pupils in primary education according to the number of hours a week they are taught the language of instruction, compared to the official minimum recommended time, public and private sectors combined, 2000/01
http://www.eurydice.org
OECD indicators on teachers and the new Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS)

International comparison of education systems: a European model?
13-14 November 2008, Paris

Michael Davidson
Senior Analyst, Indicators and Analysis Division
Directorate for Education
Why do we need TALIS?

- **Current OECD teacher-related indicators fairly limited**
  - Age and gender distribution of teachers
  - Teachers’ statutory salaries
  - Teachers’ working time
  - Average class sizes
  - Student-teacher ratios
  - Teacher-related factors that hinder instruction (PISA)
    - Teacher supply problems (school principal responses)
    - Student learning activities (student responses)

- **But this tells us little about teachers’ work in schools and what factors help or hinder in the development of effective teachers**
So what is TALIS?

- A representative sample of teachers of lower secondary education and their school principals
  - 200 schools, 20 teachers
    - Response rate (75%, 75%)
  - Teacher and Principal questionnaires (45 Minutes each)
    - Paper and pen or on-line

- In 24 countries:
  - Australia; Austria; Belgium (Flanders); Denmark; Hungary; Iceland; Ireland; Italy; Korea; Mexico; Netherlands; Norway; Poland; Portugal; Spain; Slovak Republic; Turkey; Brazil; Bulgaria; Estonia; Lithuania; Malta; Slovenia; Malaysia.
Policy focus of TALIS

- Appraisal of teachers and feedback to teachers
- Teaching practices, attitudes and beliefs
- School leadership
- Professional development of teachers
Professional Development (PD)

- **Key indicators**
  - Amount of PD undertaken
  - Type of PD
  - Impact of PD
  - PD needs

- **Analyses**
  - Relationship with appraisal and feedback in the school
Appraisal of and feedback to teachers

- How do teachers receive feedback on their work? Who from and how often?
- How does the appraisal system reward good teachers and provide support for those teachers who need it?
- How do different feedback and appraisal systems impact on the school culture, cooperation and collaboration between staff?
Appraisal of and feedback to teachers

- **Key indicators:**
  - Source of appraisal
  - Criteria used in appraisal
  - Outcomes of appraisal
  - Impact of the appraisal

- **Analyses**
  - Relationship between appraisal system and...
    - Teacher cooperation
    - School climate
    - Teacher job satisfaction
    - Teaching practices
    - School leadership
  - How does appraisal system support professional development of teachers?
School leadership

- **Key indicators:**
  - Roles and responsibilities of school leaders
  - Teachers’ perceptions of the school leadership

- **Scales for school leadership**
  - Framing and communicating school’s goals
  - Supervision and evaluation of instruction
  - Curricular coordination
  - Monitoring student progress
  - Promoting instructional improvements and professional development
  - Negotiator role
  - Coordinator and controller role
School leadership

- Analysis of prevailing styles of leadership within and between schools
  - Extent to which leadership team exists
- How these differ between countries and between different types of schools within countries
- Association between school leadership styles and practices and (for instance)
  - The evaluation and accountability frameworks in place
  - School climate
  - Teacher cooperation and collaboration
  - Teaching approaches in schools
  - The development of and support for teachers
Teaching practices, beliefs and attitudes

- **Key indicators:**
  - Beliefs about the nature of teaching and learning
  - Beliefs about self-efficacy
  - Teacher classroom practices
  - Cooperation among staff
  - Classroom environment
  - School climate

- **Scales for teaching practices**
  - Teacher controlled instruction
  - Student centred instruction
  - Structuring and scaffolding
  - Advanced verbal reflection
Teaching practices, beliefs and attitudes

Analysis e.g.:

- How do teachers’ practices, beliefs and attitudes differ with regard to teacher perceptions of leadership, school and classroom climate, self-efficacy and job satisfaction?
- Do school level factors impact on classroom practices?
- Are teacher beliefs and attitudes correlated with professional activities?
TALIS Products

- Initial report - mid June 2009
- Thematic report on professional development (with EC) - 2nd half 2009
- Technical report - 2nd half 2009
- International database
- On-line analysis tool - (being considered)
- Website (www.oecd.org/edu/TALIS)
- Dissemination events in 2009 and 2010
Thank you for Listening

www.oecd.org/edu/TALIS
Quelques éléments de comparaison sur la situation des enseignants dans le monde

Thomas M. Smith
Vanderbilt University, United States
Some elements of comparison of the situation of teachers in the world

Thomas M. Smith
Vanderbilt University, United States
Starting point

Measuring teacher quality is difficult to do within countries, let alone between countries

• Availability of data
  - Administrative data collected by Ministries of Education
  - Sample surveys (expensive, coverage, frequency)
    • OECD Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS)
    • IEA Teacher and Development Study in Mathematics (TEDS)

• Uncertainty about the measurable characteristics of effective teachers
What UIS currently collects

Minimum standards for teaching at the primary level and proportions of teachers meeting these standards
Compared to school survey data from SACMEQ

Percentage of 6th grade students with reading teachers having completed various education levels, 2000-2002

Note: In this figure, as in others based on SACMEQ data, countries are grouped according to need for expansion of primary teacher stock by 2015. The highest expected need for teachers is found in Mozambique.

Bigger problem...

- Measures only reflect degrees earned, not knowledge of content or pedagogy
- Research in high income countries suggest a weak relationship, if any, between level of educational attainment of teachers and their students’ learning
What types of comparisons about teacher training are policymakers most interested in and what types of measures would be most appropriate for comparing across countries?
Professional preparation of teachers is seen in terms of life-long learning.

- Pre-service training,
- Induction support,
- In-service or continuing professional development

are seen as part of a continuum (Feiman-Nemser, 2001)

...makes sense from a human capital point of view. Learning of teachers does not stop at the end of pre-service training.
Preservice training

- No single organizational structure that is considered most effective, given its cost
- Key aspects of pre-service teacher education include:
  - entry requirements (e.g., ISCED 2 or 3?) & level of content knowledge expected on entry
  - duration of program (3 months to 5 or more years) & what proportion is school based?
  - to what degree do participants get a chance to do “practice teaching”, when does it occur, and how long is it?
  - timing within a teachers career (some courses “sandwich” content and pedagogical training in between experiences teaching in classrooms)
  - balance between developing subject-specific content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, and professional studies
  - what is the typical/required education level and background of teacher trainers?
  - philosophy of effective instruction, e.g., behaviorist vs. constructivist models

(Lewin, 2004; Schwille and Dembélé, 2007; Stuart and Tato, 2000).
Do we need an international standard classification of teacher training?

• If yes, start with a metadata collection on teacher training programs
  - Comparative framework
    • Expert meeting sponsored by UIS
    • Pilot among countries participating in the World Education Indicators (WEI Project)
      - Argentina, Brazil, China, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Jordan, Malaysia, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Tunisia, Uruguay and Zimbabwe.
  - Decide on essential characteristics of programs
    • Allow for the collection of data on student flows through the system.
    • Relationship to placements and outcomes
What do we know about effective models for induction?

- Prior research conducted in the United States suggests that
  - **Mentorship** by a teacher in the same field
  - **Collaboration** with other teachers on instructional issues
  - Positive **administrative** support
  
  have a positive impact on commitment and retention among new teachers
Induction programs in other countries, including France, Japan, New Zealand, Switzerland, and China tend to be well funded, incorporated multiple sources of support, typically last two or more years and actively support learning about teaching (Britton et al, 2003).
What would we want to know about induction programs cross nationally?

• What are the goals and rationale for induction programs?
• Who is eligible to participate?
• How long are the programs?
• Who is involved, what types of support are provided?
• How do the programs balance assistance in teaching and assessment of teaching?
• What are the costs and how are they funded?
• What types of evaluation is done to monitor the effectiveness of induction programs?
What is the correct unit of analysis?

- Induction program
  - country, region, LEA
- School?
- Individual teacher?

- Depends on the goal
  - Alternative models or monitoring?
  - Designed vs. enacted
What do we know about effective models for continuing professional development?

