Annex D. Comparative indicators on evaluation and assessment

	Portugal	Country average ¹	Portugal's rank ²
EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT Source: Education at a Glance (OECD, 2010a) ³			
% of population that has attained at least upper secondary education, by age group			
(excluding ISCED 3C short programmes) ⁴ (2008)			
Ages 25-64	28	71	30/30
Ages 25-34	47	80	28/30
Ages 35-44	29	75	29/30
Ages 45-54	20	68	30/30
Ages 55-64	13	58	30/30
% of population that has attained tertiary education, by age group (2008)			
Ages 25-64	14	28	=28/31
Ages 25-34	23	35	25/31
Ages 35-44	15	29	=27/31
Ages 45-54	10	25	=30/31
Ages 55-64	8	20	31/31
Upper secondary graduation rates (2008)			
% of upper secondary graduates (first-time graduation) to the population at the typical	63	80	24/26
age of graduation			
STUDENT PERFORMANCE			
STUDENT TERFORMANCE			
Mean performance in PISA (Programme for International Student Assessment)			
(15-year-olds) (2009) Source: PISA Results (OECD, 2010d) ³			
Reading literacy	489	493	22/34
Mathematics literacy	487	496	=25/34
Science literacy	493	501	25/34
SCHOOL SYSTEM EXPENDITURE Source: Education at a Glance (OECD, 2010a) ³			
Expenditure on primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary institutions as			
Expenditure on primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary institutions as a % of GDP, from public and private sources	3.6		-12/26
Expenditure on primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary institutions as a % of GDP, from public and private sources 1995	3.6	~	=13/26
Expenditure on primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary institutions as a % of GDP, from public and private sources 1995 2000	3.9	~	=8/29
Expenditure on primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary institutions as a % of GDP, from public and private sources 1995 2000 2007	3.9 3.5	3.6	=8/29 =17/29
Expenditure on primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary institutions as a % of GDP, from public and private sources 1995 2000 2007 Public expenditure on primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary	3.9	~	=8/29
Expenditure on primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary institutions as a % of GDP, from public and private sources 1995 2000 2007 Public expenditure on primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary education as a % of total public expenditure (2008) ^{5, 6} Total expenditure on primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary	3.9 3.5	3.6	=8/29 =17/29
Expenditure on primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary institutions as a % of GDP, from public and private sources 1995 2000 2007 Public expenditure on primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary education as a % of total public expenditure (2008) ^{5, 6} Total expenditure on primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary education from public sources (2007) (%)	3.9 3.5 7.8	3.6 9.0	=8/29 =17/29 =19/29
Expenditure on primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary institutions as a % of GDP, from public and private sources 1995 2000 2007 Public expenditure on primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary education as a % of total public expenditure (2008) ^{5, 6} Total expenditure on primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary education from public sources (2007) (%) Annual expenditure per student by educational institutions, (2007) (US\$) ^{6, 7}	3.9 3.5 7.8 99.9	3.6 9.0 90.3	=8/29 =17/29 =19/29 2/25
Expenditure on primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary institutions as a % of GDP, from public and private sources 1995 2000 2007 Public expenditure on primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary education as a % of total public expenditure (2008) ^{5, 6} Total expenditure on primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary education from public sources (2007) (%) Annual expenditure per student by educational institutions, (2007) (US\$) ^{6, 7} Primary	3.9 3.5 7.8 99.9	3.6 9.0 90.3	=8/29 =17/29 =19/29 2/25
Expenditure on primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary institutions as a % of GDP, from public and private sources 1995 2000 2007 Public expenditure on primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary education as a % of total public expenditure (2008) ^{5, 6} Total expenditure on primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary education from public sources (2007) (%) Annual expenditure per student by educational institutions, (2007) (US\$) ^{6, 7} Primary Lower secondary	3.9 3.5 7.8 99.9 5011 6497	3.6 9.0 90.3 6741 7598	=8/29 =17/29 =19/29 2/25 21/28 19/26
Expenditure on primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary institutions as a % of GDP, from public and private sources 1995 2000 2007 Public expenditure on primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary education as a % of total public expenditure (2008) ^{5, 6} Total expenditure on primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary education from public sources (2007) (%) Annual expenditure per student by educational institutions, (2007) (US\$) ^{6, 7} Primary Lower secondary Upper secondary	3.9 3.5 7.8 99.9 5011 6497 7243	3.6 9.0 90.3 6741 7598 8746	=8/29 =17/29 =19/29 2/25 2/25 21/28 19/26 19/26
Expenditure on primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary institutions as a % of GDP, from public and private sources 1995 2000 2007 Public expenditure on primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary education as a % of total public expenditure (2008) ^{5, 6} Total expenditure on primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary education from public sources (2007) (%) Annual expenditure per student by educational institutions, (2007) (US\$) ^{6, 7} Primary Lower secondary Upper secondary All secondary	3.9 3.5 7.8 99.9 5011 6497	3.6 9.0 90.3 6741 7598	=8/29 =17/29 =19/29 2/25 21/28 19/26
Expenditure on primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary institutions as a % of GDP, from public and private sources 1995 2000 2007 Public expenditure on primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary education as a % of total public expenditure (2008) ^{5, 6} Total expenditure on primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary education from public sources (2007) (%) Annual expenditure per student by educational institutions, (2007) (US\$) ^{6, 7} Primary Lower secondary Upper secondary All secondary Change in expenditure per student by educational institutions, primary, secondary	3.9 3.5 7.8 99.9 5011 6497 7243	3.6 9.0 90.3 6741 7598 8746	=8/29 =17/29 =19/29 2/25 2/25 21/28 19/26 19/26
Expenditure on primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary institutions as a % of GDP, from public and private sources 1995 2000 2007 Public expenditure on primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary education as a % of total public expenditure (2008) ^{5, 6} Total expenditure on primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary education from public sources (2007) (%) Annual expenditure per student by educational institutions, (2007) (US\$) ^{6, 7} Primary Lower secondary Upper secondary Upper secondary All secondary Change in expenditure per student by educational institutions, primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary education, index of change between 1995, 2000 and	3.9 3.5 7.8 99.9 5011 6497 7243	3.6 9.0 90.3 6741 7598 8746	=8/29 =17/29 =19/29 2/25 2/25 21/28 19/26 19/26
Expenditure on primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary institutions as a % of GDP, from public and private sources 1995 2000 2007 Public expenditure on primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary education as a % of total public expenditure (2008) ^{5, 6} Total expenditure on primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary education from public sources (2007) (%) Annual expenditure per student by educational institutions, (2007) (US\$) ^{6, 7} Primary Lower secondary Upper secondary All secondary Change in expenditure per student by educational institutions, primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary education, index of change between 1995, 2000 and 2007 (2000 = 100) ⁶	3.9 3.5 7.8 99.9 5011 6497 7243 6833	3.6 9.0 90.3 6741 7598 8746 8267	=8/29 =17/29 =19/29 2/25 21/28 19/26 19/26 22/28
Expenditure on primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary institutions as a % of GDP, from public and private sources 1995 2000 2007 Public expenditure on primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary education as a % of total public expenditure (2008) ^{5, 6} Total expenditure on primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary education from public sources (2007) (%) Annual expenditure per student by educational institutions, (2007) (US\$) ^{6, 7} Primary Lower secondary Upper secondary All secondary All secondary Change in expenditure per student by educational institutions, primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary education, index of change between 1995, 2000 and 2007 (2000 = 100) ⁶	3.9 3.5 7.8 99.9 5011 6497 7243 6833	3.6 9.0 90.3 6741 7598 8746 8267	=8/29 =17/29 =19/29 2/25 21/28 19/26 19/26 22/28
Expenditure on primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary institutions as a % of GDP, from public and private sources 1995 2000 2007 Public expenditure on primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary education as a % of total public expenditure (2008) ^{5, 6} Total expenditure on primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary education from public sources (2007) (%) Annual expenditure per student by educational institutions, (2007) (US\$) ^{6, 7} Primary Lower secondary Upper secondary All secondary Change in expenditure per student by educational institutions, primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary education, index of change between 1995, 2000 and 2007 (2000 = 100) ⁶ 1995 2007	3.9 3.5 7.8 99.9 5011 6497 7243 6833	3.6 9.0 90.3 6741 7598 8746 8267	=8/29 =17/29 =19/29 2/25 21/28 19/26 19/26 22/28
Expenditure on primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary institutions as a % of GDP, from public and private sources 1995 2000 2007 Public expenditure on primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary education as a % of total public expenditure (2008) ^{5, 6} Total expenditure on primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary education from public sources (2007) (%) Annual expenditure per student by educational institutions, (2007) (US\$) ^{6, 7} Primary Lower secondary Upper secondary Upper secondary All secondary Change in expenditure per student by educational institutions, primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary education, index of change between 1995, 2000 and 2007 (2000 = 100) ⁶ 1995 2007 Current expenditure – composition, primary, secondary and post-secondary non-	3.9 3.5 7.8 99.9 5011 6497 7243 6833	3.6 9.0 90.3 6741 7598 8746 8267	=8/29 =17/29 =19/29 2/25 21/28 19/26 19/26 22/28
Expenditure on primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary institutions as a % of GDP, from public and private sources 1995 2000 2007 Public expenditure on primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary education as a % of total public expenditure (2008) ^{5, 6} Total expenditure on primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary education from public sources (2007) (%) Annual expenditure per student by educational institutions, (2007) (US\$) ^{6, 7} Primary Lower secondary Upper secondary Upper secondary All secondary Change in expenditure per student by educational institutions, primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary education, index of change between 1995, 2000 and 2007 (2000 = 100) ⁶ 1995 2007 Current expenditure – composition, primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary education (2007) ^{6, 8}	3.9 3.5 7.8 99.9 5011 6497 7243 6833	3.6 9.0 90.3 6741 7598 8746 8267	=8/29 =17/29 =19/29 2/25 21/28 19/26 19/26 22/28
Expenditure on primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary institutions as a % of GDP, from public and private sources 1995 2000 2007 Public expenditure on primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary education as a % of total public expenditure (2008) ^{5, 6} Total expenditure on primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary education from public sources (2007) (%) Annual expenditure per student by educational institutions, (2007) (US\$) ^{6, 7} Primary Lower secondary Upper secondary Upper secondary All secondary Change in expenditure per student by educational institutions, primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary education, index of change between 1995, 2000 and 2007 (2000 = 100) ⁶ 1995 2007 Current expenditure – composition, primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary education (2007) ^{6, 8} Compensation of teachers	3.9 3.5 7.8 99.9 5011 6497 7243 6833 72 109	3.6 9.0 90.3 6741 7598 8746 8267 88 125	=8/29 =17/29 =19/29 2/25 21/28 19/26 19/26 22/28 19/22 20/27
Expenditure on primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary institutions as a % of GDP, from public and private sources 1995 2000 2007 Public expenditure on primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary education as a % of total public expenditure (2008) ^{5, 6} Total expenditure on primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary education from public sources (2007) (%) Annual expenditure per student by educational institutions, (2007) (US\$) ^{6, 7} Primary Lower secondary Upper secondary All secondary Change in expenditure per student by educational institutions, primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary education, index of change between 1995, 2000 and 2007 (2000 = 100) ⁶	3.9 3.5 7.8 99.9 5011 6497 7243 6833	3.6 9.0 90.3 6741 7598 8746 8267	=8/29 =17/29 =19/29 2/25 21/28 19/26 19/26 22/28

