



For Official Use

Organisation de Coopération et de Développement Économiques
Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

EDU/CERI/CD/M(2015)1

26 June 2015

English - Or. English

**DIRECTORATE FOR EDUCATION AND SKILLS
CENTRE FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND INNOVATION (CERI) GOVERNING
BOARD**

Summary Record: 92nd Session of the CERI Governing Board

**14-15 April 2015
OECD Conference Centre Room CC9**

Contact(s):
Dirk VAN DAMME, Head of Division, Dirk.VANDAMME@oecd.org, +(33-1) 45 24 79 01

JT03379478

Complete document available on OLIS in its original format.

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.

EDU/CERI/CD/M(2015)1
For Official Use

English - Or. English

SUMMARY RECORD: 92ND SESSION OF THE CERI GOVERNING BOARD**14-15 April 2015****OECD Conference Centre Room CC9**

1. Mr. Masayuki Inoue, Chair of the CERI Governing Board (GB), opened the meeting and welcomed the members. Apologies were received from: Mr. Aki Tornberg (Finland); Ms. Claudia Sarrico (Portugal); and Mr. Imdat Pekdemir (Turkey).
2. The Chair congratulated the new Members who have been confirmed by Council:
 - Mr. Patrick Donaldson (Australia)
 - Mr. Matej Siskovic (Slovak Republic)
 - Ms. Francesca Crippa (EC)
3. The Chair made some the other announcements:
 - Bureau working lunch met on 14 April from 13:00 to 14:30 in CC16 of the Conference Centre.
 - There was a cocktail this evening at the close of the meeting in the Salle George Marshall in the Chateau.

1. Adoption of the Annotated Draft Agenda[EDU/CERI/CD/A\(2015\)1/REV2](#)

4. There were no comments from Board members on the draft Annotated Agenda, therefore the Governing Board **ADOPTED** the draft Annotated Agenda.

2. Approval of the Summary Record of the 91st Session[EDU/CERI/CD/M\(2014\)2](#)

5. No comments were received on the draft Summary Record, therefore the Governing Board **APPROVED** the Summary Record.

3. Oral Statements[EDU/CERI/CD/RD\(2015\)2](#)

6. Mr. Dirk Van Damme opened the oral statements in his function as the Head of CERI. He began by welcoming new members of the CERI Governing Board who were approved by Council since the Board last convened. Each new member took the floor for a brief introduction.
7. Following this, Mr. Van Damme went on to update the members on CERI's work that is not featured in individual agenda items.

8. The first project's progress presented was *Education and Social Progress (ESP)*. The project had a publication event on the 10th of March. "Skills for Social Progress" sparked a lively discussion; live video links were established to a number of external experts. The publication includes the outcomes of a high-level meeting on social progress prepared in Sao Paulo in 2014. Mr. Van Damme described the "Skills for Social Progress"-Publication as hugely interesting and innovative, paving the way for a large-scale longitudinal study as the next step of the project. Dissemination events followed in Italy and Japan, with further events planned in the Philippines and Colombia in 2015. Mr. Van Damme encouraged the delegates to approach the Secretariat if countries were interested in hosting their own events.

9. Mr. Van Damme emphasised that in researching social and emotional skills it is tempting to compare social and emotional skills with approaches to cognitive skills. For the "Skills for Social Progress" publication it was decided to avoid direct comparisons as not to juxtapose them. Rather, social and emotional skills should be seen as an addition. His oral statement also noted that the perception towards social and emotional skill had changed. Rather than considered predetermined as done in the past, these skills were found to be learnable and able to be developed in schools, families and communities. He acknowledged that measurement is a delicate issue and that CERI's research has not yet solved all problems regarding measurement. The research needs to overcome many obstacles; particularly issues of conceptualization and validation (especially cross-culturally). Acknowledging the long-term character of the project, Mr. Van Damme reminded the audience of the proverb that one needs to learn to walk before starting to run.

10. Presenting the roadmap of the Education and Social Progress (ESP) Longitudinal Study, Mr. Van Damme reminded the Governing Board that it is invited to approve the conceptual framework via written procedure. The review period extends from 17th of April to the 15th of May 2015. The review by the CERI Governing Board follows the improvement by experts in February (The Hague) and the approval by the ESP Steering Group in March (Paris). A feasibility study, following a formal call for tender for an external provider is planned for 2015 to 2018. Likewise, a goal for this timeframe is the development of measurement instruments, which particularly pertain to cross-cultural validation. Mr. Van Damme cautioned that success is not guaranteed in the development of these instruments.

11. The second project presented by Mr. Van Damme was the *Governing Complex Education Systems (GCES)* project. As the progress of the project was presented in depth when the Governing Board last convened, he focused on recent developments. Case studies of Poland and Germany have been published as CERI working papers in late 2014. Additionally, GCES published two substantive working papers (Modes of Government and Trust and Governance).

12. Together with the Estonian Ministry of Education, the GCES project organised a very successful conference in Tallinn on the use of data in education governance. Over 80 participants from 18 countries and international organisations attended the conference. The conference generated a lot of momentum for the GCES project and received much positive feedback.

13. Expanding its work on trust, GCES aligns with the horizontally organised OECD Trust Strategy as an important contributor. Likewise part of its work on trust, GCES invited countries across the OECD to submit Trust briefs. The Trust briefs are concerned with country examples regarding how trust breaks down, how it can be restored and how trust can be built and sustained in and through education.

14. In other work, the GCES project contributed to the education governance discussion in Chile. Moreover, GCES supported the School Effectiveness Review project in a visit to Uruguay regarding questions of governance underlining GCES' direct link to policy work. Additionally, preparations are underway to help Mexico reform its education ministry.

15. The GCES project is looking forward to publishing works on use of data including testing strategies and outcomes, teacher assessment and accountability, and on trust. The latter will be based on the above-mentioned Trust briefs and educational roots of trust from PIAAC data. Moreover, the team is working on a synthesis publication bringing together key insights across the project's topics envisioned for late 2015/early 2016. Mr. Van Damme invited the Governing Board members to contact Tracey Burns or other team members regarding any questions.