• Research on the effects of professional development on student achievement is limited

  - US—Student achievement gains in math if CPD is on content specific pedagogy (Cohen and Hill 1997; Wiley and Yoon 1995)

  - Israel--CPD less expensive strategy for raising test scores than reducing class size or adding school hours (Angrist and Lavy 2001).
Survey data available on participation rates

Percentage of 6th grade students whose reading teachers participated in different numbers of days of in-service courses in the prior 3 years

Source: Southern and Eastern Africa Consortium for Monitoring Educational Quality (SACMEQ), 2000-2002
But research suggests that most PD is of low quality

Percentage of 6th grade students whose reading teachers rated their in-service training as effective

Source: Southern and Eastern Africa Consortium for Monitoring Educational Quality (SACMEQ), 2000-2002
More difficult to conceptualize professional development from a “national” perspective

• Likely to be locally developed and administered, rather than administered by national authorities
• This would imply that data collection would need to occur at the regional, school, or teacher level.
Some programmatic questions that might be worth exploring include:

• What are the goals and rationale for professional development programs?
• What are the incentives for teachers to participate?
• How is it organized and provided?
• Who is involved, what types of support are provided?
• To what extent does the content of CPD focus on subject-area content and the teaching of that content?
• What are the costs and how are they funded?
• What types of evaluation is done to monitor the effectiveness of professional development programs?
And what might we want to know at the teacher level?

• Participation rates in continuing professional development of different lengths
• Participation rates in different types of CPD, including
  - Content focused
  - Based on the curriculum teachers are implementing in the classroom
  - Analysis of student work
  - Observation and feedback of teachers teaching
• Perceptions of alignment of CPD with the teachers’ learning goals, the curriculum, and any external assessments
Other measures of teacher quality

• Teachers’ academic skills
• Content knowledge
• Pedagogical content knowledge
• Experience teaching
• But,
current research suggests that these measures explain a relatively small proportion of the variation in student achievement that is associated with the assignment of a student to a particular teacher.
What do we want to know about the teacher professional continuum?

• Benchmarking standards
  - What proportion of teachers meet national standards and what are those standards?

• Visible measures of teacher quality
  - Variability across schools by student SES, urban/rural, high/low performing

• Natural experiments
  - Alternate designs for preservice, induction, and professional development
When teachers are assessed as part of assessments of students

Average mathematics achievement of 6th grade students and their math teachers

The top of the bars represent the average scores of teachers (yellow) and students (orange); the lines bisecting the top of the bars show the range within which 95% of students’ and their teachers, respectively, in each country scored (+/- 1.96 * SD). Teachers were not assessed in Mauritius or South Africa. Source: Southern and Eastern Africa Consortium for Monitoring Educational Quality (SACMEQ), 2000-2002
Pedagogical content knowledge

Learning Mathematics for Teaching

• Measures mathematical knowledge as it is used within particular tasks of teaching that reflect teachers' facility with numbers, patterns, operations, functions, algebra content, and geometry

• Current measures consist of multiple-choice prompts, achieve reliability of .70 or above, and can be used as a pre-/post-test to assess teachers' knowledge growth (Hill, Schilling, & Ball, 2004).
2. Imagine that you are working with your class on multiplying large numbers. Among your students’ papers, you notice that some have displayed their work in the following ways:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student A</th>
<th>Student B</th>
<th>Student C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35 \times 25 = 875</td>
<td>35 \times 25 = 875</td>
<td>35 \times 25 = 875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125 + 75 = 200</td>
<td>175 + 700 = 875</td>
<td>25 + 600 = 875</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which of these students would you judge to be using a method that could be used to multiply any two whole numbers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Method would work for all whole numbers</th>
<th>Method would NOT work for all whole numbers</th>
<th>I’m not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Method A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Method B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Method C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Mr. Garrett’s students were working on strategies for finding the answers to multiplication problems. Which of the following strategies would you expect to see some elementary school students using to find the answer to $8 \times 8$? (Mark YES, NO, or I’M NOT SURE for each strategy.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>I’m not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) They might multiply $8 \times 4 = 32$ and then double that by doing $32 \times 2 = 64$.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) They might multiply $10 \times 10 = 100$ and then subtract 36 to get 64.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) They might multiply $8 \times 10 = 80$ and then subtract $8 \times 2$ from 80: $80 - 16 = 64$.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) They might multiply $8 \times 5 = 40$ and then count up by 8’s: 48, 56, 64.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other measures of teacher quality

- Teachers’ academic skills
- Level of content knowledge (degree match or assessment)
- Pedagogical content knowledge
- Years of experience teaching (age)
- But these measures tend not be maintained by national education authorities.
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Other measures of teacher quality

- Teachers’ academic skills
- Level of content knowledge (degree match or assessment)
- Pedagogical content knowledge
- Years of experience teaching (age)
- But these measures tend not be maintained by national education authorities.
Even with good measures of

- Teachers’ academic skills
- Content knowledge
- Pedagogical content knowledge
- Experience teaching
- as well as other “visible signs” of teacher quality,

current research suggests that these measures explain a relatively small proportion of the variation in student achievement that is associated with the assignment of a student to a particular teacher.
What do we want to know about the teacher professional continuum?

• Benchmarking standards
  - How strongly are the indicators linked to student outcomes?

• Variability across schools by student SES, urban/rural, high/low performing

• Alternate designs for preservice, induction, and professional development
Comparing induction programs in Europe: The Estonian case

Eve Eisenschmidt PhD
Tallinn University, Estonia

eve@hk.tlu.ee
Paris, 13th November 2008
Induction- support for beginning teacher

The issue of induction and support for new teachers is of particular concern at a time when several countries have a lack of teachers and large numbers of young teachers who leave the profession after only a few years.
The European Commission Communication
*Improving the Quality of Teacher Education* (2007)

- set out the challenges for teacher education in Europe, summarising the changing demands on teachers and stressing the importance of co-ordination between initial and continuing teacher education.
(Ministers of Education 2007):

• to make teaching a more attractive career choice,
• to improve the quality of teacher education and
• to provide initial education, early career support (induction) and further professional development that is coordinated, coherent, adequately resourced and quality assured.
Ministers of Education (2007):

... to ensure that teachers:

• have access to effective early career support programmes at the start of their career;

• have access to adequate mentoring support throughout their careers;

• are encouraged and supported throughout their careers to review their learning needs and to acquire new knowledge, skills and competence.
European Parliament (2008):

• “particular attention to be paid to new teachers’ initial induction;
• encourages development of support networks and mentoring programmes,
• teachers of proven experience and capacity can play a key role in new colleagues' training, promoting team-learning and helping to tackle drop-out rates among new recruits…”
The induction phase begins after graduation from teacher education and covers the first steps of a teacher’s teaching career. This phase lasts from one to three years. An induction programme is the support that is given to newly qualified teachers in the first steps of their teaching career.
The need for induction

- Support for teachers at a crucial stage of their career
- To support socialisation in the profession
- Support the learning of teachers which is fundamentally different from their learning and their concerns during initial teacher education

From PLA, Tallinn 30th Oct 2008
Reasons for implementing induction year: from theoretical perspective

(Villegas-Reimers 2002)

- Teacher education is based on a constructivist approach where the teacher is a reflective practitioner and active learner who plans her/his professional development.

- Teacher education is a long-term and life-long process where the teacher evaluates his/her previous knowledge in practical situations, this way constructing new knowledge.

- The development of a teacher takes place in a particular context, most effectively at school, and is connected to the teacher’s daily activities.
Reasons for implementing induction: from theoretical perspective (Villegas-Reimers 2002)

- A teacher’s professional growth is an integral component of school culture and related to school development.

- Professional development is a collaborative process; schools are becoming professional learning communities.

- Professional development is multidimensional and personal and depends on a context. School culture, social, economical and political contexts influence teacher’s effectiveness and his/her motivation to work and study.
Essential elements of an induction programme

- Mentoring system
  - Individual
  - Group mentoring
    Using portfolio & feedback, observations, co-teaching, diaries, …

- Expert system
  - Seminars, courses, supportive materials, …

- Peer system
  - peer-support
  - peer-networking (and infrastructure)

- Self-reflection system

From PLA, Tallinn 30th Oct 2008
Conditions for success

- Induction as a part of continuum
- Adequate resources and recognition
- Clear roles and responsibilities
  - Beginning teacher
  - Mentor
  - School leader
  - Teacher education staff
  - Ministry and/or local authority
  - Unions/professional bodies/steering boards
- Close co-operation (based on mutual trust)
- Supportive learning environment in school
- Quality of actors: mentor, school leader, teacher educator

From PLA, Tallinn 30\textsuperscript{th} Oct 2008
The first experiences of implementation have provided the following suggestions:

- Initial teacher training should put more emphasis on and create preconditions for the development of a future teacher's professional identity (including professional self-conception).

- Mentor training should pay more attention to the mentors’ skills and readiness to support the professional growth of the novice teacher through the process of feedback and reflection.
The first experiences...

- More and more significance lies in organisational learning and learning communities as setting for fostering teacher’s professional development.

- The question of changes in implementation of the induction programme is complex. The changes on the level of understanding are more easily achieved in schools which have the characteristics of a learning organisation.
Beginning teacher’s voice:

A good thing is that the beginning is over, it will never come back!