	Portugal	Country average ¹	Portugal's rank ²
SCHOOL STAFF NUMBERS			
2 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4			
Ratio of students to teaching staff (2008) ⁹	11.3	16.4	23/27
Primary Lower Secondary	8.1	13.7	=23/24
Upper Secondary	7.3	13.5	24/24
All Secondary	7.7	13.7	29/29
CHARACTERISTICS OF THE TEACHER WORKFORCE			
(lower secondary education, 2007/08) Source: TALIS (OECD, 2009b) ¹⁰			
Age distribution of teachers			
Teachers aged under 25 years	0.5	3.0	=20/23
Teachers aged 25-29 years	7.4	12.1	17/23
Teachers aged 30-39 years	40.0	28.0	2/23
Teachers aged 40-49 years	36.3	29.6	5/23
Teachers aged 50-59 years	14.2	23.5	19/23
Teachers aged 60 years and more Gender distribution of teachers (% of females)	1.7 70.7	3.9 69.3	14/23 10/23
Teachers' educational attainment	/ U. /	09.3	10/23
% of teachers who completed an ISCED 5A qualification or higher ⁴	95.3	83.7	9/23
Employment status of teachers % of teachers permanently employed	67.6	84.5	23/23
	07.0	01.5	25,25
TEACHER SALARIES in public institutions, Source: Education at a Glance (OECD, 2010a) ³			
Annual teacher salaries (2008) ⁷			
Primary – starting salary (US\$)	21677	28949	25/29
Primary – 15 years experience (US\$)	35486	39426	20/29
Primary – top of scale (US\$)	55654	48022	8/29
Primary – ratio of salary after 15 years experience to GDP per capita	1.55	1.16	=2/29
Lower secondary – starting salary (US\$) Lower secondary – 15 years experience (US\$)	21677 35486	30750 41927	25/29 20/29
Lower secondary – top of scale (US\$)	55654	50649	10/29
Lower secondary – ratio of salary after 15 years experience to GDP per capita	1.55	1.22	4/29
Upper secondary – starting salary (US\$)	21677	32563	25/28
Upper secondary – 15 years experience (US\$)	35486	45850	21/28
Upper secondary – top of scale (US\$)	55654	54717	13/28
Upper secondary – ratio of salary after 15 years experience to GDP per capita	1.55	1.29	6/28
Number of years from starting to top salary (lower secondary education) (2008)	31	24	10/27
Decisions on payments for teachers in public schools (2008) ¹¹ Criteria for base salary and additional payments awarded to teachers in public			
institutions ■ Base salary/■ Additional yearly payment /∆ Additional incidental payment			
Years of experience as a teacher	•	•29 ■ 9 ∆8	
Management responsibilities in addition to teaching duties		•12 ■18 Δ7	
Teaching more classes or hours than required by full-time contract	Δ	•2 ■10 Δ17	
Special tasks (career guidance or counselling)	•	●4 ■13 Δ11	
Teaching in a disadvantaged, remote or high cost area (location allowance)	-	•9 ■18 Δ4	
Special activities (e.g. sports and drama clubs, homework clubs, summer schools etc.)	-	●1 ■8 Δ12	
Teaching students with special educational needs (in regular schools)	•	●9 ■11 Δ5	
Teaching courses in a particular field		•5 ■ 8 ∆4	
Holding an initial educational qualification higher than the minimum qualification required to enter the teaching profession	•	•18 ■ 9 Δ5	
Holding a higher than minimum level of teacher certification or training obtained during professional life	•	•15 ■11 Δ3	
Outstanding performance in teaching	_	•5 ■ 9 ∆8	
Successful completion of professional development activities	•	•10 ■ 7 Δ4	
Reaching high scores in the qualification examination	•	●4 ■3 Δ3	
Holding an educational qualification in multiple subjects	-	•3 ■4 △3	
Family status (married, number of children)		•2 ■8 Δ1	
Age (independent of years of teaching experience)	-	●4 ■3 Δ1	
Other	_	●1 ■ 8 Δ2	

