Developing a comprehensive monitoring and evaluation system
OECDs work on Evaluation and Assessment

Evaluation and Assessment Reviews

Education Policy Reviews

Implementation Support
Key components of E&A frameworks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Student assessment</strong></th>
<th><strong>Teacher / School principal appraisal</strong></th>
<th><strong>School evaluation</strong></th>
<th><strong>System evaluation</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summative / Formative (Diagnostic)</td>
<td>Completion of probation / Performance management (Registration, regular appraisal, promotion) / Reward schemes</td>
<td>Internal / External / School performance measures</td>
<td>Information for the public and to inform policy / Indicators / Tools to monitor pupil outcomes / qualitative reviews &amp; research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key questions

- **Why do we evaluate?** (Purpose and use of results)
- **What and how do we evaluate?** (Scope and procedures)
- **Who is involved?** (Governance and capacity)
Key components of the evaluation and assessment framework

Trends and developments in OECD countries
Student Assessment: Trends & analysis

• Research evidence on the benefits of using assessment results to inform teaching and learning has increased policy attention to formative assessment
  – The majority of systems have central policy frameworks for formative assessment in place

• Summative assessment and reporting remain important at key stages of schooling in all countries
  – Systems had policy frameworks for internal summative assessment in place to ensure transparency in marking and reporting

• Concerns about variations in the quality of learning across schools have led to a renewed focus on central standards and large-scale assessments to ensure high standards for all students.
  – Full cohort and/or sample-based assessments

• Standardised central assessments with no stakes for students are becoming increasingly common to provide formative feedback to schools and/or monitor education system performance
Student Assessment: **Trends & analysis**

- Resolving tensions between summative and formative assessments
- Assessment formats tend to remain more traditional than curriculum goals
  - *Adaptive online testing: e.g. Denmark, The Netherlands and Wales (UK)*
- Limited focus on students’ own assessment competencies
  - 21st century curricula

*Source: OECD Education 2030 project*
Student Assessment: Trends & analysis

• Teacher preparation & continuous professional development
  – Pedagogical skills: differentiated teaching, inquiry-based methods, etc.
  – Induction programmes (e.g. Singapore, The Netherlands)

• School leaders’ preparation & continuous professional development
  – “Leadership for learning” rather than administrators (e.g. British Columbia)

• Using results to report to and engage parents
  – Several countries have established websites with summary of data and information of schools (e.g. Australia)
  – Need for a careful consideration of possible unintended consequences
Teacher Appraisal: Trends & analysis

• Teacher appraisal is the component of E&A frameworks where there is the most variation across countries
  – Practices range from highly prescriptive national systems to informal approaches mostly left to the school level

• In many countries, there has been renewed focus on teacher appraisal in recent years
  – Effective appraisals can contribute to improved teaching quality

• Most systems have policy frameworks for teacher appraisal in place

• Many systems have developed professional standards for the teaching profession that can guide teacher appraisal processes and inform their professional development
## Organisation of Australian teaching standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains of teaching</th>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Focus areas and descriptors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Knowledge</strong></td>
<td>1. Know students and how they learn</td>
<td>Refer to the Standard at each career stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Know the content and how to teach it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Practice</strong></td>
<td>3. Plan for and implement effective teaching and learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Create and maintain supportive and safe learning environments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Assess, provide feedback and report on student learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Engagement</strong></td>
<td>6. Engage in professional learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Engage professionally with colleagues, parents/carers and the community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Professional Knowledge

#### Standard 2 – Know the content and how to teach it

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus area</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Highly Accomplished</th>
<th>Lead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Content and teaching strategies of the teaching area</td>
<td>Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the concepts, substance and structure of the content and teaching strategies of the teaching area.</td>
<td>Apply knowledge of the content and teaching strategies of the teaching area to develop engaging teaching activities.</td>
<td>Support colleagues using current and comprehensive knowledge of content and teaching strategies to develop and implement engaging learning and teaching programs.</td>
<td>Lead initiatives within the school to evaluate and improve knowledge of content and teaching strategies and demonstrate exemplary teaching of subjects using effective, research-based learning and teaching programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Content selection and organisation</td>
<td>Organise content into an effective learning and teaching sequence.</td>
<td>Organise content into coherent, well-sequenced learning and teaching programs.</td>
<td>Exhibit innovative practice in the selection and organisation of content and delivery of learning and teaching programs.</td>
<td>Lead initiatives that utilise comprehensive content knowledge to improve the selection and sequencing of content into coherently organised learning and teaching programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Curriculum, assessment and reporting</td>
<td>Use curriculum, assessment and reporting knowledge to design learning sequences and lesson plans.</td>
<td>Design and implement learning and teaching programs using knowledge of curriculum, assessment and reporting requirements.</td>
<td>Support colleagues to plan and implement learning and teaching programs using contemporary knowledge and understanding of curriculum, assessment and reporting requirements.</td>
<td>Lead colleagues to develop learning and teaching programs using comprehensive knowledge of curriculum, assessment and reporting requirements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teacher Appraisal: Trends & analysis