Mentor gave me advice, opened my eyes. But the main process was, of course, in my hands.
Comparing European Teacher Education Structures according to the Bologna process

Dr Apostolis Dimitropoulos
The ENTEP Network
The Bologna process: main goals by 2010

- improve quality of European higher education systems
- construct a European Higher Education Area
- increase international competitiveness of European HE system
- make higher education degree structures more comparable and readable with the introduction of a two-cycle system with a first cycle of at least 3 years
- facilitate mobility and recognition of qualifications in the EU
The Bologna process: main goals by 2010

The goals have expanded…..

- Introduction of the ECTS (credit transfer & accumulation device)
- Quality assurance
- Lifelong learning
- The third cycle-doctoral training
- Learning outcomes
- A European Qualifications Framework
The Bologna process:
main characteristics

• **Intergovernmental** - NOT a European process
• Implementation at national level
• An **holistic approach** - NOT a sectoral subject-by-subject approach
• **No particular reference to teacher education structures**
• No reference to teacher education of different levels (**pre-primary/ primary/secondary**)
• Large **variation** in initial teacher education structures in the EU countries
The Bologna process and Teacher Education structures: 10 years on

The ENTEP survey: Main questions

• Have teacher education structures become more comparable and readable?
• Is the Bologna process a success story for initial teacher education structures?
• What trends are identified in TE structures in the EU?
The Bologna process and Teacher Education structures: 10 years on

- A focus on initial teacher education structures
- The introduction of the ECTS
- The 3 levels of teachers
  - the pre-primary
  - the primary
  - the subject school teacher
The Bologna process and teacher education in Europe: 10 years on

Findings of the ENTEP survey of 18 EU countries:
Available at:
http://entep.bildung.hessen.de/papers.php
The Pre-Primary School Teacher Education

Key findings

• Over half of the countries have introduced reforms after 1999

• In most cases reforms were connected to the implementation of the Bologna process

• In over 2/3 of the countries a HE level degree is required. Mostly this is a BA. A few countries introduce an MA

• In over 2/3 countries no alternative pathways to pre-primary teacher status
The Pre-Primary School Teacher Education

Key findings

• About ¾ countries apply the concurrent model. A few countries both models or combine with consecutive models
• Duration ranges from 3 to 4 years of study
• In over half countries education at university type of institutions
• Only a few countries have implemented the ECTS
The Primary School Teacher Education

Key findings

• Almost all countries introduced reforms after 1999
• In most cases reforms were connected to the implementation of the Bologna process
• All countries require a HE degree. In most cases this is a BA. The MA is rather rare as a requirement
• Alternative pathways are rare (mainly for holders of other HE degrees)
The Primary School Teacher Education

Key findings

• Most countries apply the concurrent model. A few offer both or combine with consecutive models
• Duration ranges from 3 to 5 years of study
• In over ¾ countries education in universities. A few countries in non-university HE institutions
• About half of the countries have introduced the ECTS. In many cases implementation of the ECTS is unclear
The Subject School Teacher Education

Key findings

• Most countries introduced reforms after 1999
• Reforms were connected to the implementation of the Bologna process
• All countries require a HE degree. In most cases this is a BA. A few countries introduce the MA
• A few countries offer alternative pathways
The Subject School Teacher Education

Key findings

• In most cases education in universities. A few countries in non-university HE institutions.
• Most countries apply consecutive models. A few the concurrent or both, if for different subjects
• Duration ranges from 4 to 6.5 years of study
• Most countries have introduced the ECTS. In many cases implementation of the ECTS is unclear
Trends identified in initial Teacher Education in Europe

- A clear and longer-term trend for countries to move initial education of pre-primary, primary and subject school teachers into universities
- A clear trend to increase years of study to qualify as a teacher
- A somewhat weaker trend to introduce an MA level degree as requirement to qualify as a teacher in Europe
Conclusions

• TE structures have changed and continue to change in the EU
• The Bologna process appears to have triggered reforms in TE structures in the EU countries and has facilitated these reform processes
• The Bologna process also appears to have facilitated the implementation of longer term trends in TE (university level subject & increased length), in some countries
• Professionalisation of TE is enhanced in Europe
• Comparability and readability of TE qualifications is questionable!!!
The Bologna process beyond 2010: Issues for a shared reflection

- Is a sectoral, instead of a holistic, approach in the Bologna process needed?
- Would a special reference to TE in the Bologna process be helpful in increasing Europe-wide awareness?
- Would more and better information availability on TE structures and reforms be of help?
- Would such information, accessible by all actors involved in the design of TE programmes (policy-makers/HEIs) facilitate the exchange of best practices in TE policy and enhance comparability and readability of TE structures?
Thank you!
Atelier 1: International comparison of compulsory education
Session 3: Comparaisons internationales dans le domaine de l'équité

- European Commission's work on equity: a comparative vision / presentation_maria_Hrabinska
- Questions of Equity in the USA / presentation_susan_Sclafani
- The Question of Equity in the German Educational System / presentation_hans-peter_Fuesel
- Efficiency and equity in European Education and training systems / presentation_marc_Demeuse
European Commission’s work on equity:  
a comparative vision

Maria Hrabinska  
Paris, 13 – 14 November 2008
Policy context of monitoring of equity in E&T

► 2000 - Lisbon European Council – more and better jobs, competitiveness but also social cohesion

► 2006 - European Spring Council: High quality education and training systems that are both, efficient and equitable
- Communication of the Commission on efficiency and equity in European E&T systems

► 2007 - Report on progress towards Lisbon objectives in education and training (2007 Progress report) with focus on equity

► 2008 - Renewed Social Agenda: Green paper on education and migration
Monitoring and Analysing Progress

FIVE EUROPEAN BENCHMARKS FOR 2010

10% Early school leavers (young people)
20% Less low performers in reading literacy
15% More new Math, Science and Technology graduates
85% Upper secondary graduates (young people)
12.5% Lifelong learning participation (adults)

SIXTEEN CORE INDICATORS

1. Participation in pre-school education
2. Special needs education
3. Early school leavers
4. Literacy in reading, maths and science
5. Language skills
6. ICT skills
7. Civic skills
8. Learning to learn skills
9. Upper secondary completion rates of young people
10. Professional development of teachers
11. Higher education graduates
12. Cross-national mobility of students
13. Participation of adults in lifelong learning
14. Adults’ skills
15. Educational attainment of the population
16. Investment in education and training
2008 Progress report

- Making lifelong learning a reality
- Developing school education
- Developing vocational education and training
- Developing higher education
- Key competences for lifelong learning
- Improving equity in education and training
- Employability
- Investment in education and training
Main messages of the 2008 report

EDUCATION AND TRAINING IN THE EU IS IMPROVING SLOWLY BUT STEADILY.

PARTICIPATION IN LIFELONG LEARNING IS BECOMING A REALITY IN SOME COUNTRIES.

THERE ARE STILL IMPORTANT INEQUITIES IN EDUCATIONAL SYSTEMS IN EUROPE.
Commission’s approach to equity

► Equitable systems ensure that the outcomes of E&T are independent of socio-economic background and other factors that lead to educational disadvantage and that treatment reflects individuals’ specific learning needs.

(Communication on efficiency and equity, 2006)

► Equity is viewed as the extent to which individuals can take advantage of E&T in terms of opportunities and access, treatment and outcomes

(2007 Progress report)

► A holistic and integrated approach to equity issues

(outcome of peer learning)
EU benchmarks as a powerful instrument

- Open method of coordination
- National priorities corresponding to the agreed EU targets (national benchmarks)
- Equity dimension in all five benchmarks:
  - Early school leavers
  - Low achievers in Reading
  - Completion of upper secondary education
  - Participation in LLL
  - MST graduates (female)
Early school leavers
(by gender, by highest educational level achieved, by migrant background, by employment, participation in LLL, drop-outs in VET in Norway, status drop-outs in the USA)

Special needs education
(pupils recognized as SEN, pupils with SEN in segregated educational settings, education of pupils with SEN depending on type of difficulty)

Gender issue in E&T

Children at risk and intergenerational transmission of disadvantages (children by educational level of parents, by migrant background, probability of attaining higher education)
1. Early school leavers
   - progress, but very slow

Source: LFS, 2007
Some findings on early school leavers

- ESL do not represent a homogenous group, there are also positive leavers (mainly under those who leave the school in higher grades).

- Unemployment rate of ESL is in majority of countries higher. More employment opportunities for low skilled seems to have negative impact on the rate of ESL.