	Portugal	Country average ¹	Portugal's rank ²
TEACHER PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (lower secondary education)			
Source: TALIS (OECD, 2009b) ¹⁰			
Teacher participation in professional development (2007/08)			
% of teachers who undertook some prof. development in the previous 18 months	85.8	88.5	17/23
Average days of professional development across all teachers	18.5	15.3	7/23
Average days of professional development among those who received some	21.6	17.3	7/23
Average % of professional development days taken that were compulsory	35.1	51.0	20/23
Types of professional development undertaken by teachers (2007/08) Courses and workshops	77.0	81.2	16/23
Education conferences and seminars	51.6	48.9	9/23
Qualification programmes	29.5	24.5	7/23
Observation visits to other schools	26.4	27.6	10/23
Professional development network	15.0	40.0	23/23
Individual and collaborative research	47.1	35.4	8/23
Mentoring and peer observation	14.6	34.9	23/23
Reading professional literature	73.3	77.7	15/23
Informal dialogue to improve teaching	94.2	92.6	=8/23
Impact of different types of professional development undertaken by teachers			
(2007/08)			
% of teachers reporting that the professional development undertaken had a moderate or			
high impact upon their development as a teacher			
Courses and workshops	82.8	80.6	11/23
Education conferences and seminars	73.0	73.9	16/23
Qualification programmes	87.0	87.2	15/23
Observation visits to other schools	67.4	74.9	19/23
Professional development network	80.7	80.2	14/23
Individual and collaborative research	94.0	89.3	5/23
Mentoring and peer observation	87.6	77.6	4/23
Reading professional literature	78.9	82.8	16/23
Informal dialogue to improve teaching	88.1	86.7	10/23
Teachers' high professional development needs (2007/08) % of teachers indicating they have a "high level of need" for professional development			
in the following areas			
Content and performance standards	9.8	16.0	15/23
Student assessment practices	6.9	15.7	21/23
Classroom management	5.8	13.3	19/23
Subject field	4.8	17.0	21/23
Instructional practices	7.7	17.1	18/23
ICT teaching skills	24.2	24.7	12/23
Teaching special learning needs students	50.0 17.4	31.3 21.4	2/23 15/23
Student discipline and behaviour problems	18.2	9.7	3/23
School management and administration Teaching in a multicultural setting	17.0	13.9	7/23
Student counselling	8.5	16.7	18/23
Student counsening	6.3	10.7	10/23
TEACHER PERCEPTION OF SELF-EFFICACY			
(lower secondary education) Source: TALIS (OECD, 2009b) ¹⁰ % of teachers who "strongly agree" or "agree" with the statement "Teachers feel that	89.8	92.3	17/23
they are making a significant educational difference" (2007/08) % of teachers who "strongly agree" or "agree" with the statement "Teachers feel that	65.0	82.7	23/23
when they try really hard, they can make progress with even the most difficult and	05.0	02.7	43143
unmotivated students" (2007/08)			
SYSTEM EVALUATION			
Examination regulations, public schools only (2008) Source: Education at a Glance (OECD, 2010a) ^{3, 12}			
Primary education (Yes/No)			
A standard curriculum or partially standardised curriculum is required	Yes	27/29	
Mandatory national examination is required ¹³	No	4/29	
Mandatory national assessment is required ¹⁴	Yes	19/29	
Lower secondary education (Yes/No)			
A standard curriculum or partially standardised curriculum is required	Yes	27/29	
	* *	10/00	
Mandatory national examination is required Mandatory national assessment is required	Yes	10/28 18/29	

	Portugal	Country average ¹	Portugal's rank ²
Potential subjects of assessment at national examinations 13 (lower secondary			
education) (2006) Source: Education at a Glance (OECD, 2008) ^{3, 12}	N/	0/25	
National examinations exist (Yes/No)	Yes	8/25	
Mathematics Science	Yes No	9/9 7/9	
National language or language of instruction	Yes	9/9	
Other subjects	No	8/9	
Compulsory for schools to administer national examinations (Yes/No)	Yes	7/9	
Year/Grade of national examination	9	9.2	
Potential subjects of assessment at national periodical assessments ¹⁴ (lower	-		
secondary education) (2006) Source: Education at a Glance (OECD, 2008) ^{3, 12}			
National periodical assessments (Yes/No)	No	14/25	
Mathematics	a	12/13	
Science	a	5/13	
National language or language of instruction	a	12/13	
Other subjects	a	6/12	
Compulsory for school to administer national assessment (Yes/No) Year/Grade of national assessment	a a	10/13	
Possible influence of national examinations (lower secondary education) (2006)	u		
Source: Education at a Glance (OECD, 2008) ³			
None/Low/Moderate/High ¹⁵			
Performance feedback to the school	None		Moderate:1 High:3
Performance appraisal of the school management	None		Moderate:1 High:1
Performance appraisal of individual teachers	None		Moderate:0 H igh:1
The school budget	None		Moderate:0 High:0
The provision of another financial reward or sanction	None		Moderate:0 High:0
The assistance provided to teachers to improve their teaching skills	None		Moderate: 3 High: 0
Remuneration and bonuses received by teachers	None		Moderate: 0 High: 0
Likelihood of school closure Publication of results (Yes/No) ¹²	None	9/10	Moderate:1 High:0
Publication of tables that compare school performance (Yes/No)	Yes No	2/10	
Possible influence of national periodical assessments (lower secondary education) (2006) Source: Education at a Glance (OECD, 2008) ³ None/Low/Moderate/High ¹⁵			
Performance feedback to the school	a	None:4 Low:1	Moderate:2 High:3
Performance appraisal of the school management	a		Moderate:1 High:0
Performance appraisal of individual teachers	a		Moderate:0 High:0
The school budget	a		Moderate:0 High:0
The provision of another financial reward or sanction	a		Moderate:0 High:0
The assistance provided to teachers to improve their teaching skills	a		Moderate:3 High:0
Remuneration and bonuses received by teachers	a		Moderate:0 High:0
Likelihood of school closure	a		Moderate:0 High:1
Publication of results (Yes/No) ¹²	a	7/12	
Publication of tables that compare school performance (Yes/No)	a	2/12	
Existence of national tests (2008/09) Source: Eurydice (2009) Source: Eurydice (2009) Number of national tests (2008/09) (primary and lower secondary education) Source: E	Yes (2000) ¹⁶	30/35	
			=4/22
Compulsory tests Sample tests	3	2.7 2.3	-4/22
Optional tests ¹⁷	-	2.3	-
Years of testing	4,6,9	2.3	-
Number of subjects covered in national tests ¹⁸	2	2 subjects:14	3 subjects:11
	_	3+ subjects:13	Does not apply:5
Main aims of nationally standardised tests (2008/09) (primary and lower secondary		-	
education) Source: Eurydice (2009) ^{12, 16} (Yes/No)			
Taking decisions about the school career of pupils	Yes	17/30	
Monitoring schools and/or the education system	Yes	21/30	
Identifying individual learning needs	No	12/30	
Bodies responsible for setting national tests (2008/09) (primary and lower secondary education) Source: Eurydice (2009) ^{11, 16}			
● Tests for taking decisions about the school career of pupils/■Tests for other			
purposes/ΔNo national tests			
A unit/agency within the ministry of education without external players	-	● 2 ■ 0 Δ5	
A unit/agency within the ministry of education with external players	•=	•3 ■10 ∆5	
A public body distinct from the ministry, which specialises in education or educational	-	•11 ■ 16 Δ5	
evaluation			
A private body or university department	-	●4 ■4 ∆5	