16. Following the account of the GCES project, Mr. Van Damme summarised the progress of *Open Educational Resources (OER)* project. The project has shown that open educational resources are not to be conceived as inherently positive but that OER can inform educational policy and help policy makers and governments improve education as a whole.

17. The project organised a policy seminar at the end of January 2015 aiming to bring together policy people to discuss the possibilities of OER. Eleven countries participated in the intentionally small conference. Mr. Van Damme described that he looks forward to a timely approval by the Governing Board enabling to publish the book in the autumn of 2015.

18. The next item pertained to last year's *CERI Conference on Innovation, Governance and Education* that took place from 3-5 November 2014. The conference attracted approximately 200 participants comprising country representatives, Governing Board members and a diverse number of experts. CERI produced a summary report with findings and insights available to the Governing Board. Mr. Van Damme invited the Governing Board to provide comments on the conference.

19. Mr. Van Damme added that CERI seeks to increase efforts in communication, outreach and dissemination strategies. Recent successes in this area are increased visits to CERI's websites in past periods. Competing with Education at a Glance and PISA, CERI's outreach can be considered quite successful. Another area sought to improve is the work on social media. Particularly, the offered blogs on CERI's website are an important channel for output dissemination. At the same time, CERI tries not to have too many blogs in order to not to distract from each other.

20. As a final remark, Mr. Van Damme reminded the present Governing Board members of the Summit of Global Education Industry, which is set to take place in October 2015 in Helsinki.

21. Following Mr. Van Damme's presentation, the Director of the Education and Skills Directorate, Mr. Andreas Schleicher, introduced the current projects of the Directorate and discussed future work and improvements. Mr. Schleicher categorised the work of the Education and Skills Directorate into two major bolts, 1) strengthening employability, social participation, and inclusive societies, and 2) strengthening the effectiveness and efficiency of institutions to make reform happen.

22. Addressing the first bolt, Mr. Schleicher turned towards encouraging the development of skills within all members of society beyond economic aspects. The acquirement of skills should translate into economic growth and shared economic benefits. Mr. Schleicher used the second bolt to consider the economic side: Strengthening effectiveness and efficiency will allow for a more efficient investment of resources by understanding the necessary factors of reform.

23. Mr. Schleicher identified four pillars that support the two overarching themes within the Education Directorate: Firstly, measuring educational skills and opportunities, and their outcomes; secondly, opening the black box of learning process; thirdly, building and using skills for "better jobs and better lives", and fourthly, assisting countries with policy development and implementation, which is the fastest growing process.

24. Mr. Schleicher began by discussing the projects involved in the first pillar, the measurement of education, skills and outcomes, by first describing learning outcomes:

- PISA, which measures the acquirement of skills, equity in educational offerings, social and emotional skills, and student's attitudes towards learning, is moving to the next phase on the 6th of December 2015. The new phase, PISA for Development, extends PISA to countries where it has not been available before. A specific outcome from PISA data, the recent report on gender differences, revealed that although education systems equip boys and girls with similar skills, problems persist within the attitudes that surround skills and career paths regarding gender. The gender gap persists more in attitudes than in the demonstrated skill level of students.
- The development of the PISA Fellowship Programme has awarded 18 fellowships since its creation in 2012. These fellowships have resulted in working papers, which have appeared in academic journals and contributed to PISA, PIAAC and TALIS reports. There are two calls for proposals a year with the next round of applications closing on the 25th of May. The programme has been well received, not least by the media, and Mr. Schleicher confirmed that the Directorate is pleased with the results thus far. An alumni network will be established by the end of 2015. The first PISA fellowship programme alumni meeting will take place in the form of a Methods Seminar in Norway on the 9th and 10th of November. This meeting will provide an arena for discussion among researchers, policy makers and academics, as well as professionals who have designed the methods and implemented them. It will follow a forward-looking agenda by identifying global trends. The outcomes of the meeting are meant to improve the knowledge on the best technical and analytical methods, and alternative methods.
- The Education and Social Progress (ESP) Book Launch Seminar took place this past March, with two dissemination events held earlier this year in Italy and Japan. Two more are scheduled for the Philippines and Colombia in April and May, respectively. As a longitudinal study, ESP has established a more scientific approach for measuring emotional and social skills in young children. Many cities and regions are interested in taking part in the pilot study and field trials.
- There has been a new project proposal within Early Learning Outcomes, which has seen some interest. It is challenging on many fronts, however there are a good set of proposals for the project.

25. Continuing with the first pillar on measurement, Mr. Schleicher addressed skills, employability, social participation and inclusion, which is moving to the second phase:

- The strength of the Survey of Adult Skills (PIAAC) is in its measurement of adult skills; however, the survey does not include enough data on skill utilisation. Although economic measures are incorporated, other measures are less developed. Additionally, data on civic and social participation are limited, which weakens the relationship between adult skills and economic and social outcomes. Education and Skills Online now provides for an online version of testing which will be available to the public in August. The development of self-testing will provide greater dissemination for the project.
- Education at a Glance is beginning a new conceptual phase, which compares education systems and international standards. This new phase will be incorporated into the edition, which will be released in November 2015.

26. Mr. Schleicher described the second pillar, opening the black box of learning processes, as offering a behind-the-scenes perspective on classrooms:

- The Early Childhood Education and Care Staff Survey develops data to assist countries in evaluating the effectiveness of their policies. The survey compiles information on qualifications, professional development, practices and working conditions of staff, and looks at the interrelationship between child and staff interactions and child outcomes.
- The Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS) is heading into its third round. TALIS examines teachers' work, attitudes and initial teacher preparation, but faces limitations stemming from the self-reporting aspect of the survey. To combat this weakness, TALIS is developing a video study to analyse factual (rather than self-reported) teaching practices.
- Innovative Teaching for Effective Learning studies teachers' pedagogical knowledge and how teachers incorporate their knowledge base into their teaching.
- The PISA-based Test for Schools version of PISA (PISA for Schools) is school-based and meant to strengthen the institutional component by discovering how innovation happens in practice. It compares schools across countries and provides information about students.
- The Assessment of Higher Education Learning Outcomes (AHELO) February meeting discussed the current and future states of the project. There was an agreement to emphasise transversal skills and reduce the emphasis on disciplinary assessment. AHELO is to be extended to all eligible students as opposed to a restricted sample by institution.
- Due to findings that similar amounts are spent on education across countries but allocated very differently, the Effective Use of Resources evaluates resource allocation by determining the differences between countries in their resource investment and comparing student outcomes. Scrutinized factors include smaller class sizes, teacher quality and teaching and instruction time.