- In general, ESL tend to have lower earnings

- The chance that ESL will participate in formal education after to be 30 years old is very low

- Early school leaving is a more common phenomena among non-nationals than among nationals.

- ESL as adults participate less in LLL
Other factors negatively influencing early school leaving

- repetition of grades
- early selection in various streams of E&T systems

No impact:

- pupil-teacher ratio
- class size
- total public and private expenditure on E&T
2. 1 in 50 students in compulsory education educated in segregated settings

Students with special education needs educated in segregated settings, 1999 and 2008

Source: European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education and Eurydice
Gender differences still play a role

- girls performing less well in Math and Science, boys worse performing in Reading (PISA)
- only about 30% of female MST graduates

Female Math, Science and Technology (MST) graduates, 2000 and 2006

Source: Eurostat (UOE), 2000, 2006
4. Family background of students matters

- Impact of factors such as
  - Parental education
  - Parental occupation
  - Structure of the family

- Even the access to higher education is influenced by socio-economic background of students
The role of parental education

Difference in achievement between students with mothers with upper secondary education and students with mothers with less than upper secondary education

Source: PISA, 2003
In particular foreign background of students matters:

Difference in achievements of native students and students with foreign background and % of students with foreign background

Source: PISA, 2003
Probability of attaining higher education
by educational level of father

Source: EU-SILC, 2005
5. Low skilled participate in LLL 5-times less than high skilled

Source: LFS, 2007
To conclude: Some countries manage it…

Source: LFS, 2007
However, also availability and quality of data matters.

Composite indicator on equity as a solution?
Thank you very much for your attention!

The Progress report (2008) is available on the web.


maria.hrabinska@cedefop.europa.eu
Questions of Equity in the USA

Susan Sclafani
Managing Director, Chartwell Education Group
Former US Assistant Secretary for Education
Challenges

- Accountability for ALL Students
- Student Achievement Data Shows Needs
- Poor Public Reporting Systems
An Aligned System

- Challenging Standards
- Professional Development for Teachers
- Coherent Instruction Aligned to Standards
- Rigorous Assessments Based on Standards
- Accountability System That Includes All Students
Random Acts of Improvement

School Improvement Plan

Goal

RAI

Processes

Pinellas County Public Schools
Aligned Acts of Improvement
Where We Were, 2001

• 68% of Inner City 4th Graders Reading Below Proficient on National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP)

• NAEP at 4th / 8th /12th Grade in Math
  • 5% of African-American students at or above Proficient
  • 12th grade minority students at same level as 8th grade white students

• PISA 2000:
  • 12% at Level 5
  • 12% at Level 1
  • 6% below Level 1
Teacher Quality Issues in 2001

- Teachers Without Major/minor in Subject Taught
  - 51.5% MS Math, 40% MS Science

- National Teacher Exams
  - Exams in subject areas required in only 29 States
  - 15 states set passing rates below 25%ile in reading and math

- 45 States Offer Alternative Certification
Impact of Social Background

- Achievement Gap Based on Social Background in the United States Is Among the Largest in OECD
- 90-point Score Difference Between Students in the Top Quarter and Students in the Bottom Quarter Based on the International Socioeconomic Index
- Only a Few Countries Have Larger Gaps
NAEP Reading Scores and Education Funding

USA outspends most OECD countries
Goal of No Child Left Behind

ALL Students Proficient by 2014
Four Pillars of *No Child Left Behind*

- Accountability
- Local Control and Flexibility
- Parental Choice
- Doing What Works
Focus on What Matters – Student Achievement

- Challenging Academic Content Standards and Academic Achievement Standards
  - Mathematics and reading/language arts in 2002
  - Science added in 2005-06
- Same Expectations for All Children
- Assessment Results and State Progress Objectives Disaggregated by Poverty, Race, Ethnicity, Disability, and English Proficiency
Adequate Yearly Progress

- Set by Each State to Reach 2014 Proficiency
- Same for All Schools and Leas in the State
- Applied to All Students and Each Subgroup
- Set Separately for Reading/language Arts and Math
- Based Primarily on State Assessments
- Includes Graduation Rate for High Schools and 1 Other Indicator for Elementary Schools
- For Each Subgroup, at Least 95% of Students Enrolled Must Be Assessed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Rdg</th>
<th>Math</th>
<th>Grad</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eco. Disadv.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St w</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Reporting

- Student Academic Achievement Disaggregated by Subgroups
- Comparison of Students at Basic, Proficient, and Advanced Levels of Achievement
- Graduation Rates
- Professional Qualifications of Teachers
- Percentages of Students Not Tested
- Whether Schools Has Been Identified As "in Need of Improvement"
Highly Qualified Teachers

- All New Teachers of Core Subjects Must Have Bachelor’s Degree

- New Elementary Teachers Must
  - Demonstrate Competence on Subject Matter Tests in Core Areas
  - Hold Full State Certification (Includes Alternative Certification)
  - Meet State Licensure Requirements

- Current Teachers Must Demonstrate Subject Area Competence
Highly Qualified Teachers

- New Secondary Teachers Must
  - Demonstrate competence on subject matter test in core area to be taught or academic major, graduate degree or coursework equivalent
  - Hold full state certification (includes alternative certification)
  - Meet state licensure requirements

- Current Teachers Must Demonstrate Subject Area Competence or Major/Equivalent
Local Control/Flexibility

- 15,000 School Districts in 50 States
- Shift Policy and Practice From Focus on Inputs to Focus on Learning Outcomes
- Devolve Decision-making and Resource Allocation to States, Districts and Schools
- Hold Schools/Districts Accountable for All Students Performing at Proficient Level
Greater Parental Choice

- Choice of Schools
- Supplemental Tutoring Services
- Parent Engagement
  - How parents communicate with their children and what effect this has on student performance
  - High parent engagement can overcome differences in parental occupation
Help Schools Do What Works

- Research-based Instruction
  - Doing research into teaching practices shown to be effective in improving student performance: reading, math, and science
  - Disseminating information about those practices, so that they can become widespread
- What Works Clearinghouse Established
- PISA Surveys Provide Insights
States Responded to *NCLB*

- Accountability Plans Submitted on Time by All States
- All Plans Approved by 6/10/2002
- First “Schools in Need of Improvement” Identified Summer 2002
- Choice and Supplemental Services in Place for Fall 2002
## Where We Are Now: 4th Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% 4th Graders Basic or above Reading</th>
<th>% 4th Graders Proficient or above Reading</th>
<th>% 4th Graders Basic or above Math</th>
<th>% 4th Graders Proficient or above Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All</strong></td>
<td>59/66</td>
<td>29/32</td>
<td>65/82</td>
<td>24/39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White</strong></td>
<td>70/77</td>
<td>38/42</td>
<td>78/91</td>
<td>31/51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black</strong></td>
<td>35/46</td>
<td>10/14</td>
<td>36/64</td>
<td>5/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hispanic</strong></td>
<td>37/49</td>
<td>13/15</td>
<td>42/70</td>
<td>7/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Income</strong></td>
<td>38/50</td>
<td>13/17</td>
<td>43/70</td>
<td>8/22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Where We Are Now: 8th Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% 8th Graders Basic or above Reading</th>
<th>% 8th Graders Proficient or above Reading</th>
<th>% 8th Graders Basic or above Math</th>
<th>% 8th Graders Proficient or above Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All</strong></td>
<td>75/73</td>
<td>33/29</td>
<td>63/71</td>
<td>26/32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White</strong></td>
<td>84/84</td>
<td>41/40</td>
<td>76/82</td>
<td>34/42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black</strong></td>
<td>55/55</td>
<td>13/13</td>
<td>31/47</td>
<td>5/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hispanic</strong></td>
<td>57/58</td>
<td>15/15</td>
<td>41/55</td>
<td>8/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Income</strong></td>
<td>60/58</td>
<td>17/15</td>
<td>41/55</td>
<td>9/15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Federal/State Responses to AYP

★ **Federal Rule Changes**
  ★ Higher exemption rate for SWD
  ★ ELLs able to test in 1st language
  ★ 95% tested flexibility

★ **State Plan Changes**
  ★ Larger minimum group sizes
  ★ Slower path to 100% proficient
  ★ Growth models vs Snapshot

★ **State Assessment Changes**
  ★ Lower test cut scores
States’ Reactions to NCLB

★ Schools in Need of Improvement
  ★ Little help available from state
  ★ Districts overwhelmed by number

★ Schools in Restructuring
  ★ Districts allow easiest options
  ★ Schools allowed to remain for years

★ Attention Focused on Reading/Math
  ★ Arts education and science ignored

★ Fewer Programs for Gifted Students
**NCLB Lessons Learned**

- Need for National/External Standards and Assessments in All Subjects
- Build State Department Capacity
  - Federal grants to train staff
  - Requirements for adequate staff
- Build Local District Capacity
  - Training in meeting individual needs
  - Programs for gifted students as well
- Require States to Fund Adequately
International Comparison of Education Systems: A European Model?