	Portugal	Country average ¹	Portugal's rank ²
People in charge of administering national tests (2008/09) (primary and lower			
secondary education) Source: Eurydice (2009) ^{11, 16}			
 Tests for taking decisions about the school career of pupils/ ■Tests for other purposes/ ΔNo national tests 			
Class teachers	_	●10 ■15 ∆5	
Class teachers + external people	_	•1 ■3 Δ5	
Other teachers from the same school	•=	●3 ■3 Δ5	
Other teachers from the same school + external people	-	●1 ■4 Δ5	
External people alone	-	●3 ■5 ∆5	<u> </u>
Persons in charge of marking national tests (2008/09) (primary and lower secondary education) Source: Eurydice (2009) ^{11, 16}			
• Tests for taking decisions about the school career of pupils/■ Tests for other			
purposes/ΔNo national tests		7 10 4	-
Class teachers	-	•7 ■10 Δ: •4 ■2 Δ5	
Class teachers + external people Other teachers from the same school	-	●4 ■2 △3 ●1 ■3 △5	
Other teachers from the same school + external persons	_	•0 ■1 Δ5	
External persons alone	•=	●8 ■16 Δ:	
		-0 =10 =1	
Standardisation of test questions (2008/09) (primary and lower secondary education) Source: Eurydice (2009) ^{12, 16} (Yes/No)			
Questions are the same for all pupils taking one national test	Yes	19/30	
Questions are not the same for all pupils taking one national test	No	8/30	
Whether test questions are standardised or not varies depending on type of test	No	2/30	
Data not available	No	1/30	
Use of ICT in national testing (2008/09) (primary and lower secondary education)			
Source: Eurydice (2009) ^{12, 16} (Yes/No)	No	11/20	
ICT is currently used in national tests Use of ICT for on-screen testing	No No	11/30 3/30	
Use of ICT for marking tests	No	8/30	
Participation of students with special educational needs (SEN) in national testing	110	8/30	
(2008/09) (primary and lower secondary education) Source: Eurydice (2009) ^{12, 16}			
(Yes/No)			
Pupils with SEN may take part in national testing	Yes	27/30	
Participation in national testing for pupils with SEN is compulsory	Yes	12/30	
Participation in national testing for pupils with SEN is optional	No	9/30	
Participation varies depending on type of test, level of education or type of school	No	5/30	
Data not available	No	1/30	
Communication of the results of national tests to local authorities (2008/09) (primary			
and lower secondary education) Source: Eurydice (2009) ^{12, 16} (Yes/No) Local authorities have access to aggregated results for their own area	No	17/30	
Use of achievement data for accountability (2009) (15-year-olds) Source: PISA	INU	1 // 30	
Compendium for the school questionnaire (OECD, 2010c) ³			
% of students in schools where the principal reported that achievement data is used in the			
following procedures			
Posted publicly	30.1	36.4	22/33
Used in evaluation of the principal's performance	11.7	35.5	28/33
Used in evaluation of teachers' performance	17.1	44.2	29/33
Used in decisions about instructional resource allocation to the school	54.2	32.2	8/33
Tracked over time by an administrative authority	66.3	65.2	19/33
SCHOOL EVALUATION			
Requirements for school evaluations by an inspectorate (lower secondary education)		Nor -: 4	1 man 2 1
(2006) Source: Education at a Glance (OECD, 2008) ³	1 2	None:4	1 per 3+ years:5
None/1 per 3+ years/1 per 3 years/1 per 2 years/1 per year/1+ per year	1 per 3+ years	1 per year:1	1 per 2 years:0 1+ per year:1
Possible influence of school evaluation by an inspectorate (lower secondary		i per year.i	1. por your.i
education) (2006) Source: Education at a Glance (OECD, 2008) ³			
None/Low/Moderate/High ¹⁵			
Influence on performance feedback			
Performance feedback to the school	High	None:0 Low:1 N	Moderate:1 High:10
Performance appraisal of the school management	High		Moderate:3 High:7
Performance appraisal of individual teachers	a	None:1 Low:5	Moderate:2 High:3
Financial and other implications		N	M. L. A. O. III. I. I
The school budget The provision of another financial reward or sanction	a		Moderate: 2 High: 1
The provision of anomer financial feward of Sanction	a	110HC.4 LOW.4	Moderate:0 High:1

	Portugal	Country average ¹	Portugal's rank ²
The assistance provided to teachers to improve their teaching skills	Moderate	None:1 Low:2	Moderate:6 High:2
Remuneration and bonuses received by teachers	None		Moderate:2 High:0
Likelihood of school closure	a		Moderate:2 High:2
Publication of results (Yes/No) ¹² Publication of tables that compare calcular performance (Yes/No)	Yes	11/13 1/12	
Publication of tables that compare school performance (Yes/No) Requirements for school self-evaluations (lower secondary education) (2006)	No	1/12	
Source: Education at a Glance (OECD, 2008) ³		None:6	1 per 3+ years:1
None/1 per 3+ years/1 per 3 years/1 per 2 years/1 per year/1+ per year	1+ per year		1 per 2 years:0 1+ per year:3
Possible influence of school self-evaluations (lower secondary education) (2006)			•
Source: Education at a Glance (OECD, 2008) ³ None/Low/Moderate/High ¹⁵			
Influence on performance feedback			
Performance feedback to the school	None		Moderate:1 High:8
Performance appraisal of the school management	None		Moderate:4 High:4
Performance appraisal of individual teachers	None	None:4 Low:4	Moderate:2 High:2
Financial and other implications	N	N 5 I 2	M 1 2 III 1 1
The provision of spether financial reward or constitution	None		Moderate: 2 High: 1 Moderate: 1 High: 0
The provision of another financial reward or sanction The assistance provided to teachers to improve their teaching skills	None None		Moderate:1 High:5
Remuneration and bonuses received by teachers	None		Moderate:0 High:1
Likelihood of school closure	None		Moderate: 1 High: 0
Publication of results (Yes/No) ¹²	No	4/14	moderate.r ringin.o
Publication of tables that compare school performance (Yes/No)	No	1/14	
Frequency and type of school evaluations (lower secondary education) (2007/08)			
Source: TALIS (OECD, 2009b) ¹⁰			
% of teachers working in schools where school evaluations were conducted with the			
following frequency over the last five years			
Frequency of school self-evaluation			- /
Never	47.9	20.2	2/23
Once	19.3	16.2	7/23
2-4 times	13.3 13.0	18.3 34.9	18/23 20/23
Once per year More than once per year	6.4	10.3	14/23
Frequency of external evaluation	0.4	10.3	14/23
Never	49.1	30.4	6/23
Once	29.9	30.8	12/23
2-4 times	18.2	20.5	15/23
Once per year	2.1	11.4	19/23
More than once per year	0.6	7.0	20/23
No school evaluation from any source	32.8	13.8	3/23
Criteria of school evaluations (lower secondary education) (2007/08) Source: TALIS (OECD, 2009b) ¹⁰			
% of teachers whose school principal reported that the following criteria were considered			
with high or moderate importance in school self-evaluations or external evaluations			
Student test scores	65.9	76.2	17/23
Retention and pass rates of students	94.2	70.8	2/23
Other student learning outcomes	85.2	78.9	6/23
Student feedback on the teaching they receive Feedback from parents	73.5 78.3	72.7 77.3	10/23 13/23
How well teachers work with the principal and their colleagues	78.3 79.8	83.7	17/23
Direct appraisal of classroom teaching	40.8	71.1	22/23
Innovative teaching practices	71.8	76.7	18/23
Relations between teachers and students	88.7	87.1	11/23
Professional development undertaken by teachers	72.7	81.5	20/23
Teachers' classroom management	72.5	80.7	17/23
Teachers' knowledge and understanding of their main subject field(s)	75.4	78.2	17/23
Teachers' knowledge and understanding of instructional practices in their main subject field(s)	78.4	77.5	16/23
Teaching of students with special learning needs	80.7	77.2	11/23
Student discipline and behaviour	80.4	83.6	16/23
Teaching in a multicultural setting	57.9	52.9	8/23
Extra-curricular activities with students (<i>e.g.</i> school plays and performances, sporting activities)	83.3	74.5	10/23

