



EUROPEAN SECTORAL SOCIAL DIALOGUE IN EDUCATION

Working Group "Quality in Education"

Meeting 21 March 2011

Minutes

Chair: Hans Laugesen (ETUCE)

1. The Chair welcomed colleagues to the second meeting of the working group. The first meeting had taken place on 8 November 2010 and the minutes had been circulated previously.
2. Since the first meeting, the trade union and employer secretariats had prepared a short questionnaire, the results of which were summarised and analysed in a note which had been circulated by email beforehand and which was also made available in hard copy at the meeting. Charles Nolda (EFEE secretariat) had been responsible for combining the ETUCE and EFEE summaries of the individual replies and highlighted the key points in a PowerPoint presentation (see [annex](#)). In total, 20 replies had been received (two of which, from the unions in Greece and the employers in Latvia, had not arrived in time for inclusion in the summary).
3. There were clear indications from the survey results, in particular the growing use of self-evaluation as part of the evaluation process both for individuals and schools; the relatively limited use of regular evaluation processes for individual teachers in some countries; the evidence that in many countries systems had been and continued to be under active review; and widespread acknowledgment of the difficulty in balancing the authorities' wish to use evaluation both to improve the performance of schools and to hold them to account; and the need for teachers to trust the fairness and relevance of the systems in use.
4. All those present were invited, if they had not already done so, to complete the survey and send it to their respective secretariat so that a more complete analysis could be included in the working group's report to the plenary committee in October 2011.
5. Following the presentation on the results of the survey, there was a general discussion. Some of the points made and questions asked were as follows:
 - Because evaluation results had been misused in the past, the trust of teachers could only be gained if several conditions were strictly applied.
 - More clarity is needed about methods, criteria and goals.
 - Which partners and groups need to be involved? For instance in Denmark, student union representatives are involved in evaluating learning outcomes, which means not only that

teachers' performance is considered but also student behaviour, including preparation before classes.

- In Portugal, the unions successfully insisted on the involvement of parents and students in the process being subject to the permission of each teacher.
 - Are local systems better than centralised ones? Can we switch from individual to team evaluation?
 - PISA scores do not cover everything that teachers and schools are trying to do by any means and are therefore insufficient by themselves as a method of evaluation.
 - In the Netherlands, the school Inspectors only visit schools that are considered on the basis of statistical data and online self-evaluation to be "at risk".
 - While self-evaluation is often a very helpful method, it should be seen as a complement to external evaluation rather than as a substitute for it.
 - Support and specialist staff should also be included in evaluation processes since their contributions to the education process also need to be taken into account.
 - In Finland, there are no inspectors and no national tests. The system is based on trust and localised.
 - "Who will evaluate the evaluators?" is a familiar question but a necessary one to avoid systems depending too much on statistics rather than trust.
 - For the Ministry in Malta (the employers) school evaluation is the most useful tool. All staff are covered. Evaluation is seen as part of professional development. Self-evaluation is the starting point, quality is the main theme.
6. After lunch, the meeting resumed with a presentation by Claire Shewbridge of the OECD. She described the current major review within OECD of evaluation and assessment frameworks. This study concerns a range of processes and the linkages between them: student assessment/teacher appraisal/school evaluation/system evaluation. The OECD believes that the key policy issues for analysis are:
- Designing a systematic framework for evaluation and assessment procedures;
 - Developing competencies for evaluation and for using feedback;
 - Making the best use of evaluation results;
 - Implementing evaluation and assessment policies.
7. The study's final report is due in 2012 and meantime progress can be reviewed at www.oecd.org/edu/evaluationpolicy. Already the first country report (Sweden) is on line.
8. Claire's slides (see annex) have been circulated and copies are also available from the ETUCE and EFEE secretariats. Claire said that she and her colleagues in the review team at the OECD would like to keep in touch with the working group and noted that the expected date for the finalisation of the working group's report would allow our findings to be taken into consideration in the OECD's report.
9. The Chair warmly thanked Claire for her presentation and noted the mutual advantages to be gained from the link now made between the OECD review team and the working group.

10. The meeting now turned to consider the working group's next steps. The Chair proposed the following structure for a report to the plenary meeting of ESSDE in October.

| |
|---|
| <p>Structure of inspirational report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Purpose: to promote a culture of evaluation that is accepted at all levels• Identify a process, not a single model• Focus areas: performance/added value/process• Actors to be focussed on: teachers, school management and employers, students, support staff• Tools and methods• Process advice to gain ownership |
|---|

11. This proposal was broadly welcomed by the working group and it was agreed that the secretariats would draft a report in consultation with the Chair of the working group, with the ambition of circulating the draft to all members of the working group two or three weeks in advance of the next meeting which will be on 20 September.

12. In further discussion, more points were made, including the following:

- The report would need to cover the possible problems for teachers and implementation challenges that need to be overcome.
- There needs to be an emphasis on social dialogue at all levels, in order to instil confidence and trust.
- Everybody in the system, including those in overall charge of the administration of education, needs to be subject to evaluation.
- Initial training for teachers needs to include preparation for evaluation.
- There needs to be open debate about the broad purposes of education before there can be clarity about what is to be evaluated, why and how.

13. Bianka Stege informed the meeting that EFEE intends to submit a project proposal to the European Commission for the August deadline, which would build on the work of the Quality in Education working group. ETUCE would be invited to be partners. In the same way, ETUCE is submitting a project proposal for the March deadline (with EFEE as partners) on the subject of recruitment and retention, building on the work of the Demographic Challenges working group.

14. The Chair closed the meeting at approximately 3.30 pm with thanks to all participants and presenters.

Annexes

- Presentation synthesis replies questionnaire
- Presentation OECD

Participants 21/03/2011

| Workers | Country | Name | First name | Organisation |
|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| 1 | CY | Savva | Stefanos | OLTEK |
| 2 | CZ | La Sala | Zdenka | CMOS |
| 3 | DE | Schwiegershausen-Güth | Maya | ver.di |
| 4 | DE | Hocke | Norbert | GEW |
| 5 | DK | Laugesen | Hans | GL |
| 6 | EL | Kotsifakis | Themistoklis | OLME |
| 7 | ES | Redero | Antonio | FETE UGT |
| 8 | FI | Koivisto | Merja | OAJ |
| 9 | FR | Ritzenthaler | Albert | SGEN-CFDT |
| 10 | IT | Dal Pino | Maria Lucia | CISL-S |
| 11 | LU | Ries | Claude | SNE |
| 12 | PT | Braganca | Maria Arminda | FNE |
| 13 | SI | Modrijan | Sandi | ESTUS |
| 14 | UK | de la Motte | Bruni | UNISON |
| 15 | EU | Le Bodic | Anne-Claire | CESI |

| Employers | Country | Name | First name | Organisation |
|------------------|----------------|-------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1 | ES | Boscá Vidal | Joana | General Direction of VET |
| 2 | IT | Pontieri | Maria | ARAN |
| 3 | MT | Sciberras | Micheline | Directorate Educational Services |
| 4 | SE | Looberger | Malin | SALAR |
| 5 | SE | Moberg | Phia | SALAR |
| 6 | EU | Nolda | Charles | EFEE |
| 7 | EU | Stege | Bianka | EFEE |