Conference of Nice
- French Presidency of the European Union -
13 - 14 November 2008

The Question of Equity in the German Educational System

Prof. Dr. Hans-Peter Füssel
German Institute for International Pedagogical Research Berlin
Linkage of Social Background and PISA Reading Achievement between 2000 and 2006 by country - Inclination of the pertinent Social Gradient:

For all those OECD countries where significant data exist for both assessments

Source: PISA Consortium Germany, PISA 2006, p.323
Competence Deficits of 15-year-old Students with Migration Background (1st Generation, 2nd Generation and Youths with one Parent who has immigrated) as compared to Peers whose Parents where born in Germany:

Relative Chance of Foreign Youths as compared to German Youths of acquiring a Higher Education Entrance Qualification prior to the age of 21:

Source: Federal Statistical Office and statistical offices of the Länder, Microcensus Scientific Use File 2004, own calculations
Thank you!

Prof. Dr. Hans-Peter Füssel  
German Institute for International Pedagogical Research  
Warschauer Strasse 36  
D- 10243 Berlin  
- Germany - 

fuessel@dipf.de
Efficiency and equity in European education and training systems. What we know about equity in Europe?

Pr. Marc Demeuse
Institut d’Administration scolaire
Université de Mons-Hainaut
Académie universitaire Wallonie-Bruxelles
marc.demeuse@umh.ac.be
http://www.umh.ac.be/inas
The context...

- In fact, « by law », very few EC in the field of education except concerning 3 main objectives: *improvement of quality, cooperation and mobility*
- 2000: European report on the quality of school education (Sixteen quality indicators)
- 2006: *Efficiency and equity in European education and training systems* (EC)
Original references…


Commission of the European Communities (2004 et sq.), Commission staff working paper, *Progress towards the Common Objectives in Education and Training. Indicators and Benchmarks*, Bruxelles, CEC

MEMO/06/321: Frequently Asked Questions: Are European education & training systems equitable and efficient?

No « natural » trade off between equity and effectiveness

- Effective AND Fair: Finland
- Effective BUT NOT Fair: Flemish Community (BE)
- NOT Effective BUT Fair: Espagne
- NOT Effective AND NOT Fair: French speaking Community (BE)

Global positive link between the both dimensions: Effective ↑ AND Fair ↑
Relation between systemic structures and segregation
Equity and effectiveness / efficiency
What is it about? (1)

EFFECTIVENESS

- Effectiveness: *Quality of being able to bring out an intended results*
- Efficiency: *The ratio of the output to the input of any system*

- Average results (utility) or results for each individuals

- Normative approach (relative)
- Criterion-referenced approach (absolute)
Efficiency: EC definition

- **Efficiency** involves the relationship between inputs and outputs in a process. **Systems are efficient if the inputs produce the maximum output.** Relative efficiency within education systems is usually measured through test and examination results [internal efficiency], while their efficiency in relation to wider society and the economy is measured through private and social rates of return [external efficiency].

Equality or Equity?
What is it about? (2)

EQUALITY: of WHAT?
EQUITY: effective OR statistical (virtual)?

Five principles of justice
1. No interest in equity:
   « natural » or « libertarian » positions
   Maximisation of individual potential, freedom…

2. Equality of access or opportunity
3. Equality of treatment
4. Equality of achievement or academic success
5. Equality of actualization (social output)

BUT « natural » and imprescriptible rights of man
Three kinds of inequalities

- Inequalities among individuals
- Inequalities between groups or categories
- Individuals or groups below the threshold
Which groups are important?

- Those you can’t escape: parental characteristics and socio-economical status, gender, national origin…

- But: very difficult to distinguish (strong correlations and common causation « out of the model »)
Equity: EC definition

- **Equity** is viewed as the extent to which individuals can take advantage of education and training, in terms of opportunities, access, treatment and outcomes.

- Equitable systems ensure that the outcomes of education and training are independent of socio-economic background and other factors that lead to educational disadvantage and that treatment reflects individuals’ specific learning needs. Inequity in relation to gender, ethnic minority status, disability and regional disparities etc. is not the prime focus here, but is relevant as far as it contributes to overall socio-economic disadvantage.

To open the discussion about the EC communication…
Recommendations?

- The examination of the **effectiveness** of European educational systems should be accompanied by an examination of their **efficiency**. The examination of effectiveness should include the evaluation of objectives defined within the context of the Lisbon programme and should be more **criteria-based** (linked to specific objectives in terms of well-being or actual options to continue training throughout life) than **normative** (in terms of comparison or percentages).

- There should be a clarification of terminology, both for **effectiveness / efficiency** and for **equity**.

- The examination of the equity of European educational systems should include the notion of a **threshold**, present in the Lisbon objectives, extended to other areas. Individual characteristics from which an individual cannot escape, such as sex or national origin, should be included in the examination of equity.
Recommendations?

- *The data on which the communication is based* (Cunha, Heckman, Lochner and Masterov, 2005) *does not offer sufficiently robust elements*, in particular in the European context, to indicate with certainty, as the Commission appears to believe, that financial effort must be concentrated in pre-school education. More research on pre-school education is necessary on an EU level.

  !!! No evidence based policy !!!

- The recommendation to concentrate the available means on disadvantaged pupils seems better supported (by evidence), but programmes still need to be put in place which avoid *negative labelling effects* for selected children or their separation from other pupils, which further reinforces the *effects of segregation* (and *segregation effects*).
Les politiques d’éducation prioritaire en Europe
Conceptions, mises en œuvre, débats

sous la direction de
Marc Demeuse, Daniél Frangi
David Greger et Jean-Yves Rochex
Recommendations?

- From the pre-school level, social diversity of classes and schools must be ensured in order to avoid a differentiation of curricula and expectations.

- Analysing education systems and the impact of one or other form of organisation is a difficult job that requires access to and processing of huge amounts of data. Most often, there is not one isolated parameter, but a set of parameters that must be identified. To obtain a result, it is therefore generally necessary to work on several dimensions at once, otherwise the system runs a severe risk of adapting to the new situation with no notable improvement (e.g. prohibiting grade retention can accentuate selectivity in the most prestigious subjects or an increase of interest in “special education”).
Recommendations?

- Factors affecting teaching efficiency, apart from those linked to school structures, are even less well understood and research focusing on classroom practices by means of direct observation should be supported and encouraged.

- The equity objectives must also be used to limit discrepancies between the weakest and the strongest in order to allow all pupils, including the weakest, to master basic skills considered essential to lead a worthwhile and active life as a citizen and not merely as a worker.

- With regard to compulsory education, the equality of results is therefore the aim, not merely equalisation of opportunities for children in the school system. Contrary to the implications of the Commission’s Communication, it is therefore not sufficient to invest in the early years (pre-school) in order to place all young people on the same starting line and give them equal chances.19
Recommendations?

- The different levels of support from which each pupil may benefit at home, throughout his/her school career, and the sometimes very unequal nature of the education provided, during compulsory schooling, are clear evidence of the need to monitor all school careers, particularly at moments of choice or orientation, so that these do not become mechanisms of selection.

- As for pre-school education, the Commission’s analysis seems generally acceptable with regard to the “diagnosis” element. Higher education, with its growth should benefit from greater financing than it currently receives. However, the favoured solution does not seem to present guarantees of success that one would expect from an in-depth reform of financing.
Recommendations?

- The central idea, to increase private financial participation (owing to, as mentioned right at the beginning of the Communication, a context of restriction of public spending), does not seem to offer any guarantee of equality of access for a certain number of reasons that the Commission itself mentions. One can therefore only raise questions at this part of the Communication and hope for a more solid document.
Recommendations?

- **Both public and private partners should cooperate to define needs, develop and finance programmes, while preserving the final decisions on programme content and access for the public authorities.** This will avoid the emergence of “ad hoc” training, exclusively reflecting the short-term needs of companies. The speed of change in the labour market requires training to equip people with general and adaptable competences, allowing them to benefit from lifelong learning.

- To avoid the redundancy or under-valuing of competences acquired during working life, the recognition of experience gained on-the-job should also be improved. This is not to promote competition with qualifications earned through formal (usually initial) training, but to allow people to benefit from their real experiences in both working and non-working life.
Recommendations?