27. Mr. Schleicher continued to the third pillar, building and using skills for “better jobs for better lives”. The projects discussed in this section are designed to use, not collect data, and bring together expertise from ministries of labour, education, social affairs and regional governments. The work-based learning and vocational education projects have not undergone changes. Skills and Innovation for Education provides a framework for assessing the innovation ecosystem, and identifies the skills necessary for innovative professions. A Skills Outlook on the use of skills in the workplace, global value chains, the development of skills, and how skills are made available in the labour market will be released soon.

28. The fourth pillar, assisting countries with policy development and implementation, enables the Education and Skills Directorate to assist countries through several programmes:

- Education GPS (GPS) is now up and running online, and provides easy access to OECD analysis on education, data and policy advice. The Education Policy Outlook, which provides a comparative analysis on educational policies and reforms including their design and evaluation, has been well received.
- There are several types of country specific reviews conducted by the Directorate. Country notes summarize country's performances through comparative data, while country reviews provide a deeper analysis on specific policies. Diagnostic reviews of national policy evaluate the impact of national policies on education. Tailor-made studies, the fastest growing project within the work programme, accumulate evidence and experience to evaluate specific requests on policy implementation, evaluation and capacity building.
- Governing Complex Education Systems (GCES): GCES builds collaborative networks among stakeholders in order to reinforce trust and improve equity. The CERI Conference, which took place in November of last year, was a transversal conference combining work from multiple directorates.

29. Next, Mr. Andreas Schleicher commented on future work for the Education and Skills Directorate. He cited the improvement of co-ordination between the projects and surveys within the Directorate as a major task. He expressed the desire for comparable measurements of performance and socio-economic background within multiple surveys. In order to facilitate cohort links, the timing of PISA, PIAAC and TALIS surveys is planned to align better in the

future. Additionally, the surveys should be run by joint expert groups where possible to integrate expertise and resources across projects. This will enable the projects to move in a more consistent direction and have results that are more compatible. Integration will be a difficult task but would increase the value-added of Directorate.

30. Several members of the Governing Board commented and asked questions following Mr. Schleicher's presentation. He responded after hearing all of the questions:

- Answering to a question regarding the alignment between PIAAC and AHELO, Mr. Schleicher said that PIAAC and AHELO currently do not have significant links. However, they are both moving closer on their emphasis of transversal, crosscutting skills. While PIAAC measures foundation skills, which are more easily comparable, it is limited in its measurement of innovation skills. Alternatively, AHELO looks at cognitive ability and high-level skills. We need to make improvements in the comparability of PIAAC and AHELO.
- The Board member from Chile voiced his appreciation for the tailor-made reports. Because of such a report, Chile is currently undergoing a huge reform. Mr. Schleicher responded that work on tailor-made reports would continue to increase as part of the work programme. He described that Chile's report was a good learning exercise for CERI and has allowed testing CERI's capacity. These reports allow to package information in a meaningful way that is closely applicable to the specific country.
- The question raised by the Board member of the European Commission pertained to the role of the various individual committees governing the directorates' surveys PIAAC, PISA and TALIS. Mr. Schleicher responded that every survey having its own governance structure is ending, as the employment of different governance structures creates tension among them. The Directorate needs to work hard to simplify governance and governing bodies by consolidating and aligning surveys. However, it will also be controversial and difficult to combine governance structures into larger ones that then must deal with an entire set of tasks. The goal is to have governing bodies that build on synergies.

31. The Governing Board **NOTED** the Oral Statements.

4. CERI Budget*

*BIAC and TUAC experts and Invitees were requested to leave the room for this item.

4.a. *Report on the Budget Implementation for the year 2014

[EDU/CERI/CD\(2015\)1](#)

32. This item was presented by Mr. Dirk Van Damme and Ms. Charlotta Gustafsson. Mr. Van Damme reported on CERI's budget implementation for the year 2014, providing information on the implementation of the budget per budget line, an overview of expenditure per output, and an overview of the voluntary contributions received for CERI outputs over the years 2013-14. The total deficit of 2014 was of KEUR 212. Mr. Van Damme explained that over- and underspending for some outputs were the consequences of management decisions of the Secretariat taking into account the needs of projects and budgetary effects of unforeseen events. The overall deficit of 2014 was planned beforehand in order to use a carried over surplus of KEUR 280 from past years. These movements left a surplus to be carried over to 2015 of KEUR 68. The main reasons for overspending in 2014 were two major activities: 1) the Sao Paulo High-level Policy Forum and 2) the CERI conference. Finally, he presented the voluntary contributions (VCs) accepted for each of the CERI activities for the years 2013-14. VCs are increasingly important to help compensate the decrease in spending power due to the zero nominal growth (ZNG) budgeting. This was the second time CERI presented its expenses to the Board and will continue to do so every year at the spring meeting.

33. The CERI Governing Board **NOTED** the reporting on 2014 Expenditure.

4.b. *Rethinking the CERI Funding Structure

[EDU/CERI/CD\(2015\)8](#)

34. This item was presented by Mr. Dirk Van Damme. In October 2014, the Board was informed of the impact of a continued zero nominal growth (ZNG) budgeting (i.e. without correction for inflation) on CERI's spending power and its capacity to deliver its programme of work. The consequences of the ZNG budget have become significant. Since 2009, the loss of spending power reached KEUR 405 in 2014. In 2015, it will represent KEUR 439 (13% of the annual budget of the programme) and in 2020 it will grow to KEUR 719.

