



ENTEPE MEETING AND CONFERENCE

ST. JULIANS, MALTA

20. – 22. 4. 2017

Coordination Note

The ENTEPE meeting and the conference took place from April 20-22 in St. Julians, Malta. The event was organised under the Maltese Presidency of the Council of the European Union. It was hosted by the ENTEPE Maltese representative, Joseph Giordmania, with the support of the Ministry for Education and Employment in Malta.

ENTEPE INTERNAL MEETING

1. INTRODUCTION

The ENTEPE meeting started with a welcome message by the ENTEPE coordinator, Mojca Peček Čuk. A special welcome was given to the new ENTEPE representative from Greece, Mr Pavlos Charamis; the new ENTEPE representative from Latvia, Ms Lelde Zemberga and her colleague Mr Andis Geižāns; Mr. Bruno Lee Lai from Portugal, and Ms Karmen Chakir, the new ENTEPE assistant from Slovenia. Mojca Peček Čuk offered special thanks to Joseph Giordmaina, ENTEPE representative from Malta, and Raymond Camilleri, Director for EU and International Affairs, Research and Policy Development at the Ministry of Education and Employment in Malta, for not only giving ENTEPE an opportunity to meet in Malta but also for all their engagement in preparing the International Conference on Teacher Assessment and Evaluation. Additionally, she provided general information about the schedule of the meeting and the one-day International Conference on Teacher Assessment and Evaluation. Some technical information were discussed, too.

Following the introduction, ENTEPE representatives present at the conference were invited to introduce themselves.

2. REPORTS ON ENTEPE'S RECENT ACTIVITIES

- ENTEPE logo. Joseph Giordmaina had asked the Head of the Institute for Design and Creativity in Malta if it is possible to launch a logo competition for students. Initially the idea was accepted; however, due to their involvement in different projects the



realisation of the idea was postponed. Daniela Worek offered to prepare a few proposals for the new ENTEP logo that could be discussed at the next ENTEP meeting in Portugal. The suggestion was gratefully accepted. Some ideas for the new logo were suggested: Africa on the globe has to be removed; the picture and the writing can be separated and it is not necessary that the writing is on the picture like now; ideas of teacher collaboration, connection, cooperation should be clear from the logo; the colour should be the blue of the EU; the logo has to work in black-and-white too, not only in colour.

= Recognisability of ENTEP and ENTEP documentation

Daniela Worek and Francesca Caena gave a report on how ENTEP was presented at the European Conference on the Recognition of International Teaching Diplomas in Frankfurt in March 2017 and at the D.A.C.H – Seminar on Governance in Teacher Education in Zürich in March 2017. After a short discussion it was emphasised that ENTEP's presentation at different (international) conferences is very important, since it is still not well known in many countries. For this purpose it was decided to make a general PowerPoint presentation that every representative could take and adapt to suit his/her needs and the conference. In this presentation ENTEP achievements, its mission and role have to be highlighted. For this purpose, the paper about the ENTEP mission will be reviewed and updated. The question of developing an ENTEP statute was also discussed. Liesbeth Hens will prepare a draft version of the mission and achievements for the template presentation that will be discussed at the next ENTEP meeting. When the agreement on all this is achieved, the ENTEP web page will be updated accordingly.

= Latest development in teacher education in EU countries

After a short discussion it was agreed that it would be better to know in advance who will make a presentation on the latest development of teacher education in his/her country at ENTEP's future meetings. The scheduled presentations for the next meeting are: Greece, Belgium – French Community and Poland. Before the next ENTEP meeting the coordinator will check whether there are important new developments also in some other countries that can also be presented at the meeting.

3. 20 YEARS AFTER BOLOGNA

During the meeting the discussion paper on 20 years after Bologna was discussed first in groups and later in the whole ENTEP group. The main conclusions/suggestions were related to some general issues about the style, terminology and structure of the paper; to the aim of the paper that needs to reflect the ENTEP's role and spirit; to the part related to mobility and quality. It was decided that the focus in the discussion paper should not be on the



Declaration but on the Bologna process, which presupposes some content and style changes in the text.

Since the main question on this topic is whether we are really any wiser and in what way because of Bologna process, it was decided that the title should be changed to “20 Years on; How Much Wiser Are We – Has Bologna Made European Teacher Education a Living Reality?”.