	Portugal	Country average ¹	Portugal's rank ²
Impacts of school evaluations upon schools (lower secondary education) (2007/08)			
Source: TALIS (OECD, 2009b) ¹⁰ % of teachers whose school principal reported that school evaluations (external or self-			
evaluation) had a high or moderate level of influence on the following			
Level of school budget or its distribution within schools	35.8	38.0	11/23
Performance feedback to the school	91.6	81.3	5/23
Performance appraisal of the school management	91.1	78.7	3/23
Performance appraisal of teachers Assistance provided to teachers to improve their teaching	57.3 55.1	71.1 70.3	19/23 19/23
Teachers' remuneration and bonuses	2.6	26.1	=21/23
Publication of school evaluations (lower secondary education) (2007/08) Source:	2.0	20.1	21/20
TALIS (OECD, 2009b) ¹⁰			
% of teachers in schools where school evaluation results were :			
Published; or	63.2	55.3	11/23
Used in school performance tables	23.5	28.7	15/23
Use of student test results in school evaluation (2008/09) (primary and lower secondary education) Source: Eurydice (2009) ^{12, 16} (Yes/No)			
Test results may be used for evaluation	Yes	15/30	
Test results used for external evaluation	No	5/30	
Recommendations or support tools for the use of results during internal evaluation	No	7/30	
Use varies depending on type of test, level of education or type of school	Yes	3/30	
Publication of individual school results in national tests (2008/09) (primary and lower			
secondary education) Source: Eurydice (2009) ^{12, 16} (Yes/No)		40	
Individual school results may be published	No	10/30	
Publication organised, or required of schools, by central/local governments	No No	9/30	
Publication at the discretion of schools Accountability to parents (2009) (15-year-olds) Source: PISA Compendium for the	No	1/30	
school questionnaire (OECD, 2010c) ³			
% of students in schools where principals reported that their school provides parents with			
information on:			
This child's academic performance relative to other students in the school	36.5	46.1	21/32
This child's academic performance relative to national or regional benchmarks	41.7	46.8	17/33
This child's academic performance of students as a group relative to students in the	11.5	23.1	24/33
same grade in other schools TEACHER APPRAISAL			
Frequency and source of teacher appraisal and feedback (lower secondary			
education) (2007/08) Source: TALIS (OECD, 2009b) ¹⁰			
% of teachers who reported having received appraisal and/or feedback on their work			
with the following frequency from the following sources			
Feedback received from the principal			
Never	38.8	22.0	4/23
Less than once every two years	8.4	9.2	9/23
Once every two years	2.5	4.5	17/23
Once per year Twice per year	16.8 6.7	22.8 12.3	18/23 22/23
3 or more times per year	16.8	17.1	11/23
Monthly	4.5	6.6	=13/23
More than once per month	5.4	5.4	11/23
Feedback received from other teachers or members of the school management team			
Never	31.4	28.6	8/23
Less than once every two years	5.1	6.9	15/23
Once every two years	1.6 9.5	2.6 13.3	=20/23
Once per year Twice per year	9.3 6.3	9.7	18/23 20/23
3 or more times per year	23.5	19.3	6/23
Monthly	11.0	10.4	9/23
More than once per month	11.6	9.1	6/23
Feedback received from an external individual or body (e.g. external inspector)			
Never	84.0	50.7	2/23
Less than once every two years	7.7	19.0	19/23
Once per years	2.0 4.2	5.4 13.2	19/23 22/23
Once per year Twice per year	4.2 0.9	5.4	=22/23
3 or more times per year	0.9	4.3	22/23
Monthly	0.2	1.2	23/23
	0.1	0.8	23/23

	Portugal	Country average ¹	Portugal's rank ²
Criteria for teacher appraisal and feedback (lower secondary education) (2007/08)			
Source: TALIS (OECD, 2009b) ¹⁰ % of teachers who reported that the following criteria were considered with high or			
moderate importance in the appraisal and/or feedback they received			
Student test scores	64.4	65.0	12/23
Retention and pass rates of students	75.2	56.2	3/23
Other student learning outcomes	71.0	68.4	11/23
Student feedback on the teaching they receive	82.7	72.8	6/23
Feedback from parents	73.3	69.1	8/23
How well they work with the principal and their colleagues	80.5	77.5	6/23
Direct appraisal of classroom teaching Innovative teaching practices	55.3 69.4	73.5 70.7	20/23 13/23
Relations with students	69.4 90.9	85.2	5/23
Professional development undertaken	66.4	64.5	10/23
Classroom management	76.4	79.7	14/23
Knowledge and understanding of their main subject field(s)	78.6	80.0	13/23
Knowledge and understanding of instructional practices in their main subject field(s)	78.9	78.2	13/23
Teaching of students with special learning needs	58.2	57.2	11/23
Student discipline and behaviour	80.2	78.2	11/23
Teaching in a multicultural setting	47.9	45.0	10/23
Extra-curricular activities with students (e.g. school performances, sporting activities)	72.9	62.3	8/23
Outcomes of teacher appraisal and feedback (lower secondary education) (2007/08)			
Source: TALIS (OECD, 2009b) ¹⁰			
% of teachers who reported that the appraisal and/or feedback they received let to a			
modest or large change in the following aspects of their work and careers			-0/
A change in salary	1.7	9.1	=20/23
A financial bonus or another kind of monetary reward	0.6	11.1	22/23
A change in the likelihood of career advancement	6.2 26.3	16.2	19/23
Public recognition from the principal and/or their colleagues Opportunities for professional development activities	26.3 11.3	36.4 23.7	15/23 20/23
Changes in work responsibilities that make the job more attractive	25.3	26.7	9/23
A role in school development initiatives (e.g. curriculum development group)	25.3	29.6	12/23
Actions undertaken following the identification of a weakness in a teacher appraisal (lower secondary education) (2007/08) Source: TALIS (OECD, 2009b) ¹⁰			
% of teachers whose school principal reported that the following occurs if an appraisal of			
teachers' work identifies a specific weakness			
The principal ensures that the outcome is reported to the teacher			
Never	0.5	2.6	=12/23
Sometimes	14.5	9.5	4/23
Most of the time	24.5	25.8	14/23
Always	60.6	62.1	13/23
The principal ensures that measures to remedy the weakness in their teaching are			
discussed with the teacher Never	0.0	1.0	=11/23
Sometimes	16.9	9.4	4/23
Most of the time	26.0	30.7	15/23
Always	57.1	58.9	15/23
The principal, or others in the school, establishes a development or training plan for the	37.1	30.9	15/25
teacher to address the weakness in their teaching			
Never	13.6	10.5	7/23
		22.0	16/23
Sometimes	29.4	33.0	10/23
Sometimes Most of the time	35.6	33.0 35.9	10/23
Most of the time Always			
Most of the time Always The principal, or others in the school, imposes material sanctions on the teacher (e.g. reduced annual increases in pay)	35.6 21.3	35.9	10/23
Most of the time Always The principal, or others in the school, imposes material sanctions on the teacher (e.g. reduced annual increases in pay) Never	35.6 21.3 98.6	35.9 20.6 86.0	10/23 9/23 4/23
Most of the time Always The principal, or others in the school, imposes material sanctions on the teacher (e.g. reduced annual increases in pay) Never Sometimes	35.6 21.3 98.6 1.4	35.9 20.6 86.0 11.3	10/23 9/23 4/23 20/23
Most of the time Always The principal, or others in the school, imposes material sanctions on the teacher (e.g. reduced annual increases in pay) Never Sometimes Most of the time	35.6 21.3 98.6 1.4 0.0	35.9 20.6 86.0 11.3 1.8	10/23 9/23 4/23 20/23 =14/23
Most of the time Always The principal, or others in the school, imposes material sanctions on the teacher (e.g. reduced annual increases in pay) Never Sometimes Most of the time Always	35.6 21.3 98.6 1.4	35.9 20.6 86.0 11.3	10/23 9/23 4/23 20/23
Most of the time Always The principal, or others in the school, imposes material sanctions on the teacher (e.g. reduced annual increases in pay) Never Sometimes Most of the time Always The principal, or others in the school, report the underperformance to another body to take action (e.g. governing board, local authority, school inspector)	35.6 21.3 98.6 1.4 0.0 0.0	35.9 20.6 86.0 11.3 1.8 0.9	10/23 9/23 4/23 20/23 =14/23 =14/23
Most of the time Always The principal, or others in the school, imposes material sanctions on the teacher (e.g. reduced annual increases in pay) Never Sometimes Most of the time Always The principal, or others in the school, report the underperformance to another body to take action (e.g. governing board, local authority, school inspector) Never	35.6 21.3 98.6 1.4 0.0 0.0	35.9 20.6 86.0 11.3 1.8 0.9	10/23 9/23 4/23 20/23 =14/23 =14/23
Most of the time Always The principal, or others in the school, imposes material sanctions on the teacher (e.g. reduced annual increases in pay) Never Sometimes Most of the time Always The principal, or others in the school, report the underperformance to another body to take action (e.g. governing board, local authority, school inspector)	35.6 21.3 98.6 1.4 0.0 0.0	35.9 20.6 86.0 11.3 1.8 0.9	10/23 9/23 4/23 20/23 =14/23 =14/23