35. Mr. Van Damme explained that, despite the loss in annual spending power (now at 13% per year), CERI has made important efforts to increase efficiency and maximise the value for money of its activities. The strategies that have been used to cope with the loss of spending power include reductions in staff and cuts in operational expenditure. The former has been achieved by (1) reducing the volume of official staff and complementing official staff with temporary staff (consultants and interns), and by (2) replacing more expensive senior staff (A4 or senior analysts) with junior staff categories (A1 junior analysts and B4 research assistants). However, further staff costs reductions would compromise CERI's capacity to deliver its programme of work. Therefore, it is crucial to find new ways to fund the programme of work.

36. At the meeting in October 2014, the Board could not agree on a financial reform. It asked the Secretariat for innovative and creative proposals to review the current funding mechanism to secure a more sustainable funding base.

37. Mr. Van Damme explained the principles that have been considered when thinking of new funding models. These include: (1) providing a sustainable funding basis for CERI to successfully fulfil its mandate; (2) warranting a fair distribution of costs and benefits over countries; and (3) allowing for some flexibility in country participation while ensuring relevance and added value for all countries participating.

38. At the last CERI GB meeting, the Board suggested the creation of a small working group to look into new funding mechanisms for CERI's work. On 30 March, a first informal meeting was held to explore the different options without any decision making. This meeting helped the Secretariat better identify the advantages and disadvantages of each option. The alternative funding strategies were presented in order for the Board to discuss and identify the options that deserve full development. The alternative options presented were:

- Option 1. Implementing a new scale of contributions
- Option 2. Increasing the Part II budget
- Option 3. Increasing the voluntary contributions (VCs) from countries
- Option 4. Enlarging the programme to new participants
- Option 5. Complementing country funding with funding from foundations or third parties
- Option 6. Isolating activities which would be completely funded through participation fees

39. Mr. Van Damme asked the Board for critical thoughts and ideas on the alternative funding options as well as on the principles behind these models. He also asked the Board to express their preference towards the funding models that deserve full technical development for further discussion at the next CERI GB meeting.

40. Mr. Skovsgaard (Denmark) pointed out that his country favours the return to a zero real growth (ZRG) budget. He strongly advised to further develop Option 1 (implementing a new scale). He suggested to follow a similar model to the one that is used to finance PISA. He added that Option 2 (increasing Part II budget) is not optimal. Furthermore, he argued his country is not in favour of Option 3 (increasing VCs) as these are not easily handled in his country.

41. Mr. Arroyo (Spain) expressed his country's preference for Options 1 and 4 (enlarging programme to new participants). He argued that Option 3 (increasing VCs) could help at present but that in the future it was not a viable alternative. He pointed out that they did not support Option 5 (funding from foundations) as they envisaged countries could lose part of their independency.

42. Mr. Easton (USA) recognised the difficulty of this topic. He pointed out that his country is looking very carefully at its participation in OECD projects. He argued that decisions over participating in CERI's activities are difficult in part because the United States has strong infrastructure in education research. He noted his country is interested in Option 1, but they would also consider "merging with another body in the OECD". He stressed the seriousness of the case by asking the Secretariat to consider analysing the different options under a scenario whereby the United States did not contribute at all.

43. Ms. Lefresne (France) argued that more information is needed in order to discern the value of the different options presented by the Secretariat. She expressed the need to know the algorithms behind each option and a simulation of the different options to understand what it represents for each country. She pointed out that, at this stage, France would prefer the option that was not presented, that is Option 7 (merge with the INES budget line). She suggested having this funding discussion with the INES community.

44. Mr. Maccarini (Italy) noted that passing to a zero real growth (ZRG) budgeting is not acceptable or sustainable for his country. He appreciated, however, the need of finding solutions to have a more sustainable funding. He echoed the comment of France on having simulations on the consequences of different options for each country would be useful for the Board to make decisions. He also argued that many of the presented options were not mutually exclusive and suggested considering a mixed strategy as an additional option. He expressed concerns regarding Option 5 because independence of countries is important. However, he suggested this option could be considered in combination with other options and by clearly defining how potential risks would be minimised.

45. Mr. Wolter (Switzerland) highlighted that this is not a new discussion. He made two observations. First, he noted that decisions over preferred options are not straightforward because they need to be endorsed by different ministries in many countries. From previous discussions, the option of merging CERI with other activities is challenging and has high risk of not receiving support. Second, Mr. Wolter expressed support for Option 5 if good governance rules are set.

46. Mr. Inoue (Japan) acknowledged the challenging financial situation of CERI and the need to find new funding mechanisms starting from 2017-18. He conveyed his country's recommendation for Option 1 with a flat fee as PISA, INES and other programmes do. He also requested that other moderate options be developed for future discussions.

47. Mr. Avila (Mexico) noted Mexico's economic difficulties and the impact this has had on funding international organisations. He suggested considering Option 6 which may represent a fair approach. He noted that his country could support the Secretariat with Option 4 in its efforts to include new participants, especially to the inclusion of Latin American countries. He also suggested that it would be useful that the Secretariat consulted countries on the possibility of further developing Option 3. He was in favour of continuing discussions through the informal working group.

48. Ms. Kikas (Estonia) stated that her country strongly agrees in the need to restructure CERI's funding mechanisms to find a sustainable solution. Estonia is ready to negotiate digressive scales to have a fair contribution of small countries.

49. Mr. Hislop (Ireland) noted the importance of carefully analysing the options presented to make the right choice as this has important implications for the future work of CERI. He stressed that the options presented need to be worked upon with more detail. He echoed the comments by France and Italy on the need to understand the implications of the different options. He argued that another informal meeting would be useful to discuss options would help move this agenda forward. Ireland would participate in such meeting if it is organised. He noted that options based on Part I reform are not necessarily relevant for CERI. He argued that Option 4 (extending participation to new countries) is attractive. He emphasised that an important principle to be added is that any option that would lead to a two-tier CERI membership should be avoided. Mr. Hislop pointed out the need to clearly define the actual overall budget needed in order to better identify how funding could be provided. He also commented that, given the budgetary constraints in many member countries, it is not realistic to consider ZRG. He considered more feasible and realistic a “ZNG plus” (some level above ZNG).