The discussion paper will be rewritten by Daniela Worek and Francesca Caena. Before the next meeting representatives will get the next version of it and at the meeting in Portugal the discussion on the new version will be held. In addition, a discussion on specific activities related to the topic will be organised in Portugal ENTEP meeting as well. To achieve this goal Romita Iucu will send us a summary what has been already done. Daniela Worek and Francesca Caena will prepare a proposal on potential questions and areas that could be analysed by ENTEP representatives and send them to ENTEP representatives prior to the next meeting.

During the discussion different issues on how to continue this topic were proposed: preparing lessons of wisdom in different countries about the Bologna process; gathering data for initial teacher education – the already available data gathered are wide, general, not in initial teacher education; checking whether every ENTEP country is included in the Eurydice studies; analysing whether the graph from Eurydice would be different if taking in consideration just the initial teacher education; looking at the question if it is possible to distinguish between initial education and initial teacher education.

4. UPCOMING ENTEP MEETINGS AND CONFERENCES

The next ENTEP meeting and the conference will be organised between the 19th and the 21st of October 2017 in Lisbon. The day of arrival will be the 18th of October. The title of the conference will be **EVALUATION FRAMEWORKS FOR SCHOOLS AND TEACHERS**. The conference will be structured in the same ways as the conference in Malta: in the morning, the keynote speakers will be invited to discuss theoretical issues on the question of frameworks and quality that matters in schools when we evaluate teachers; and in the afternoon case studies from some countries will be presented. Potential countries for presentation are France, Croatia, Poland, Belgium (French Community), maybe Austria.

Questions that might be discussed at the conference are:

Why are we talking about professionalization of teaching occupation in so many countries; what is the teaching profession; can we compare teachers with other professions and do we need to do that; what professionalization of teacher means in the age of neoliberalism, postmodernity and how these things relate to standards; is it good that teaching is a regulated profession and do we really want that; who develops the framework and standards – why are teachers not doing that - are teachers not able to develop a body of knowledge, competences



for themselves; is there somebody else who knows better what is good for them; the challenge of the transition from standards to frameworks could be addressed.

The 2018 ENTEP spring conference and meeting could be organised in March or April by the French Community in Belgium.

THE LATEST DEVELOPMENTS IN TEACHER EDUCATION

MALTA

Sandro Caruana, Dean, Faculty of Education, University of Malta

Taking Teaching to Master level in Malta

One of the main challenges in initial teacher education is to prepare professional teachers who are in a position to respond to the demands of a rapidly-changing society. This is evident in much of the documentation produced by EU institutions over the past years, with aspects such as addressing the needs of migrant learners, teachers' professional development and the use of digital technologies in the classroom featuring prominently. Though Malta's nature of a small-island state presents specific context-related educational needs, many issues faced are similar to those present in a number of European countries. Over the past years, also in the light of such issues, the Faculty of Education has resolved to restructure its initial teacher education course. This process, through which the Master in Teaching & Learning (MTL) was introduced, has led to a significant reform in teacher preparation with the aim of rendering it more practice-based than it was in the past. This reform is in its initial stages and there are yet many challenges to be addressed, including those related to student-teachers' assessment and evaluation. Nevertheless, the MTL represents a major opportunity for teacher education to develop further and to determine the course of its future, also offering possibilities to address relevant areas within the educational system (refer ppt on ENTEP web pages).

LATVIA

Lelde Zemberga

According to the regulation, there are the same restrictions for all teachers in Latvia at all education levels – tertiary degree (equivalent to ISCED level 5A or 5B) to be able to teach. There is a requirement for teachers to have a 36 hours of continuous professional development every 3 years provided in A courses (improves professional and pedagogical competence and are implemented by educational institutions or NGO's) and B courses (aimed to broader teachers' specialisations through longer university-based professional development programmes, leading to qualifications in a second subject or education level). From 2014 there



is a state support for teacher training – funding from state budget for implementation of A and B courses. From this year specific support from state funding for implementation of teacher training courses will be provided for gymnasiums (in work with talents and improvement of education content), special education institutions – special education development centres (inclusive education aspects) and professional education competence centres (adult learning). Additionally teacher training activities are included in several ESF projects. The ongoing reform on development of new competency-based curriculum (in the framework of ESF project “Implementing Competency-based approach to curriculum in Latvia”) will also affect teacher training needs, making as a priority foreign language, digital, communication and cooperation skills. As a way of quality monitoring, evaluation system of professional performance of school heads has been introduced from January 2017 and the existing assessment system of teacher performance is being reviewed by making an emphasis on observation and evaluation of lessons (refer ppt on ENTEP web pages).