	Portugal	Country average ¹	Portugal's rank ²
The principal ensures that the teacher has more frequent appraisals of their work			
Never	11.6	9.0	5/23
Sometimes Mark after a felicitude	43.5	34.5	6/23 15/23
Most of the time	34.9 10.0	41.3 15.2	15/23
Always Teacher perceptions of the appraisal and/or feedback they received (lower	10.0	13.2	17/23
**Secondary education) (2007/08) Source: TALIS (OECD, 2009b) ¹⁰ **Of teachers who reported the following about the appraisal and/or feedback they had received in their school			
Appraisal and/or feedback contained a judgement about the quality of the teacher's work Appraisal and/or feedback contained suggestions for improving certain aspects of	77.4 56.1	74.7 58.0	10/23 16/23
teacher's work Appraisal and/or feedback was a fair assessment of their work as a teacher in this school			
Strongly disagree	4.2	4.4	10/23
Disagree	14.4	12.4	6/23
Agree	66.7	63.3	=9/23
Strongly agree	14.8	19.9	17/23
Appraisal and/or feedback was helpful in the development of their work as teachers in this school			
Strongly disagree	4.8	5.6	=11/23
Disagree	12.7	15.9	16/23
Agree	68.5	61.8	5/23
Strongly agree	14.0	16.8	15/23
Teacher perceptions of the personal impact of teacher appraisal and feedback (lower secondary education) (2007/08) Source: TALIS (OECD, 2009b) ¹⁰ % of teachers who reported the following changes following the appraisal and/or feedback they received in their school			
the following personal impact from appraisal and feedback			
Change in their job satisfaction			
A large decrease	3.9	2.5	2/23
A small decrease	5.8	4.8	7/23
No change	42.1	41.2	12/23
A small increase	38.2	37.3	12/23
A large increase Change in their job security	10.1	14.2	16/23
A large decrease	2.1	1.5	5/23
A small decrease	2.9	3.0	10/23
No change	77.7	61.9	4/23
A small increase	13.3	21.8	18/23
A large increase	4.0	11.8	22/23
Impact of teacher appraisal and feedback upon teaching (lower secondary education) (2007/08) Source: TALIS (OECD, 2009b) ¹⁰			
% of teachers who reported that the appraisal and/or feedback they received directly led			
to or involved moderate or large changes in the following			
Classroom management practices	22.4	37.6	20/23
Knowledge or understanding of the teacher's main subject field(s)	18.8	33.9	18/23
Knowledge or understanding of instructional practices	23.0	37.5	=16/23
A development or training plan for teachers to improve their teaching	26.8 21.4	37.4 27.2	15/23 16/23
Teaching of students with special learning needs Student discipline and behaviour problems	26.9	37.2	=16/23
Teaching of students in a multicultural setting	14.7	21.5	$\frac{-10/23}{13/23}$
Emphasis placed by teachers on improving student test scores in their teaching	35.5	41.2	12/23
Teacher appraisal and feedback and school development (lower secondary	33.3	71,2	12/23
education (2007/08) Source: TALIS (OECD, 2009b) ¹⁰ % of teachers who agree or strongly agree with the following statements about aspects of			
appraisal and/or feedback in their school In this school, the school principal takes steps to alter the monetary reward of the	22.4	23.1	12/23
persistently underperforming teacher In this school, the sustained poor performance of a teacher would be tolerated by the rest	20.0	33.8	20/23
of the staff In this school, teachers will be dismissed because of sustained poor performance	27.2	27.9	14/23
In this school, teachers will be dismissed because of sustained poor performance. In this school, the principal uses effective methods to determine whether teachers are performing well or badly.	57.2	55.4	11/23
In this school, a development or training plan is established for teachers to improve their work as teachers	49.3	59.7	17/23

	Portugal	Country average ¹	Portugal's rank ²
In this school, the most effective teachers receive the greatest monetary or non-monetary rewards	11.0	26.2	16/23
In this school, if I improve the quality of my teaching I will receive increased monetary or non-monetary rewards	17.8	25.8	13/23
In this school, if I am more innovative in my teaching I will receive increased monetary or non-monetary rewards	17.4	26.0	=13/23
In this school, the review of teacher's work is largely done to fulfil administrative requirements	47.9	44.3	10/23
In this school, the review of teacher's work has little impact upon the way teachers teach in the classroom	55.3	49.8	9/23
Official methods for the individual or collective evaluation of teachers (2006/07) Source: Eurydice (2008) ^{12, 16}			
Teacher evaluation exists	Yes	30/33	
Teacher inspection on an individual or collective basis	Yes	22/30	
School self-evaluation	Yes	14/30	
Individual evaluation by school heads	Yes	16/30	
Individual evaluation by peers	Yes	5/30	
Methods used to monitor the practice of teachers (2009) (15-year-olds) Source: PISA Compendium for the school questionnaire (OECD, 2010c) ³ % of students in schools where the principal reported that the following methods have			
been used the previous year to monitor the practice of teachers at their school			
Tests of assessments of student achievement	48.5	58.3	25/34
Teacher peer review (of lesson plans, assessment instruments, lessons)	78.4	56.3	12/34
Principal or senior staff observations of lessons	20.3	68.3	=30/34
Observation of classes by inspectors or other persons external to the school	1.5	28.0	33/34
STUDENT ASSESSMENT			
The influence of test results on the school career of pupils (2008/09) (primary and			
lower secondary education) Source: Eurydice (2009) ^{11, 16}			
ISCED 1/ ISCED 2 ⁴			
Award of certificates	ISCED 2	ISCED 1:2 ISC	ED 2:12
Streaming	-	ISCED 1:4 ISC	
Progression to the next stage of education	-	ISCED 1:1 ISC	ED 2:2
No national tests, or no impact on progression	ISCED 1	ISCED 1:29 ISC	CED 2:22
Completion requirements for upper secondary programmes Source: Education at a			
Glance (OECD, 2009a) ^{3, 11}			
 Final examination /■ Series of examinations during programme /Δ Specified number 			
of course hours and examination / ♦ Specified number of course hours only			
ISCED 3A ⁴	m	•21 ■ 19 Δ19 ♦ 3	
ISCED 3B	m	•6 ■ 8 △7 ♦ 0	
ISCED 3C	m	•17 ■ 18 △17 ♦ 1	
Student grouping by ability (2009) (15-year-olds) Source: PISA Compendium for the school questionnaire (OECD, 2010c) ³			
% of students in schools where principals reported the following on student grouping by ability			
Student are grouped by ability into different classes			
For all subjects	3.2	9.4	24/33
For some subjects	5.8	37.4	33/33
Not for any subject	87.0	50.4	2/33
Student are grouped by ability within their classes			
For all subjects	5.4	4.5	6/33
For some subjects	20.0	46.4	32/33
Not for any subject	71.9	47.0	2/33
Groups of influence on assessment practices (2009) (15-year-olds) Source: PISA			
Compendium for the school questionnaire (OECD, 2010c) ³			
% of students in schools where the principal reported the following groups exert a direct			
influence on decision making about assessment practices	00.7		4 /2 2
Regional or national education authorities (e.g. inspectorates)	93.5	56.6	1/33
The school's governing board	95.1	29.6	1/33
Parent groups	17.1	17.3	15/33
Teacher groups (e.g. staff association, curriculum committees, trade union)	3.0	58.1	33/33
Student groups (e.g. student association, youth organisation	1.2	23.4	32/33
External examination boards	95.1	45.2	2/31