50. Ms. Scheys (Flemish community of Belgium) was in favour of the principles for new funding models in order to keep CERI as a working organisation with a sustainable budget. She noted her country’s support for Option 4, opening the programmes to other countries, e.g. in Latin America (Brazil) and Asia. She also expressed being favour of Option 6 and of creating a development fund if there is agreement on the governance of such a fund. She also expressed support for Option 5 subject to clear governance to keep priorities of the Governing Board. They are strongly critical against Option 7. She requested that the informal group should meet again to concretise options so a decision can be made in the Autumn.

51. Mr. Donaldson (Australia) commented that in his country they have ZNG. He noted that if CERI would move to a ZRG budget, his country would have to decide which projects to cut. He requested to present in the paper the prioritisation of projects within existing resources. He pointed out that Australia is in a similar situation as the United States. They have a number of internal studies that they are using instead of the projects in CERI. He supported the comments of Ireland and France around simulation to have a better idea of the impact of each option. They are interested in further developing Option 6. They see risks of Option 5 in terms of sustainability.

52. Mr. Will (Canada) emphasised the importance of reaching an agreement that puts CERI in a sustainable funding basis. He noted that, for Canada, Option 1 is the most simple, equitable and sustainable option. He noted the need of identifying the risks of sustaining the status quo. For example, identify the CERI projects that would be cut if the spending capacity continues to diminish; and estimate the financial impact on the budget if one of the top five contributing members leaves CERI, as the United States suggested.

53. Mr. Alexander Sidorkin (Russian Federation) expressed his support for Option 5, diversification of funding is unavoidable given the economic situation of countries. He echoed other countries’ comments that governance mechanisms can be set to reach project independence. He proposed that CERI considers creating a consortium of research universities as they are natural allies of research activities; they have lobbying power with governments; and, they have experience on fundraising and building independent funding.

54. Ms. Ängmo (Sweden) thanked the Secretariat for the paper for this item as well as the informal meeting. She favoured a mix of funding strategies, but stressed the importance that CERI works as independent as possible. She noted that her country is reflecting options of Part II. She expressed concerns about the timing of decisions that need to be made about the funding options as they need to have complex discussions with many ministries as the Swiss Board member noted.

55. Mr. Myrdal (Iceland) noted the difficulty of this topic. Iceland is not very active in CERI projects because of budgetary constraints. He expressed his country’s support to consider Option 1 with some modifications towards flexibility based on suggestions in Option 6, isolating activities with participating fees. He pointed out the need to preserve the core programme of CERI on research in education and innovation as well as preserve CERI’s required overhead.

56. Ms. Beller (Israel) shared some reflections regarding comments made by the United States and Australia. She noted that the Secretariat could stress the benefits of CERI so member countries could clearly see the added value of CERI's activities, especially countries with strong research institutions.

57. Ms. Schreiner (Austria) thanked the Secretariat for preparing this work and for organising the informal meeting. She noted Austria supports Option 4 as part of the solution. Her country sees benefits of this option not only in budgetary terms but also in terms of the increase of the international perspective of the work.

58. Ms. Nilssen (Norway) noted her country is in favour of Option 1. She expressed concerns of ending with a more complex model if combining too many options in the future. The budget would become more complicated and less transparent than the present one.

59. The Chair thanked the Board for their valuable interventions to this difficult subject. He noted the complexity of the decision-making process, especially as several ministries need to participate in this process. However, he stressed the time limit for this discussion as funding for the next biennium (2017-18) has to be agreed soon.

60. Mr. Van Damme thanked the Board for the discussions as it provided concrete and specific guidance, making it easier to proceed to the next steps. He also thanks the Board for the appreciation of their work during the informal meeting and the amount of time and energy Board members have spent on this process. He expressed his understanding of countries' economic and budgetary constraints and stressed that he would account for this when formulating alternative funding solutions. He recognised the risks associated with changing the funding model as this can be a complicated process in the capital cities of member countries. However, doing nothing is possibly not the best option, at least not at this moment of the reflection process.

61. Mr. Van Damme clarified the deadline for applying for a new CERI mandate to the Budget Committee and Council. The ultimate date is the Spring meeting of 2016. He would prefer to have a rather conclusive discussion during the Board meeting of November 2015, with one more informal meeting beforehand. For the next discussion, the Secretariat will prepare a number of options with clear simulations. Mr Van Damme noted this version did not include formulations in order to discuss first the principles behind the models, and to avoid falling into a negotiation process from the initial stage.

62. Mr. Van Damme summarised his reflections regarding the comments made of the different options. Option 1 will be explored more in-depth, possibly with different variants. Option 2 did not receive any support. Option 4 will have to clarify more what the prospects are. Option 5 would need to develop good governance principles. As noted by some countries, this option would be for specific purposes and under governance rules of the CERI Governing Board. Option 6 did not receive much support, but it should not be eliminated at this stage as it could be part of the solution. Mr. Van Damme acknowledged the comment made by Norway of avoiding a funding formula that is too complicated. Option 7 has its defenders and its strong opponents. The Secretariat needs to discuss this last option with the INES community before further developing it. A new proposal, which has been mentioned in the past, emerged in the discussion: to complement CERI's work with a consortium of education research. The Secretariat is willing to look into it, although it has some downsides, especially regarding the governance of the projects.

63. Mr. Schleicher acknowledged this meeting was a step forward in the discussions of a new funding model for CERI. He noted the importance of separating the size of the budget and the way the funding is shared among countries. He stressed that what is important is that the distribution of costs is fair and appropriate for the work the Secretariat is undertaking. He pointed out that a conclusion from the discussion is that the current funding approach is neither fair nor appropriate. He also emphasised that the approaches have to be carefully thought and wished for resolving this crucial issue in the immediate future.