ENTEPE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE: “TEACHER ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION”

The goal of the conference was on the one hand to share viewpoints, experiences, knowledge on questions relating to teacher assessment and evaluation. On the other hand, to collect as many relevant, positive and effective policy examples with new insights and reflections that could open up wider discussions for policy makers across Europe. The conference was opened by Joseph Caruana, Permanent Secretary in Ministry for Education and Employment in Malta, and Mojca Peček Čuk, ENTEPE coordinator, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia.

In the first part of the conference some theoretical issues of the topic were discussed. This part was chaired by Maria McNamara, Director General at the Directorate for Educational Services – DES in Malta.

The first speaker, **Antoine Mioche**, Ministry of National Education, Higher Education and Research, General Inspectorate, France, held a presentation titled *From pixels back to the bigger picture: making teacher evaluation work in institutional and human context*. In his presentation he stressed that in recent years, growing recognition of the impact of the quality of teaching on pupil achievement has led to a greater emphasis on empowering teachers to deliver high-quality instruction. This has involved efforts in teacher training as well as a corresponding focus on teacher competences, the latter designed partly to shape the form and content of initial teacher education, and partly to inform teacher appraisal and professional development. While these are welcome changes, which make for greater consistency within and possibly across education systems, and also provide a conceptual backbone to any



thinking on teaching and teacher education, this presentation argued that they are not without risk.

To begin with, competence frameworks may foster a perception of teaching as merely a set of attitudes and procedures, in which the part devoted to actual teaching and learning becomes secondary. They can also give a fragmented vision of teaching, which young teachers in particular will find difficult to translate into effective practice as they strive to tick separate competences that ultimately fail to cohere. Perhaps more problematically, though less visibly, competence frameworks encourage the improbable notion that teaching is everywhere and in any circumstances identical and unchanging. They seldom allow room for institutional and human context, and never for useful variations in teaching style. Lastly, their unconditional acceptance may lead school heads or policy makers, among others, to place the onus of quality solely on the shoulders of teachers, while teachers clearly operate within a much wider institutional and policy context.

To achieve effectiveness and fairness teacher evaluation would benefit first from clear thinking on formative, as distinct from summative, evaluation, especially given that temised evaluation forms based on competence frameworks tend to blur the dividing line between the two. It must be clear whether (or when) a teacher is evaluated against a set of expectations, which are themselves shaped and constrained by policy choices and to which he or she has to conform, and whether (or when) he or she is evaluated against a set of development objectives, for which advice and additional training are provided. When the latter is the case, self-evaluation and the writing of evaluation reports, if at all possible, should be encouraged as correctives to a mechanical, de-contextualised approach. In all circumstances, the emphasis ought to be on teaching and pupil learning, the latter not to be confused with pupil results.

The next speaker, **Martha Rozsi**, OECD, presented the *NESLI teacher and school leader appraisal survey*, which included 39 countries, and its results.

As she pointed out, monitoring and appraising teachers is central to improve schools and learning environments. If well designed, teacher appraisal and feedback systems can be used as tools to increase teacher effectiveness and achieve better learning outcomes. In 2014, the Network for the collection and adjudication of system-level descriptive information on educational structures, policies and practices (NESLI) from the OECD Indicators on Education Systems (INES) programme administered a survey on Evaluation and Assessment including teacher and school leader appraisal systems in place in school year 2014/15 in OECD and other partner countries. This survey was built on earlier and ongoing works and data collections from the OECD and covered public and government-dependent private schools at primary, lower secondary and upper secondary levels of education. The questionnaire focused on five different types of teacher appraisal: teachers on probation, regular appraisals, teacher registrations, appraisals for promotions, and appraisals for rewards. The questionnaire was designed to provide an overview of the appraisal systems in place, including their prevalence, the governance and responsibilities for these systems, procedures and techniques used in these appraisals and how appraisals were used in the different



countries, including their impact on professional development and career advancement, incentives for positive performances, and responses or disincentives for underperformance. This presentation provided an overview of the questionnaire administered and its results for the 39 OECD and partner countries that participated in the survey, with a focus on teacher appraisals for lower secondary education.