- High stakes teacher appraisal may lead to a climate of stress and anxiety
- Overreliance on one or two sources of information
  - Simplistic use of student assessment results
  - Insufficient guidance for classroom observation
- Lack of a professional standards to guide appraisal and professional development in some countries
  - Alignment of professional standards with ambitions of curricula!
- Absence of career opportunities for teachers
School Evaluation: Trends & analysis

• Almost universal focus in national policy to stimulate school self-evaluation (No requirements in GRC, ITA, MEX and ESP)
  – Requirements vary significantly in nature, e.g. conduct self-evaluation; produce specific report on school development; account for school quality
  – Providing comparative information to schools on performance and other measures
School Evaluation: Trends & analysis

- School-self evaluations through a participatory process involving the broad school community
- Peer review between schools (e.g. Finland, Flemish Community of Belgium, the Netherlands, Norway)
- Investing in the capacity for self-evaluations, not limited to school leaders
School Evaluation: Trends & analysis

• Providing **support and guidance** for school self-evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Examples of national support for school self-evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Quality in Schools (QIS) project Internet platform supplies schools with information and tools for both evaluation and data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>The Quality and Supervision Agency runs an Evaluation Portal with online tools and resources for school evaluation and in collaboration with the Danish Evaluation Institute offers voluntary training sessions for school principals and teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Strengthened support in 2012 includes Guidelines for School Self-Evaluation in primary and secondary schools; a dedicated school self-evaluation website; Inspectorate support for all schools and teachers; and seminars for school principals which are organised by the professional development service for teachers. In 2003 the Inspectorate developed two frameworks for self-evaluation in primary and secondary schools (Looking at our schools). Since 1998, professional development for teachers offered in context of School Development Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>The Education Review Office provides support tools and training for school self-review and improvement, suggesting a cyclical approach and providing a framework for success indicators (same as those used in external reviews).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Framework for school self-evaluation (How good is our school?) includes quality indicators in five key areas. Education Scotland website also provides a range of self-evaluation materials and good practice examples. Education Scotland runs good practice conferences on different themes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School Evaluation: Trends & analysis

- **External school evaluation** is established in the vast majority of OECD countries *(Except: FIN, GRC, HUN, ITA, JPN, LUX & MEX)*
  - Typically devised by central or state authorities and conducted by Education authorities and/or specific bodies (e.g. School Inspectorate, School Review Body)
  - Publication of comparative school performance measures

- **Several countries evaluate local authorities or boards to which the schools belong** (e.g. Denmark, the Netherlands, Wales)
  - Annual quality reports (caution for administrative burden)
School Evaluation: Trends & analysis

- Risk that compliancy dominates school evaluation i.e. accountability dominates the improvement function
- In some countries lack of national criteria for school quality to guide school evaluation
  - Common understanding of “What is a good school” (e.g. Scotland, New Zealand, Wales)
  - Need for ensuring alignment and avoiding duplication
- Move towards alignment between self-evaluation and external evaluation
School Evaluation: Trends & analysis

• Adapting external school evaluation to reflect the context and maturity of the system

• Need for ensuring systematic follow up and support
  – Targeted support to weak performing schools and/or municipalities/boards
  – Enhancing the school improvement governance structure
    • Wales: Establishment of 4 regional consortia
    • Norway: Regional networks
    • Scotland: Regional school improvement collaboratives
By the late 1990s all OECD countries had participated in an international student assessment.
System evaluation: Trends & analysis

- Calls to monitor performance in the public sector – influence of New Public Management
  - Paradigm shift to “New Public Governance”, includes focus on systems thinking, organisational learning, collaboration, monitoring beyond outcomes - also processes
- Many systems do not have an overall framework for education system evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators of a strategic approach to information collection</th>
<th>Countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mapping against system priorities AND plan to prioritise new collection</td>
<td>Australia; Czech Republic; Hungary; Israel; Netherlands; Slovak Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapping against system priorities</td>
<td>France; Iceland; Ireland; Northern Ireland (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan to prioritise collection of new information</td>
<td>Belgium (French &amp; Flemish Comm.); Chile; Finland; Slovenia; Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>Austria; Denmark; Italy; Korea; Luxembourg; Mexico; New Zealand; Norway; Poland; Sweden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
System evaluation: **Trends & analysis**