64. The Chair thanked the Director for his comments as well as the Board members for their constructive and valuable feedback. He stressed the importance of the next steps for having a fruitful discussion at the next session of the Board.

65. The Governing Board:

- **NOTED** the difficulty of finding a more sustainable funding model for the CERI Work Programme.
- **AGREED** with the principles proposed by the Secretariat, especially ensuring a fair distribution of costs and benefits over countries.
- **EXPRESSED** support or disagreement of the funding options proposed by the Secretariat. Option 1 received strongest support (Canada, Denmark, Estonia, Japan, Norway, Spain, Sweden and United States) for further development, followed by Option 4 (Austria, Belgium, Ireland, Mexico and Spain), and Option 5 (Australia, Belgium, Switzerland and the Russian Federation). On the other hand, Option 2 did not receive support and Option 3 was considered difficult to handle (Denmark) with potential risks of sustainability (Australia and Spain).
- **REQUESTED** another informal working group meeting to discuss fully-developed models before the Autumn meeting of the CERI Governing Board (19-20 November).

5. CERI Governing Board and the Assessing Higher Education Learning Outcomes (AHELO) Project

[EDU/EDPC\(2013\)17/REV3](#)

66. This item was presented by Mr. Dirk Van Damme. He briefed the Board on the revised proposal to countries to launch the AHELO Main Study. Revisions pertain to the scope of the proposed assessment, governance and funding of the AHELO Main Study. The CERI Governing Board has the opportunity to play a supportive role in the conceptual work and design of the study and, eventually, to participate in its governance arrangements. The expertise of the CERI Governing Board could, for instance, be mobilised to support the research needed for developing the assessment instruments as well as to define the research agenda around AHELO. Engaging the Board could also provide a broader basis for the conceptual and methodological choices the participating countries will have to make.

67. Mr. Fadel (BIAC) welcomed the additions in the revised proposal paper and noted the potential of AHELO to provide a more accurate insight into higher education than existing international comparisons. BIAC agrees with the proposal that the Main Study should focus essentially on transversal/generic skills and consider not only results of the assessments, but also the value added of higher education institutions relative to their socio-economic and institutional context. Another suggestion is to use AHELO results to explore potential mismatches between secondary education learning outcomes and higher education entrance requirements. With regard to governance, BIAC has no objections to the arrangements outlined in the proposal but would like to request further clarification on the channels and extent of consultation with employers to deliver advice to the AHELO Main Study.

68. Several requests to clarify the current status of the AHELO proposal and potential implications for CERI were formulated. The Australian Board member inquired about the costs associated with engaging in the development of the study. Mr. MacDonald (Canada) noted that his country would like to see substantive issues discussed at the Education Policy Committee, in particular the minimum number of countries required for the study to go forward and the extent to which the project will rely on voluntary contributions. Ms. Robertson (New Zealand) echoed the need to gain a better understanding of what the involvement of CERI staff would be in AHELO in order to assess the relative costs and benefits of this engagement.

69. Ms. Nilssen (Norway) expressed that her country has always been a strong supporter of the AHELO Main Study given the lack of good comparative indicators of the quality of higher education. Since a range of CERI projects provide valuable insights on how to develop and measure 21st century competences in school settings, it seems natural that CERI should be involved in extending this discussion to the field of higher education.

70. Mr. Sidorkin (Russian Federation) noted that his country was not present at the meeting where the updated proposal of the AHELO Main Study was discussed and hence would need more information to assess its potential participation and the differences between AHELO and similar projects at an international scale.

71. Mr. Van Damme thanked the Board members for their comments and noted that, ultimately, the discussion related to whether the CERI Governing Board is a relevant body to inform the development of AHELO, would have to be resumed once the Main Study would take off. He also explained that, should the project go forward, the governance of AHELO would remain with the Education Policy Committee and the Board of Participating Countries. With regard to potential cost implications, time spent by CERI staff working on AHELO would be accounted as part of the latter.

72. Mr. Schleicher reminded the Board that questions such as what specific competences should AHELO try to measure or what governance structure to adopt for the project are still open questions that participating countries will have to decide upon. He noted how PISA began with a much smaller number of participating countries than its current membership, and that the key consideration remains whether a project is cost effective for participants. Mr. Schleicher also argued that CERI has important assets to contribute to the strategic development of AHELO and other large-scale studies in the Directorate.

73. Mr. Inoue (Chair) noted that the Board had not agreed on a clear position regarding the involvement of CERI in the development of AHELO and will therefore come back to this question in future sessions, also depending on the approval of the current AHELO proposal.

6. Ministerial Global Education Industry Summit

[EDU/CERI/CD\(2015\)5](#)

74. This item was presented by Mr. Dirk Van Damme. He explained that the education industry plays an increasingly important role in shaping the educational environment. But at the same time there is not yet any platform to bring together policy makers, education innovators and leaders of private sector industries engaged in education, to discuss the topic and strategies of innovation in education. The purpose of the summit is to provide such a platform, connecting education ministers and key representatives of the international and national education industries – including but extending beyond educational technology firms – to share views on public policy and innovation in education. Since the last CERI GB meeting, intensive discussions have taken place to concretise the organisation of the summit with the three partners: the OECD Secretariat, the Ministry of Education and Culture of Finland and the European Commission. As a result, the summit will take place at the Finlandia Hall in Helsinki. The list of participants will be partly determined by the ministers who have to choose the interlocutors with whom they would like to initiate the dialogue. The BIAC is also strongly associated with this selection process in order to help to identify the most relevant interlocutors. The objectives and the agenda of the summit were set up keeping in mind the main concerns previously expressed by the Governing Board's members at the first discussion on this topic at the last Board meeting: the actual lack of evidence any positive role technologies have on education and training; the need to avoid the summit turning into a marketing event; and to avoid industries becoming the main drivers of the educational reforms.

75. Ms. Crippa (European Commission) was impressed by this very relevant initiative which highlights a clear need of a dialogue between ministries and the industry sector. She said that we also must continue to focus on an extensive definition of innovation: as illustrated by the diversity of the participants – innovation is more than only matters of technology. She also announced that the European Commission will not only bring ideas to the summit but will also contribute to its budget.