Michael Schratz, School of Education, Innsbruck University, Austria, delivered a presentation entitled *Teacher assessment and evaluation: what counts as quality?* As he stressed in his speech, during the last few decades, policy-focused attempts to modernize and restructure the provision of education in countries in the Western world have been strongly associated with ideas travelling rapidly across national boundaries. This process was initiated by large-scale assessments (e.g. PISA) which introduced evidence-based policy-making as one of the main levers of educational change. Initially quality discussions took their starting point in student achievement, but quickly moved on to the main actors who are responsible for every day activities in teaching: the teaching force. Consequently, educational policies were initiated which on the one hand aim at improving teacher education (pre-service and in-service), on the other hand try to assess and evaluate the quality of teacher performance. Different models have been introduced within European Union countries, which follow different theoretical models (e.g. professional, managerial, entrepreneurial, bureaucratic, etc.). This presentation looked at the pivotal points of how teacher assessment and evaluation could act as parameters of quality in strategies for improving educational practice.

The last speaker in the first part of the conference, **Ian Mifsud**, from the Ministry for Education and Employment, Director General Quality Assurance and Standards, Malta, gave a presentation entitled *Teacher assessment and evaluation: risks and opportunities from a contextualised perspective*. He began his presentation with the thought that learning is fostered through a facilitative process in a conducive context. Within formal education, the teacher is the prime, yet not sole actor, in creating this context and facilitating learning amidst a myriad of other variables. As part of human behaviour, we continually tacitly assess ourselves and each other throughout our interactions, but as happens in other circumstances, formalising it inherently reframes this process raising questions that should be considered. What purpose is teacher assessment and evaluation intended for? How is the information derived from this process being used? Whose interests are being served? How are the tools and methodologies being adopted perceived by and impacting on the different stakeholders within the process? Is this supporting the creation of a context that is conducive to learning?

Through repeatedly declared statements such as “*the quality of an education system cannot exceed the quality of its teachers*”, various researchers and policy makers acknowledge and recognise the magnitude of the teacher’s agency in the quality and outcome of the schooling experience. This intertwines with issues of power, control, autonomy, accountability, responsibility and professionalism. All facets of a deeper and powerful, yet fragile human belief we all know as trust. Like other convictions, trust develops and is earned over time and may be easily weakened or lost if not sustained consistently. Likewise, within



the educational system, genuine trust is essential in order to nurture a positive, collegial climate required for learning. The presentation exposed the current and continually evolving Maltese context in the field of teacher assessment and evaluation, whilst exploring these fundamental issues within the wider educational sphere.

For the second part of the conference, the expert's meeting was organised. It was chaired by Vlatka Domović, Faculty of Teacher Education, University of Zagreb, Croatia. At the expert meeting four case studies of teacher assessment and evaluation were presented.

At first **Francesca Caena**, University Ca' Foscari, Venice, Italy, gave a speech on *teacher assessment and evaluation in Italy*, where teacher evaluation was introduced in 2015, at school level, and can focus on different areas according to each institution, with criteria set by school boards. It is likely to focus on professional development, additional qualifications, roles played within the school (management, coordination, projects, pupil support, school exchanges and trips). Regular evaluation is linked to salary incentives, but is not connected to career progression; it is carried out by school leaders on the basis of context-related evaluation criteria and teachers' applications. Teacher evaluation represents one aspect of teacher professionalism which is targeted by the strategic Framework Law 'La Buona Scuola', aiming at an overhaul of the whole education system. In rolling out the reform, coordination and planning at the macro level of governance (ministry and local education authorities) have turned out to be crucial in determining successes, hurdles and difficulties in implementation.