- Public investment should focus on the most disadvantaged target groups, as they are the ones who benefit least from continuing training, either because they lack the basic competences required to exploit the opportunities, or because they are unable to access training during their working life, being outside the world of work or confined to low-skill activity areas.
To go further…


  [http://www.wwwords.co.uk/pfie/content/pdfs/6/issue6_6.asp](http://www.wwwords.co.uk/pfie/content/pdfs/6/issue6_6.asp)

Glossary

- **Criterion-Referenced Approach.** A criterion-referenced approach in assessment is used to estimate how much of the content and skills covered have been acquired by the individuals assessed. Performance is judged against a set of criteria rather than in comparison to other individuals tested, as with norm-referenced tests.

- **Norm-Referenced Approach.** A norm-referenced approach in assessment is used to estimate how the individuals being assessed compare to other individuals in terms of performance on the test. Individual performance is judged in comparison to other individuals tested, rather than against a set of criteria, as with criterion-referenced tests.

• What we know and what we must know about (in)equity in Education presentation_louis-andre_Vallet
• Time trends in Value added performance in England : implications for Equity presentation_sally_Thomas
• Cross-national approaches to measuring disparities in educational resources and learning outcomes presentation_albert_Motivans
• Les différentes mesures en faveur de l’équité en France presentation_Dominique_Barnichon
WHAT WE KNOW AND WHAT WE MUST KNOW
ABOUT (IN)EQUITY IN EDUCATION:
A SOCIOLOGICAL VIEW BASED ON INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH

Louis-André Vallet (CNRS)
Quantitative Sociology Laboratory
Centre for Research in Economics and Statistics (CREST)
Paris – France
Over the twentieth century, in European and, more generally, Western countries, it is well known that:

- dramatic increases in the supply of formal education have occurred for successive birth cohorts;

- and educational reforms have also been implemented to provide children from all social backgrounds with increased education and to promote equality of educational opportunity.

As a consequence, sociologists have for long tried to assess whether or not educational attainment has gradually become less dependent on ascriptive individual characteristics, especially social origins.

In this talk, I will therefore firstly review

**How Sociologists Have Progressively Changed Their Views About Temporal Trends in Inequality of Educational Opportunity**
1. In the late 1970s and the 1980s, researchers used to analyse inequality of educational attainment with linear regression models of years of education completed on a set of individual characteristics (including birth cohort and social origin).

   They generally observed that the enlarged distribution of schooling in modern societies has resulted in a historical decline in the proportion of variance explained by background variables.

2. Even if the former result is fully valid, sociologists nonetheless became progressively aware of a shortcoming of studies following this methodology. Their results indeed conflate and confound two phenomena:

   - change in the distribution of education that is caused by educational expansion;
   - and change in the allocation of education between children of different social classes.

   Arguably, this is only the second phenomenon that should be taken into account to capture change in inequality of educational opportunity!
Let me clarify this key issue with the example of a fictitious society:
- with only two social classes (so there are children of white-collar origin and children of blue-collar origin);
- and a very simple educational system with only one diploma.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diploma</th>
<th>Passed</th>
<th>Not Passed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Origin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-collar</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue-collar</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>250</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Birth cohort I*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diploma</th>
<th>Passed</th>
<th>Not Passed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Origin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-collar</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue-collar</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>350</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Birth cohort II*
35% of Cohort II passed the diploma as against 25% of Cohort I, so it is clear that educational expansion occurred.

As a consequence, for children of both social origins, the odds of passing rather than not passing the diploma have improved. For instance, for the blue-collar origin, they increased from 0.19 (i.e. 125/675) to 0.33 (i.e. 200/600).

However, between Cohort I and Cohort II, the relative gap between children of white-collar origin and children of blue-collar origin for the odds of passing rather than not passing the diploma has remained totally unchanged because:

\[
\frac{125/75}{125/675} = \frac{150/50}{200/600} = 9
\]

In other words, the intrinsic association between social origin and education (measured with the odds ratio statistic) did not change at all.

So, we may conclude that our fictitious society has experienced educational expansion without any change in inequality of educational opportunity.
3. From the mid-1980s, researchers have therefore examined whether, net of the educational expansion, any historical trend has occurred in the statistical association between social background and educational attainment.

A first comparative study was edited in 1993 by Shavit & Blossfeld (both professors at the European University Institute) with the participation of 13 countries and 25 sociologists (Czechoslovakia, Great Britain, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Poland, Sweden, Switzerland, Taiwan, USA, West Germany).

The book was entitled “Persistent Inequality” because the editors concluded:

“whereas the proportions of all social classes attending all educational levels have increased, the relative advantage associated with privileged origins persists in all but two of the thirteen societies” (p. 22)

Only Sweden and the Netherlands are characterized by some equalization in educational opportunity, but virtual stability prevails in all other countries over much of the twentieth century.

4. However, more recently, **by using considerably larger datasets and more powerful statistical models, researchers have challenged this conclusion.**

First, national studies have added new “exceptions”. For instance, convincing series of empirical studies have demonstrated that France and Germany have also experienced a decline in inequality of educational opportunity.

Second, a paper entitled “Non-Persistent Inequality in Educational Attainment” will soon be published in the *American Journal of Sociology*. It demonstrates downward trend in the eight European countries studied (Britain, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, Poland, Sweden) (Breen, Luijkhx, Müller & Pollak, 2009).

Third, a recent book investigated stratification in access to and completion of tertiary education in 15 countries with the participation of 34 sociologists (Australia, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Great Britain, Israel, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Russia, South Korea, Sweden, Switzerland, Taiwan, USA) (Shavit, Arum & Gamoran, 2007).

It generally concludes that **all social classes have benefited from the expansion of higher education**. Neither greater diversification nor privatisation in higher education has resulted in greater inequality.
WHAT ARE THE MAIN CHARACTERISTICS OF THE DECLINE IN IEO?

For many countries, the decline in inequality essentially appeared in birth cohorts born between the mid-1930s and the end of the 1950s.

Those cohorts got their education at a time of generally improving living conditions. In some countries (notably Sweden), there is also evidence of a positive effect of educational reforms (with the introduction of the comprehensive school).

The decline in inequality corresponds to better school trajectories for, primarily, children from the agricultural class and, secondarily, children from the working class. The decline in inequality has often been more pronounced among women than among men.

In several countries, the decline in inequality in the most basic educational transitions is accompanied by stability or increase in inequality in more advanced transitions. However, the total effect is a positive one because the former transitions are more consequential than the latter.
However, even if “persistent inequality” is falsified, inequality of educational opportunity still exists. Why?

To explain educational inequalities, sociologists distinguish between ‘primary effects’ and ‘secondary effects’ of social origin (Boudon, 1974).

**Primary effects** are those effects that are expressed in the empirically observed association between children’s social origins and their average level of academic ability.

- children of more advantaged backgrounds perform better, on average, than children of less advantaged backgrounds;

- such a difference appears early at school and is cumulative, i.e. the gap tends to increase along the educational career;

- for instance, a recent longitudinal French study demonstrates that only half of the difference measured at the end of elementary school was already present five years before (Caille & Rosenwald, 2006).
At a given level of academic ability, *secondary effects* are those effects that are expressed in the actual choices and decisions that families make in the course of the educational career.

- several factors affect these decisions: the perceived benefit, the perceived cost, and the perceived risk associated with continuing in education;

- and their assessment depends on the family position in the social structure;

- for instance, the so-called theory of ‘Relative Risk Aversion’ has been rather successfully tested; it states that families seek, above all, that their children avoid downward social mobility (more than get upward mobility);

- such a theory helps in explaining why youths with the same ability but different social backgrounds may stop at different stages of the educational system;

- it also suggests that a key aspect to equalize education would be to influence the family assessment of the decision factors (here, the high educational aspirations that immigrant families have for their children are quite suggestive in this respect).
SO, WHAT MUST WE KNOW TO BE BETTER EQUIPPED TO EQUALIZE EDUCATION WITHIN EUROPEAN COUNTRIES?

We certainly need to know more about the relative importance of primary and secondary effects, and there is ongoing research on this issue (EQUALSOC EU noE).

We also need to understand the development of primary and secondary effects over the school careers more thoroughly.

To understand the development of educational inequalities and to become more able to provide evidence-based guidelines in educational policies, educational research needs longitudinal high-quality data that describe, not only achievement and attainment, but also family situation and school context broadly conceived.

Finally, I will argue that the comparative PISA OECD survey would become even more useful than it is today by adopting a longitudinal design, i.e. by assessing the achievement of pupils not only at the age of 15, but also at the age of, say, 10 or 11. By so doing, the PISA survey would become able to rigorously trace change in educational achievement of the same pupils and to properly identify the influence of national institutional arrangements over this development.
Time trends in Value Added performance in England: implications for Equity

French Presidency of the European Union
Nice Conference
13-14 Nov 2008

Dr Sally Thomas

Plan
• Background
• Lancashire LEA Value Added Project – time trends over 14 years
• Summary
Background

- From early 1990’s political attention and market driven reforms have sought to increase the accountability of schools in the UK.