	Portugal	Country average ¹	Portugal's rank ²
Responsibility for student assessment policies (2009) (15-year-olds) Source: PISA			
Compendium for the school questionnaire (OECD, 2010c) ³			
% of students in schools where the principal reported the following groups have			
considerable responsibility in establishing student assessment policies Establishing student assessment policies			
Principals	24.6	63.5	32/33
Teachers	60.2	69.0	25/33
School governing board	38.5	26.5	10/33
Regional or local education authority	8.2	15.5	14/32
National education authority	59.3	24.3	3/33
Frequency of student assessment by method (2009) (15-year-olds) Source: PISA			
Compendium for the school questionnaire (OECD, 2010c) ³			
% of students in schools where the principal reported the student assessment methods			
below are used with the indicated frequency Standardised tests			
Never	11.9	23.7	22/33
1-2 times a year	57.6	51.0	12/33
3-5 times a year	21.2	16.5	11/33
Monthly	6.1	4.3	10/33
More than once a month	1.2	3.4	=14/33
Teacher-developed tests			
Never	0.0	2.7	=20/33
1-2 times a year	0.7	6.7	=26/33
3-5 times a year	28.8	30.0	19/33
Monthly More than once a month	65.0 5.1	27.6 33.3	1/33 32/33
Teachers' judgmental ratings	3.1	33.3	32/33
Never	0.0	6.6	=28/33
1-2 times a year	1.4	12.0	32/33
3-5 times a year	1.8	22.9	32/33
Monthly	12.4	15.7	24/33
More than once a month	84.1	42.2	2/33
Student portfolios			
Never	12.0	24.1	25/33
1-2 times a year	48.9	34.4	4/33
3-5 times a year Monthly	24.5 5.8	20.6 10.4	11/33 24/33
More than once a month	5.2	9.3	=15/33
Student assignments/projects/homework	3.2	7.3	13/33
Never Never	1.3	1.5	=6/33
1-2 times a year	5.7	12.2	22/33
3-5 times a year	12.7	16.1	19/33
Monthly	13.6	13.6	18/33
More than once a month	66.4	56.5	=10/33
% of students reporting the following on the frequency of homework (2000)			
(15-year-olds) Source: PISA Student Compendium (Reading) (OECD, 2000) ³			
Teachers grade homework	5.2	140	22/27
Never Sometimes	5.2 47.3	14.9 44.2	22/27 11/27
Most of the time	47.3 30.4	44.2 24.5	=7/27
Always	15.0	13.9	10/27
Teachers make useful comments on homework	10.0	13.7	10/2/
Never	17.8	23.5	21/27
Sometimes	60.6	50.1	2/27
Most of the time	15.6	19.2	18/27
Always	4.3	4.9	16/27
Homework is counted as part of marking	2 -	10 =	0-7-
Never	2.7	13.7	25/27
Sometimes Mark of the dimen	21.3	33.3	23/27
Most of the time	26.3	25.7 24.7	15/27
Always Use of student assessments (2009) (15-year-olds) Source: PISA Compendium for the	48.3	24.7	3/27
school questionnaire (OECD, 2010c) ³			
% students in schools where the principal reported that assessments of students are used			
for the following purposes			
To inform the parents about their child's progress	99.0	97.5	13/33

	Portugal	Country average ¹	Portugal's rank ²
To make decisions about students' retention or promotion	97.2	77.1	5/33
To group students for instructional purposes	22.0	49.8	30/33
To compare the school to district or national performance	47.0	53.0	22/33
To monitor the school's progress from year to year	87.7	76.0	10/33
To make judgements about teachers' effectiveness	34.2	46.9	21/33
To identify aspects of instruction or the curriculum that could be improved	78.8	76.7	19/33
To compare the school with other schools	39.2	45.4	20/33
% of students repeating a grade in the previous school year according to reports by school principals in the following levels (2009) (15-year-olds) Source: PISA Compendium for the school questionnaire (OECD, 2010c) ³	37.2		20,00
ISCED2 ⁴	9.5	3.2	2/29
ISCED3	10	4.5	3/29
% of students repeating one or more grades according to their own report (2009) (15-year-olds) Source: PISA Volume IV (OECD, 2010e) ³	35.0	13.0	4/34
Parents' perception of school's monitoring of student progress (2009) (15-year-olds) Source: PISA Compendium for the parent questionnaire (OECD, 2010b) ³ % of parents who agree or strongly agree with the following statements ¹⁹ My child's progress is carefully monitored by the school			
	20.6	18.5	3/8
Strongly agree			
Agree	67.7	59.4	1/8
Disagree	8.8	17.3	8/8
Strongly disagree	0.9	2.2	8/8
My child's school provides regular and useful information on my child's progress			
Strongly agree	25.9	19.9	2/8
Agree	60.7	54.3	=2/8
Disagree	10.3	19.7	8/8
Strongly disagree	1.7	4.0	8/8
Level of school autonomy regarding the criteria for the internal assessment of pupils (2006/07) (primary and lower secondary education) Source: Eurydice (2008) ^{12, 16}	E11	E-II-24 Limit-	1.10 N0
Full/Limited/No autonomy	Full	Full:24 Limited	1:10 NO:0
School decision-makers involved in determining the criteria for the internal assessment of pupils (2006/07) (primary and lower secondary education) Source: Eurydice (2008) ^{12, 16}			
School responsibilities involved	Yes	34/34	
School head	No	0/34	
Teachers individually or collectively	No	13/34	
School management body	No	0/34	
Responsibilities vary depending on level of education	Yes	21/34	
School autonomy in preparing the content of examinations for certified qualifications (2006/07) (primary and lower secondary education) Source: Eurydice (2008) ^{12, 16}			
School responsibility involved/examinations for certified qualifications exist	Yes	24/34	
Full/Limited/No autonomy	Full	Full:5 Limited	0 No:19
School decision-makers who may be involved in preparing the content of examinations for certified qualifications (ISCED 2) ⁴ (2006/07) Source: Eurydice (2008) ^{12, 16}		5/0.4	
School responsibility involved/ examinations for certified qualifications exist	Yes	5/34	
School head	No	0/5	
Teachers individually or collectively	No	1/5	
School management body	No	0/5	
Responsibilities vary depending on level of education	Yes	4/5	

Sources

Eurydice (2008), Levels of Autonomy and Responsibilities of Teachers in Europe, Eurydice, Brussels.

Eurydice (2009), National Testing of Pupils in Europe: Objectives, Organisation and Use of Results, Eurydice, Brussels.

OECD (2000), PISA Student Compendium (Reading), OECD, http://pisa2000.acer.edu.au/downloads.php/.

OECD (2008), Education at a Glance, OECD Indicators 2008, OECD, Paris.

OECD (2009a), Education at a Glance, OECD Indicators 2009, OECD, Paris.

OECD (2009b), Creating Effective Teaching and Learning Environments: First Results from TALIS, OECD, Paris.

OECD (2010a), Education at a Glance, OECD Indicators 2010, OECD, Paris.

OECD (2010b), PISA 2009 Compendium for the parent questionnaire, OECD, http://pisa2009.acer.edu.au/downloads.php.

OECD (2010c), PISA 2009 Compendium for the school questionnaire, OECD, http://pisa2009.acer.edu.au/downloads.php.