The next speaker, **Maria Luisa Oliveira**, Ministry of Education, Portugal, held a presentation on *teacher assessment and evaluation in Portugal*. According to her further adjustments were made to teacher assessment and evaluation over the last years in Portugal. The current teacher assessment and evaluation model has been in force since 2012. The key objectives being the improvement of quality of educational service and of student learning, as well as teachers' professional appreciation and their personal and professional development, this teacher assessment and evaluation model encompasses both an internal and an external dimension. Its internal dimension is, generally speaking, the responsibility of the head of department or the school principal. Its external dimension, which involves the observation of lessons, is carried out by teachers that meet specific requisites, namely, to hold a training course in teachers' evaluation or pedagogical supervision. As it is closely linked to career progression, teachers' assessment and evaluation is one of the mandatory requirements for teachers to move up to the next career step, which usually occurs every four years. In schools where principals are concerned, their assessment and evaluation is regulated by specific legislation, since the dimensions they are assessed have been adapted to their position.

Daniela Worek, Hessische Lehrkräfteakademie, Germany, presented *teacher Assessment and Evaluation in Germany*, where for more than three decades, assessment, evaluation, and accountability have been major strands of educational policy and practice internationally. Even so the available data on how exactly assessment- and evaluation-based policies are framed and implemented in Germany, or how they shape practices within schools,



are still limited. This presentation addressed these issues with a broad focus that takes into account several perspectives on school evaluation and student assessment, together with everyday practices of teacher judgment and grading. First, she addressed assessment and evaluation practices for the purpose of educational system monitoring. Second, school evaluation practices, as well as the use of assessment and evaluation results at the school level, were discussed. A third perspective focused on practices of teacher evaluation. Finally, practices of student assessment within schools and classrooms were examined.

The last but not least, **Romita Iucu**, University of Bucharest, Romania, discussed on *teacher assessment and evaluation in Romania*. His presentation was aiming to introduce the Romanian national teacher assessment system, in the context of real challenges which were surrounding the educational background. The methodology which provides the framework for an evaluation unit, objective and transparent teacher and support staff and also provides a motivational system to drive up individual professional performance of teachers, underline the responsibility of assessment linked, annually, to the schools through the methodical commission and to the administrative board of the institution, as well as, the school inspectorates, temporarily. The specific legislative measures regulates the procedure for evaluating the work of teachers and staff from school units, determines the rules for performance appraisal and individual application of evaluation criteria and assessment tools, are also under a deep contextual analysis.

Each presentation in both parts of the conference was followed by discussion in which many questions were opened. To mention some of them:

In most cases, the most important people in the evaluation are school principles. However, is it always good (even if the principle is extremely competent) that somebody leads the system of evaluation in the institution? It was discussed that it is all about the concept of leadership.

Based on what can be said that a school improved? Maybe we are still too much focused on numbers (from research like PISA) and not on other criteria (values of children).

Some systems of teacher assessment and evaluation, like in Germany, do not motivate the employed since there are no consequences for anyone. However, for example, in Luxemburg there is no assessment and thus no consequences for bad work, but teachers are satisfied, motivated, they feel supported. Why such differences?

What is quality in teacher assessment and evaluation? What defines a school as a bad school and what as a good one? Teacher assessment and evaluation might be used as a parameter of quality in strategies for improving educational practices.

In the teacher assessment and evaluation process the whole person should be seen, not just through the checklist, but also through the personally. It was also pointed out that we should not be focused only on the individual teacher, the competences should be evaluated also from the point of view of group work, collaboration.

The distinctions between school and teacher quality evaluation were discussed. It was pointed out that we get the achievement of the school from the achievement in different classrooms.



Too often different aspects are fragmented, this is why it is important to find the connection between individual and school – one needs others and has to be supported.

Teacher assessment and evaluation have to take into consideration whether teacher's work promotes the student's development, learning, and if it benefits children.

It is necessary to create a balance between standards and dispositions of teachers and a balance between the role of inspectors who have the responsibility to evaluate teachers and others that do that; but politics and society should also be involved and put evaluation on the top of its agenda.

In many countries the aspect of school autonomy should be discussed; that is, how to increase the role of principals to take responsibility. Additionally, teacher assessment and evaluation also needs to be focused on support and professional development of teachers. The question is how to empower teachers to understand formative implications of evaluation; how to balance cooperation and competition?

Questions of balance between qualitative and quantitative assessment, self-assessment and external assessment, teacher assessment and school assessment were raised.

It is important to know what kind of results we expect from evaluation since the process of evaluation is related to this. It is a question of positive motivation vs negative expectations.

The issues of terminology was raised, too – do we always mean the same things by the same word?

ENTEPE Coordinator
Mojca Peček Čuk