- Since 1992 schools' raw examination performance has been published annually. These league tables have been widely criticised as unfair to schools with disadvantaged intakes.

- Other reforms in the last 15+ years include a new national inspection system (OFSTED), a national curriculum and national testing via standard assessment tasks and examinations.

- In this context school effectiveness and improvement research has been given a far greater emphasis than it enjoyed previously.

- For example, the government has now introduced contextualised value added measures of student progress. Also the idea of intelligent accountability has been introduced via ‘A new Relationship with Schools’ (DFES, 2004) and this has resulted in school self-evaluation becoming a key feature of the national inspection system (Ofsted, 2005).
National Standards for Headteachers (DfES, 2004) provides guidelines on the core purpose of headteachers and states that:

The headteacher, working with others, is responsible for evaluating the school’s performance to identify the priorities for continuous improvement and raising standards;
The Lancashire Value Added Project
-Examining 14 year time trends-

Key Research Questions

1. What are the average trends in pupil performance?

2. Do individual school performance trends differ from the average trends in raw and value added performance?

Additional Research Questions

3. Has variability between schools in terms of raw and value added performance increased or decreased?

4. Has the average gap in attainment between advantaged and disadvantaged pupils - in terms of free school meals a measure of low family income - increased or decreased?
Sample

- Collected from schools in Lancashire Local Education Authority (LEA), one of the largest LEAs in North West England

- Data available for fourteen consecutive cohorts of KS4 (16-year-old) pupils from 1993 to 2006, a total of 214,159 pupils in 138 schools

- Outcome variables: General Certificate of Secondary Education (GCSE) examinations (eg total score, English, mathematics, science) and other qualifications (eg General Vocational Qualifications [GNVQ]) taken by pupils at age 16

- Explanatory variables: prior attainment taken by pupils at age 11 (cognitive abilities test [NFER CAT] with subtest scores in verbal, quantitative and non-verbal aspects) and other pupil background variables such as fsm, age, gender, ethnicity.
Lancashire 1993-2006: Different Outcomes

Year

Total GCSE and Total GCSE/GNVQ/Other Point Scores

English and Maths GCSE Point Scores


© Thomas 2008
Raw Linear Trend Analysis 1993-2006: Total GCSE Score

Note: Model B

© Thomas 2008
Value Added Linear Trend Analysis 1993-2006: Total GCSE Score

Note: Model A

© Thomas 2008
Value Added Non-Linear Trend Analysis 1993-2006: Total GCSE Score

Note: Model C
Changes in School Level Variance over time: Value Added (non-linear model C) and Raw (non-linear model D) outcome scores
Differing views - The Telegraph, 20 August 2008

“At GCSE the gap in achievement between children from poorer and more affluent backgrounds is narrowing and results for children on free school meals are rising faster than the average”

**Lord Adonis, the schools minister**

“…The Government has let down an entire generation of pupils who are not getting anything like the basic set of qualifications they need to continue studying or get the job they want. The problems with educational underachievement are concentrated in the poorest areas of the country.

**Maria Miller, Conservative shadow families minister**
Summary

- The results indicate that on average across all schools there is a clear improvement trend in both value added and raw GCSE results over the fourteen-year period from 1993 to 2006.

- However, the overall linear trend for individual schools typically conceals a considerable amount of year-to-year variation and it appears that continuous improvement is difficult over more than 3 or 4 years.

- Over 14 years less than 15% of schools moved from ‘performing below expectation’ category to ‘performing above expectation’ category in terms of value added results – and no schools did so in terms of raw results.

- Differences between schools (variance) over time suggest that schools are becoming less similar in terms of both value added and raw performance – especially in the last 4 years – for total GCSE and total GCSE/GNVQ/Other.

- The average attainment gap for disadvantaged versus other pupils appears to fairly stable over time in terms of total GCSE score. However this is not the case when vocational qualifications are also included - where the difference appears to be increasing.
Cross-national approaches to measuring disparities in educational resources and learning outcomes

Albert Motivans
UNESCO Institute for Statistics

International comparisons
Paris, France
14 November 2008
Educational inequality: back on the global policy agenda

- Convergence of rights-based and economic arguments for education
- Changing development discourse on inequality
  - Education For All Global Monitoring report
  - World Dev Report, Human Dev Report
  - Other sectors (health equity)
- Changing monitoring frameworks
  - Millennium Development Goals
  - European indicator sets
What can cross-national approaches tell us about education inequality?

Comparisons and benchmarking at the core of distributional issues across and within countries

- Monitoring rights (absolute benchmarks) and progress towards expansion of educational opportunities
- Assessing resource allocation to schools, districts, regions
- Contexts and/or policies help to minimise differences in the impact of socioeconomic status
- Differences in the organisation of schools and classrooms
## UIS perspectives on cross-national measures of education inequalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Sherman, Poirier</th>
<th>Willms</th>
<th>Grisay, Zhang, Postlethwaite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Targets of equity</td>
<td>States/districts</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; or 8&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; grade pupils and SES</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; grade pupils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objects of equity</td>
<td>Access (NER) Resources (PTR, per pupil expenditure)</td>
<td>Reading and mathematics achievement</td>
<td>Classroom resources, Teacher satisfaction, Student motivation, Teaching practices, OTL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countries</td>
<td>16 federal countries</td>
<td>PIRLS, TIMSS, PISA</td>
<td>12 middle-income countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept</td>
<td>Horizontal, EEO</td>
<td>Horizontal, EEO</td>
<td>Horizontal, EEO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_EEO=Equal educational opportunity_
Education frameworks and objects of education inequality

Source: EFA GMR, 2005
What types of policy options help to improve learning outcomes?

- Performance or SES-targeted
- Universal
- Compensatory policies
- Inclusive

Source: Willms, 2006
Between and within-school differences

Lesotho

South Africa

Universal, compensatory policies

Performance-targeted, socio-economically targeted, compensatory, inclusive

Source: Zhang, 2008
Drawing together the perspectives: which way for Europe?

- These approaches present useful perspectives for systematic monitoring of inequality in Europe.
- Value-added provided by wider application across other regions – more robust methodologies.
- More holistic approach which links across different objects of inequality will strengthen explanatory power.
- Better understanding of role of context matters for policy interventions – disadvantaged classrooms change the way teachers organise their classrooms, how they teach and how they view their pupils.
Working papers are available on the UIS website

Educational Equity and Public Policy: Comparing Results from 16 Countries

Learning Divides: Ten Policy Questions about the Performance and Equity of Schools and Schooling Systems

A View Inside Primary Schools
Les différentes mesures en faveur de l’équité en France

Dominique BARNICHON

Conférence de Paris
Vendredi 14 Novembre 2008
1. Équité en France
(problématique française)

Deux principes fondamentaux
1er principe fondamental

Liberté, Egalité, Fraternité …
1er principe fondamental
Liberté, Égalité, Fraternité …
1er principe fondamental

Liberté, Égalité, Fraternité …

• Constitution (1958), article 1er :

  « La France est une république indivisible, laïque, démocratique et sociale. Elle assure l’égalité devant la loi de tous les citoyens sans distinction d’origine, de race ou de religion. »

• Existence d’organismes publics nationaux pour la garantir.
2ème principe fondamental :

Intégration à la française

– ni ethnique,
– ni communautariste,
– ni liée à la religion.

Au-delà de l’immigration, l’intégration inclut toutes les formes de mixité, tous les publics défavorisés et dits « à besoins spécifiques » …
Égalité et ... équité

Déclaration des droits de l’homme de 1789 :
« les hommes naissent et demeurent libres et égaux en droits ... »
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Déclaration des droits de l’homme de 1789 :
« les hommes naissent et demeurent libres et égaux en droits ... »

1) Égalité devant la loi

2) Égalité sociale
Égalité et ... équité

Déclaration des droits de l’homme de 1789 :
« les hommes naissent et demeurent libres et égaux en droits ... »

1) Égalité devant la loi
2) Égalité sociale
3) Égalité des chances

Apparaît alors la notion d’équité ...
« Un système est équitable si les résultats de l’éducation et de la formation sont indépendants du milieu socio-économique et d'autres facteurs conduisant à un handicap éducatif et que le traitement reflète les besoins spécifiques des individus en matière d'apprentissage »

(« Efficacité et équité des systèmes européens d’éducation et de formation », Communication de la Commission au Conseil et au Parlement Européen, doc. 12677/06)
Résumé d’un pilotage simpliste de l’équité

\[\begin{cases} 
& \overline{x} \text{ ne baisse pas} \\
& \sigma \text{ diminue}
\end{cases}\]
Résumé d’un pilotage simpliste de l’équité

\[\begin{align*}
\bar{x} & \text{ ne baisse pas} \\
\sigma & \text{ diminue}
\end{align*}\]

Évolutions du système éducatif et Équité

(rupture des années 60)
Résumé d’un pilotage simpliste de l’équité
\[ \begin{align*} 
\bar{x} & \text{ ne baisse pas} \\
\sigma & \text{ diminue} 
\end{align*} \]

Évolutions du système éducatif *et* Équité
(rupture des années 60)

La loi pour l’égalité des chances (*mars 2006*)
\[ 50 – 80 – 100 \]
Le socle commun ...