76. Mr. Kalenius (Finland), speaking on behalf the host country, welcomed the opportunity to organise this event. Innovations and new technologies in education are challenges and opportunities for the design and implementation of new public policies. As for other important reforms, governments must play a key role to manage these changes. But we should continue to focus on strategic and systemic analysis and avoid getting bogged down by technical details.

77. Mr. Bangs (TUAC) thanked the Secretariat for keeping the dialogue open about the concerns raised at the last Board meeting. He appreciated the efforts of the Secretariat in avoiding a mainly commercial outlook to the event. . Nevertheless, the main objective of discussing the opportunities offered by innovation in teaching and learning, would benefit from the participation of teachers in the Summit. He made critical comments on the number and on the nature of the expected participants. He asked for at least four representatives of TUAC and four other of BIAC, emphasising that many other voices should be considered in this debate. He also noted that the organising committee could be more inclusive, even if it is only a “pilot-summit”. He regretted that the meeting was named ‘Summit’, pointing out that this decision could lead to confusion with the Teachers’ Summit.

78. Mr. MacDonald (Canada) highlighted that, if the summit is not only focused on technological aspects, it may result new ideas from this platform. Industry has a role to play in the development of efficient learning in schools. But it’s important to strike a balance with pedagogy. Mr. Halasz (Hungry) also expressed his concerns about the current focus on technology. The risk, he argued, is that ministries might consider including only technology companies for the meeting. It’s the reason why it should be more relevant to maintain a wide definition of innovation in order to include various other actors who are also important in this field. . He added, for example, that the agenda should ask specific and relevant questions on, the census of the current practices, the challenges for the countries which would like to benefit from this industry, or the areas where industries could play a key role. Mr. Halasz also said that a non-technologic theme could be added on the agenda, as the question of the evaluation or of the responsibility where theses service providers are also important. The goal should be to achieve a balance between all the stakeholders involved in educational innovation. Ms. Beller (Israel) proposed to add another theme to the Summit: the questions raised by big data and by the new languages’ processes. These innovations bring out the links between technologies and teaching. Moreover, she thought that one should invite some researchers of higher education. Ms. Robertson (New Zealand) declared her great interest for the issues addressed in the agenda but agreed with the concerns expressed by previous members. She noted that elected officials may stand in for the minister and asked for clarification.

79. Mr. Rouw (Netherlands) voiced strong support for the initiative. He pointed out that private and public sectors should innovate together. He expressed some concerns about the subtitle of the Summit. Moreover, he considered that the propositions for the agenda are too general and suggested more specific questions: 1) how to use the innovative capacities of private companies without denying the public values of education? 2) who are the true owners of these educational materials and how to take into account experience feedbacks from users? 3) How governments can help textbook publishers to develop new devices and new business models for generating profits in a digital environment? Another remark is the lack of data on education industry. A preparatory meeting to the Summit would be welcomed to synthesise existing data.

80. Mr. Fadel (BIAC) was very pleased with this project encouraging dialogue between public and private sector. He found this project courageous but also complex. He would appreciate a classification of expecting participants (SME, companies, technology companies...). The BIAC’s vice-chair is based in Helsinki and could assist the organising committee there. He agreed with the idea that the Summit might avoid focusing too much on technology, at the same time noting that it is important to highlight the strong potential of education industry. He admitted that it is rather difficult to organise such a Summit and that, since the last international meeting four years ago, our knowledge has not progressed very much. Finally, he considered that a question on the negative effects of technology in education should be addressed during the Summit.

81. Ms. Lefresne (France) expressed some concerns about the scope of the meeting. She wondered why the Secretariat limits the topic to only private sector. Would it be possible to invite some actors from the not-for-profit sector? In France, these actors provide and facilitate the access to a number of technological devices. Can the current subtitle be modified from “industry” to “non-public actors”? Mr. Avila (Mexico) agreed with the concerns expressed by the Ms. Lefresne. The scope of the Summit must be extended because, he argued, the actors involved in education industry are diverse. Considering the “sector of education” rather than “industry” should enhance the Summit, including the 4th session of the agenda.

82. Ms. Angmo (Sweden) thanked the Secretariat having kept in mind the concerns expressed by the Board. She noted that the objective of the Summit is not to define “education industry” but without any clear definition, there would be too many potential candidates to take into account. The agenda seems to be very interesting but it is also too large. Given the timeline, it would be preferable to limit debates to practical considerations. Ms. Valsky (the Austrian Education counsellor) agreed with previous comments. She also expressed concerns about the issues of the protection of privacy which could be threatened by the development of education industry. She also would like to know more precisely to whom the invitations will be addressed because, she said, the Summit could be facing the competition of other international events. The delegate from Portugal thanked the organisers of the Summit. He shared the concerns of Austria on invitations and asked if “non-UE countries OECD-partners” could be invited.

83. Mr. Bangs (TUAC) added some comments. Netherlands’ and Austria’s comments, he thought that it would be necessary to focus debates to avoid the risk of losing the meaning of the Summit. But he stressed that the issues of the protection of the privacy and the needs of taking stock of both positives and negative aspects of the development of education industry are important questions to consider.