- Balancing regular and cyclical collection of information to monitor trends and developments
- Ensuring reliable data reporting – caution over incentive structures
  - Reliance on a heavy test-based accountability system:
    - May threaten professional development and capacity building and culture of dependence
    - “Gaming” or window dressing
    - Caution for “narrowing of the curriculum”
- Broader curriculum coverage with sample surveys vs full cohorts
System evaluation: Trends & analysis

- Emerging recognition of importance of student well-being (e.g. Norway, Belgium Community of Flanders, Wales)
- Ensuring sufficient capacity at national level to analyse information and report this in an accessible way
- Making better use of results in planning and policy development
  - Too much data and information!!
  - Finding ways to better communicate results
  - Political urgency vs availability of broad data and research base
Create synergies within a coherent evaluation and assessment framework

Aim to avoid:
- Duplicated procedures
- Inconsistent objectives

The evaluation and assessment framework

- Put the learner at the centre
- Enhance teacher professionalism
- Foster leadership for learning in schools
- Inform policies for system improvement

Move from compliance to quality
Create links

Student assessment
Teacher appraisal
School principal appraisal
School evaluation
System evaluation

Aim to avoid:
- Duplicated procedures
- Inconsistent objectives
Recommendations of “Education in Latvia”

“Need for developing a coherent assessment and evaluation framework for informing policy and educational practice”

• Arrangements were found not equally well developed and lacking synergy

• Need for alignment of arrangements to education objectives
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Recommendations of “Education in Latvia”

“Need for developing a coherent assessment and evaluation framework for informing policy and educational practice”

- Arrangements were found not equally well developed and lacking synergy
- Need for alignment of arrangements to education objectives

- e.g. differences in student performance between rural and urban schools
- e.g. variable capacity municipalities
- e.g. size of school network, low pupil/teacher ratio
Recommendations of “Education in Latvia”

Student assessments

• Curriculum renewal - need for re-alignment of student assessments

**Organisational changes curricula**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Education (grades 1-9; ages 7-15/16)</th>
<th>Upper Secondary Education (grades 10-12; ages 16-18/19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fewer academic subjects</td>
<td>Fewer academic subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More time for deep learning</td>
<td>10/11 grade - completion of compulsory basic courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater school autonomy in curriculum implementation</td>
<td>11/12 grade - selection of a few higher level courses for in-depth study; A level exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of transversal competencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendations of “Education in Latvia”

Student assessments

- Curriculum renewal: need for re-alignment of student assessments
- Intend to emphasise formative assessment
  - Investing in teacher capacity for formative assessments
  - Monitoring development of teacher capacity
Recommendations of “Education in Latvia”

Staff appraisals

- System should be further developed into one geared towards supporting continuous professional learning and development
- Expanded to include school leaders – and support staff
- Need for revisiting professional standards of teachers, school leaders and support staff to align to ambitions of the new curricula??
Recommendations of “Education in Latvia”

School evaluations – internal and external

• The improvement function of school evaluations should be strengthened

• Continue promoting strong school self-evaluations (Ireland, Scotland, New Zealand, etc.)

• State Education Quality Service (SEQS) should strengthen its follow-up support to schools

• SEQS to explicitly report on the effectiveness of municipalities in supporting their schools (e.g. Denmark, Netherlands, Wales)
Recommendations of “Education in Latvia”

School evaluations

• Clarifying “What is a good school?” in light of the new curriculum

  – Quality criteria regulation: 1) Curriculum; 2) Quality of teaching; 3) Support for the differentiation of teaching; 4) Equipment, material and technical resources; 5) Physical environment and accessibility of the environment.

  – School evaluation by SQES: 1) Curriculum; 2) Teaching and learning; 3) Learner achievement; 4) Support for learners; 5) Ethos; 6) Resources; 7) Organization of work, management and quality assurance.

  – Curriculum renewal calls for developing “Schools as Learning Organisations”: 1) Vision to Develop Every Child’s Potential; 2) Staff Teamwork and Reciprocal Learning; 3) Inquiry and Innovation Culture; 4) Leadership Support for Change
Recommendations of “Education in Latvia”

School evaluations

• Promotion of “horizontal accountability” & collaborative learning and working
  – Promoting a participatory approach to self-evaluation involving all school staff, students, parents, community and other partners
  – Peer review by schools (ideally continuous) (New Zealand, the Netherlands)
  – Promotion of school-to-school collaborations and networking
    • Pooling of human- and financial resources
  – Enhancing the school improvement governance structure (Wales, Norway, Scotland)
Recommendations of “Education in Latvia”

System level monitoring

• Realisation of education objectives, with particular reference to the new curricula
  – What schools and municipalities are progressing doing well? – identification and sharing of “good practices” & supporting peer learning
  – What schools and municipalities need more support?

• Strategic use of research to support system-level monitoring
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