OECD (2010d), PISA 2009 Results: What Students Know and Can Do, Volume I, OECD, Paris.

OECD (2010e), PISA 2009 Results: What Makes a School Successful?: Resources, Policies and Practices, Volume IV, OECD, Paris.

Data explanation:

m Data are not available

- a Data are not applicable because the category does not apply
- ~ Average is not comparable with other levels of education
- = At least one other country has the same rank

The report Eurydice (2009) includes all 32 member countries/education areas of the European Union as well as the members of the European Economic Area (Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway).

TALIS is the OECD's Teaching and Learning International Survey which was implemented for the first time in 2007/08. The data provided concerns 23 countries. The results derived from TALIS are based on self-reports from teachers and principals and therefore represent their opinions, perceptions, beliefs and their accounts of their activities. Further information is available at www.oecd.org/edu/talis.

PISA is the OECD's Programme for International Student Assessment, which was undertaken in 2000, 2003, 2006 and 2009. 15-year-old students worldwide are assessed on their literacy in reading, mathematics and science. The study included 27 OECD countries in 2000, 30 in 2003 and 2006, and 34 in 2009. Data used in this appendix can be found at www.pisa.oecd.org.

General notes:

- 1. The country average is calculated as the simple average of all countries for which data are available.
- 2. "Portugal's rank" indicates the position of Portugal when countries are ranked in descending order from the highest to lowest value on the indicator concerned. For example, on the first indicator "population that has attained at least upper secondary education", for the age group 25-64, the rank 30/30 indicates that Portugal recorded the 30th highest value of the 30 countries that reported relevant data.
- 3. The column "country average" corresponds to an average across OECD countries.
- ISCED is the "International Standard Classification of Education" used to describe levels of education (and subcategories).

ISCED 1 - Primary education

Designed to provide a sound basic education in reading, writing and mathematics and a basic understanding of some other subjects. Entry age: between 5 and 7. Duration: 6 years

ISCED 2 - Lower secondary education

Completes provision of basic education, usually in a more subject-oriented way with more specialist teachers. Entry follows 6 years of primary education; duration is 3 years. In some countries, the end of this level marks the end of compulsory education.

ISCED 3 - Upper secondary education

Even stronger subject specialisation than at lower-secondary level, with teachers usually more qualified. Students typically expected to have completed 9 years of education or lower secondary schooling before entry and are generally around the age of 15 or 16.

ISCED 3A - Upper secondary education type A

Prepares students for university-level education at level 5A

ISCED 3B - Upper secondary education type B

For entry to vocationally oriented tertiary education at level 5B

ISECD 3C - Upper secondary education type C

Prepares students for workforce or for post-secondary non tertiary education

ISCED 4 - Post-secondary non-tertiary education

Programmes at this level may be regarded nationally as part of upper secondary or post-secondary education, but in terms of international comparison their status is less clear cut. Programme content may not be much more advanced than in upper secondary, and is certainly lower than at tertiary level. Entry typically requires completion of an upper secondary programme. Duration usually equivalent to between 6 months and 2 years of full-time study.

ISCED 5 - Tertiary education

ISCED 5 is the first stage of tertiary education (the second – ISCED 6 – involves advanced research). At level 5, it is often more useful to distinguish between two subcategories: 5A, which represent longer and more theoretical programmes; and 5B, where programmes are shorter and more practically oriented. Note, though, that as tertiary education differs greatly between countries, the demarcation between these two subcategories is not always clear cut.

ISCED 5A - Tertiary-type A

"Long-stream" programmes that are theory based and aimed at preparing students for further research or to give access to highly skilled professions, such as medicine or architecture. Entry preceded by 13 years of education, students typically required to have completed upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary education. Duration equivalent to at least 3 years of full-time study, but 4 is more usual.

ISCED 5B - Tertiary-type B

"Short-stream" programmes that are more practically oriented or focus on the skills needed for students to directly enter specific occupations. Entry preceded by 13 years of education; students may require mastery of specific subjects studied at levels 3B or 4A. Duration equivalent to at least 2 years of full-time study, but 3 is more usual.

- 5. Public expenditure includes public subsidies to households for living costs (scholarships and grants to students/households and students loans), which are not spent on educational institutions.
- 6. For Portugal, data refers to public institutions only.
- 7. Expressed in equivalent US\$ converted using purchasing power parities.
- 8. Expenditure on goods and services consumed within the current year which needs to be made recurrently to sustain the production of educational services refers to current expenditure on schools and post-secondary non-tertiary educational institutions. The individual percentage may not sum to the total due to rounding.
- 9. Public and private institutions are included. Calculations are based on full-time equivalents. "Teaching staff" refers to professional personnel directly involved in teaching students.
- 10. The column "country average" corresponds to an average across TALIS countries.
- 11. The column "country average" indicates the number of countries/systems, in which a given criterion is used, for example, regarding the indicator "Decision on payments for teachers in public schools". In the row "Management responsibilities in addition to teaching duties", •12 •18 Δ7 indicates that this criterion is used to determine the base salary in 12 countries/systems, to determine an additional yearly payment in 18 countries/systems and to determine an additional incidental payment in 7 countries/systems.
- 12. The column "country average" indicates the number of countries for which the indicator applies. For example, for the indicator "mandatory national examination is required" 4/29 means, that 4 countries out of 29 for which data are available report that mandatory national examinations are required in their countries.
- 13. By "national examination" we mean those tests, which do have formal consequences for students.
- 14. By "national assessment" we mean those tests, which do not have formal consequences for students.
- 15. These measures express the degree of influence on the indicator: None: No influence at all, Low: Low level of influence, Moderate: Moderate level of influence, High: High level of influence. The column "country average" indicates the number of countries/systems, in which one of the given criteria is used.
- 16. For this indicator, the column "country average" refers to Eurydice member countries/areas.
- 17. "Compulsory tests" have to be taken by all pupils, regardless of the type of school attended, or by all students in public sector schools. "Optional tests" are taken under the authority of schools.
- 18. Austria, Belgium-Flemish Community, Ireland, Lithuania, Latvia, Sweden, England, Northern Ireland and Scotland apply several tests at the national level each with a distinct number of subjects. Thus, for these countries no exact number of subjects tested can be provided.
- 19. Results are based on reports from parents of the students who were assessed and reported proportionate to the number of 15-year-olds enrolled in the school.

Eurydice (2008)	Eurydice (2009)
•	•
-	•
	•
•	•
•	•
	•
-	•
	•
-	•
-	•
	•
-	•
-	•
•	•
	-
•	•
•	•
•	•
•	•
•	•
•	•
•	•
•	•
-	•
	•
	•
	•
	•
•	•
•	•
	•
3	•



From:

OECD Reviews of Evaluation and Assessment in Education: Portugal 2012

Access the complete publication at:

https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264117020-en

Please cite this chapter as:

Santiago, Paulo, et al. (2012), "Comparative indicators on evaluation and assessment", in *OECD Reviews of Evaluation and Assessment in Education: Portugal 2012*, OECD Publishing, Paris.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264117020-14-en

This work is published under the responsibility of the Secretary-General of the OECD. The opinions expressed and arguments employed herein do not necessarily reflect the official views of OECD member countries.

This document and any map included herein are without prejudice to the status of or sovereignty over any territory, to the delimitation of international frontiers and boundaries and to the name of any territory, city or area.

You can copy, download or print OECD content for your own use, and you can include excerpts from OECD publications, databases and multimedia products in your own documents, presentations, blogs, websites and teaching materials, provided that suitable acknowledgment of OECD as source and copyright owner is given. All requests for public or commercial use and translation rights should be submitted to rights@oecd.org. Requests for permission to photocopy portions of this material for public or commercial use shall be addressed directly to the Copyright Clearance Center (CCC) at info@copyright.com or the Centre français d'exploitation du droit de copie (CFC) at contact@cfcopies.com.