*pour la 1ère fois,*

– des compétences fixées par le législateur,

(competences = connaissances + capacités + attitudes)
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Le socle commun …

*pour la 1ère fois,*

– des compétences fixées par le législateur,
  (compétences = connaissances + capacités + attitudes)

– des objectifs énoncés non comme un
  catalogue de disciplines, mais en termes de performances des élèves,

– une obligation de résultats.
Les 7 « piliers » (du socle)

– Maîtrise de la langue française
– Pratique d’une LV étrangère
– Mathématiques et culture scientifique et technologique
– Maîtrise des TIC usuelles
– Culture humaniste
– Compétences sociales et civiques
– Autonomie et esprit d’initiative
Repérage de la réussite
(ou de l’échec) scolaire
Repérage de la réussite (ou de l’échec) scolaire

a) Mesure directe :

• Indicateurs de validation du socle (en cours de déploiement)

• Tests de maîtrise des compétences 2007 (sur échantillon)
Élèves de CM₂

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>français</th>
<th>mathématiques</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ensemble</td>
<td>86,3 %</td>
<td>90,6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>garçons</td>
<td>83,7 %</td>
<td>91,1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>filles</td>
<td>89,0 %</td>
<td>88,1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>« à l'heure »</td>
<td>91,5 %</td>
<td>94,2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>en retard</td>
<td>60,2 %</td>
<td>68,0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16,4 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>français</td>
<td>mathématiques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ensemble</td>
<td>79,9 %</td>
<td>89,4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>garçons</td>
<td>74,5 %</td>
<td>89,4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>filles</td>
<td>85,5 %</td>
<td>89,4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;à l'heure&quot;</td>
<td>90,7 %</td>
<td>96,4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>en retard 33,2%</td>
<td>60,3 %</td>
<td>76,8 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b) Mesure indirecte :
b) **Mesure indirecte** :

- Retards scolaires (15,2 % des élèves des zones défavorisées ont **2 ans** de retard à l’entrée en 6ᵉme),
- Redoublements (jusqu’à 20% chaque année pour les zones très défavorisées en collège),
- Sorties précoces ou sans diplôme,
- Grandes difficultés de lecture (15% en 6ᵉme),
- Démotivation, absentéisme, problèmes de comportement …
2. Quelles mesures en faveur de l’équité ?
2. Quelles mesures en faveur de l’équité ?

a) Étude de la relation
   – moyens
     – contexte
     – résultats
1er exemple

Contexte socio-économique favorable

* Proportion d'entrants en 6ème de condition sociale déf

* Proportion d'entrants en 6ème de c.s. favorisée

* Taux de chômage*

* Taux d'accès au brevet

* Taux d'accès au Bac (total) selon le lieu de résidence

* Résultats évaluations de 6ème en math

* Résultats évaluations de 6ème en français

* Taux de sorties niveau VI et V bis*

* Socle 3ème B2i

* Socle 3ème LV

* Taux de redoublement en 2nde GT*

Taux d'accès au brevet

*Taux de redoublement en 6ème*

*Entrants en 6ème avec au moins 1 an de retard*

*Taux de redoublement en CE1*

*% de boursiers en collège public*

*% de collèges en RAR*

Taxe d'apprentissage par élève (2nd degré)

P/E 1er degré

H/E collège

H/E LEGT

H/E LP

Taux de poursuite dans l'enseignement supérieur

Moyens élèves

Bonne réussite scolaire

France

····· Minimum

····· Maximum

*indicateurs inversés*

X

Minimum

Maximum

Contexte socio-économique favorable

Moyens élèves

Bonne réussite scolaire
**2ème exemple**

Contexte socio-économique favorable

- Proportion d'entrants en 6ème de condition sociale déf
- Proportion d'entrants en 6ème de c.s. favorisée
- Taxe d'apprentissage par élève (2nd degré)
- P/E 1er degré
- H/E collège
- H/E LEGT
- H/E LP
- Taux de poursuite dans l'enseignement supérieur

*Taux de redoublement en CE1*

*% de collèges en RAR*

*% de boursiers en collège public*

*Taux de redoublement en 6ème*

*Taux de redoublement en 2nde GT*

*Taux de sorties niveau VI et V bis*

*Taux de chômage*

*Taux d'accès au brevet*

*Taux d'accès au Bac (total) selon le lieu de résidence*

*Socle 3ème LV*

*Socle 3ème B2i*

*Résultats évaluations de 6ème en français*

*Résultats évaluations de 6ème en math*

*Résultats évaluations de 6ème en français*

Moyens élevés

G France

- - - Minimum
- - - Maximum

*indicateurs inversés*

Bonne réussite scolaire
Contexte socio-économique favorable

- Proportion d'entrants en 6ème de condition sociale déf
- Proportion d'entrants en 6ème de c.s. favorisée
- Taux de chômage
- Taux d'accès au brevet
- Taux d'accès au Bac (total) selon le lieu de résidence
- Taux de redoublement en 2nde GT
- Taux de redoublement en 6ème
- Taux de redoublement en CE1
- % de collèges en RAR
- % de boursiers en collège public

Taux d'accès au 1er degré

Taxe d'apprentissage par élève (2nd degré)

P/E 1er degré
H/E collège
H/E LEGT
H/E LF
Taux de poursuite dans l'enseignement supérieur
Résultats évaluations de 6ème en math
Résultats évaluations de 6ème en français
*Taux de sorties niveau VI et V bis*

Y
France
Minimum
Maximum
*indicatrices inversés*

Bonne réussite scolaire

Moyens élevés
4ème exemple

Contexte socio-économique favorable

*Taux de redoublement en CE1*

*Taux de redoublement en 6ème*

*Taux de redoublement en 2nde GT*

*Taux de poursuite dans l'enseignement supérieur*

Proportion d’entrants en 6ème de condition sociale déf

Proportion d’entrants en 6ème de c.s. favorisée

Taux d'accès au brevet

Taux d'accès au Bac (total) selon le lieu de résidence

Taux d'accès au Bac (total) selon le lieu de résidence

% de collèges en RAR*

% de boursiers en collège public*

% de collégés en RAR*

Taux d'apprentissage par élève (2nd degré)

P/E 1er degré

H/E collège

H/E LEGT

H/E LP

Résultats évaluations de 6ème en français

Résultats évaluations de 6ème en math

Taux de poursuite dans l'enseignement supérieur

Moyens élevés

Bonne réussite scolaire

Contexte socio-économique favorable
Éléments de réponses :

→ faut-il renforcer les moyens ?

→ quelles dotations pour les académies ?
b) Zones d’éducation

- RAR  (réseaux ambition-réussite)
- RRS  (réseaux de réussite scolaire)
- hors EP  (hors éducation prioritaire)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicateur</th>
<th>Réalisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rapport RAR / hors EP en français</td>
<td>0,68 (± 0,05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport RAR / hors EP en mathématiques</td>
<td>0,78 (± 0,04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport RRS / hors EP en français</td>
<td>0,88 (± 0,06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport RRS / hors EP en mathématiques</td>
<td>0,90 (± 0,04)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**INDICATEUR 2.3 :** Rapport des taux de réussite au brevet, en RAR / hors EP et en RRS / hors EP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006 Réalisation</th>
<th>2007 Réalisation</th>
<th>2011 Cible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rapport RAR / hors EP</td>
<td>0,76</td>
<td>0,81</td>
<td>0,85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rapport RRS / hors EP</td>
<td>0,87</td>
<td>0,89</td>
<td>0,95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c) Aide aux élèves

- PPRE,
- Accompagnement éducatif,
- 200 lycées d’excellence,
- École ouverte …
d) Mixité

– Primo arrivants,
– Handicapés,
– Garçons, filles.
Conclusion