84. Mr. Dirk Van Damme expressed his appreciation for the rich and interesting discussion and welcomed the Board's suggestions. The Secretariat has to confer first with Finland and the European Commission to provide answers to all the questions, but he can already clarify some points. Mr. Van Damme went on to say that the OECD's Accession and Key Partner countries will be invited. Concerning the number of BIAC and TUAC representatives at the Summit they will also be invited but the number of participants would be more limited. The Summit should have a convenient format for facilitating the dialogue and discussions. Concerning the emphasis on technology Mr. Van Damme mentioned that the title of the Summit no longer mentions it. However, two sessions with the word “technology” were kept in the agenda because that is a convenient way to solicit interest and understanding. Further modifications to the agenda will take place as the sessions are firmed up. Moreover, regarding the typology of participants, we should not be too limited and to invite a wide range of participants. It is important that countries select the partners who are relevant for them and in their own national context. Mr. Van Damme also agreed with the risk of confusion between the dialogue on teachers and the dialogue with teachers and underlined that they should be involved more explicitly in debates. He was more concerned about the participation of the not-for-profit sector. The CERI already noted the crucial role that this sector plays in education. He warned that if we extend the scope of the meeting too far, we run the risk of diluting its originality. This question will be considered by the organising committee in any case. Regarding the agenda, Mr. Van Damme agreed that it could be more precise. But he stressed that this first annual Summit should not be too restrictive and that we are still at the beginning of the consultation process and then we should be flexible and open-minded. He concluded by saying that the propositions from Mrs Beller were very relevant, as were the comments from the Board on the necessary balance among all education stakeholders.

85. The Governing Board:

- **APPROVED** the general outline of the Summit; and
- **APPROVED** the draft agenda.

7. Update on the INES Programme

[EDU/EDPC/RD\(2015\)2](#)

86. Ms. Florence Lefresne (France, Chair of the INES Advisory Group) and Mr. Dirk Van Damme introduced this item. First, Ms. Lefresne presented the progress made in the implementation of the International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED) 2011 and more specifically the recent publication of the ISCED 2011 Manual. The new ISCED provides a number of advantages and analytical opportunities, more specifically with regard to early childhood education and care (ECEC), vocational education and training (VET) and tertiary education.

87. Mr. Van Damme introduced the recently published EAG Interim Report, including 2013 data on a number of indicators. From Education at a Glance (EAG) 2015 onwards, we will be able to publish data on y-1 on a number of indicators. The report was launched in London end of January and received extensive media coverage. Next, the draft table of contents of the new EAG 2015 was presented. Special attention had gone into improving the policy relevance of the indicators and the analysis presented. The publication date of EAG 2015 is set for 24 November 2015. Ms. Lefresne continued by discussing the measures taken to improve the policy relevance of EAG, for example by inserting textboxes on specific issues, by improving the timeliness of the data, and by issuing specific thematic reports.

88. Next, the newly planned work on indicators on tertiary education was presented. Following the priority rating exercise in the INES Working Party, new indicators will be developed in the following domains: the structure of tertiary education, equity and labour market outcomes. This work will be implemented in close collaboration with the EDPC Informal Working Group on Higher Education.

89. Before opening the discussion, the Chair expressed his high appreciation of the work in the INES programme and EAG. He applauded the initiatives taken to improve the policy relevance of the work. Mr. Patrick Donaldson (Australia) equally supported the drive to improve the policy relevance of the indicators work, but expressed concerns about the increasing number of indicators and the size of the publication. Mr. Matej Siskovic (Slovak Republic) welcomed the aim to provide more recent data, but warned about the use of data collected through different methodologies. Mr. Harold Hislop (Ireland) welcomed the synergies with the work on evaluation and assessment and the useful addition of new indicators referring to this. Ms. Micheline Scheys (Belgium – Flemish) appreciated the efforts made to improve the policy relevance and timeliness of the data but wondered whether the publication date would enable that.

90. Ms. Lefresne thanked the Board for the questions and comments. She emphasised the meticulous nature of the priority rating exercise in selecting and prioritising the chosen indicators. Mr. Van Damme explained the planning to move to more timely data and the option to move to an end of November launch date this year. If feasible, EAG would return to a launch date early September from 2016 onwards. The Chair thanked the Secretariat and the Board members for their interventions.

91. The Governing Board **NOTED** and **DISCUSSED** recent and upcoming progress in the INES work programme.

8. Innovative Learning Environments: Final Report

[EDU/CERI/CD\(2015\)2](#), [EDU/CERI/CD/RD\(2015\)3](#)

92. Mr. David Istance introduced this item, which was both focused on the final ILE report and a review of the ILE project as a whole given that the operational work is now completed. He began by outlining the “ILE approach”: the three ILE strands of i) a foundation in learning research, ii) inspiring innovative cases, and iii) system change as a distinctive project philosophy; the ambition to provide frameworks and materials for those engaged in educational innovation; direct engagement with systems and innovators as well as research; and the visible production of publications and international events. He outlined the indicators developed in the final strand to show when the ILE “7+3 framework” had become widely adopted, and corresponding policies and conditions; he also outlined the draft final report that had been circulated to the Board as a room document. This report includes analysis of the strategies and initiatives submitted to Strand 3 of ILE; a specific chapter on the “meso” level of networks, clusters and communities of practice (which is the level at which the submitted strategies have mainly operated); and one on the “meta” level of wider systemic transformation. He outlined steps to be taken in finalising the main final report as well as the ILE “Handbook” in preparation and to encourage diffusion, and referred to the continued focus in future CERI work on the micro level and innovation through extension of the ITEL work towards innovative pedagogy.

93. Mr. Bangs (TUAC) introduced the discussion of the paper and reflection on the ILE work as a whole. He referred to the value of ILE and the approach to innovation based on research and how it can very valuably inform other strands of EDU work, especially policy work. He referred specifically to the International Summit on the Teaching Profession which is addressing very similar issues but in which the language and frameworks used may often be different. He drew attention to the importance of the learning principles and especially the emphasis on emotions. He welcomed the outward-facing perspective in the emphasis on horizontal connection and partnerships in education as “an incredibly fertile mine of innovation”. He endorsed the need for knowledge systems to avoid becoming cumbersome information banks and for accountability arrangements to be in the service of learning rather than the other way around. He also identified areas of complex decision-making and action: for instance, in the challenge of maintaining coherence while recognising that complex systems cannot be steered mechanistically top-down, or in maintaining equity while moving beyond standardisation. He welcomed the draft final report as a very useful contribution to the reflections on policy, innovation and system change.

94. The ensuing discussion was very positive about the contribution that ILE has made and the final reports being discussed. There was recognition of the value of the specifically-developed ILE concepts and frameworks that are not necessarily simple to grasp but which have made an important original contribution e.g. the “pedagogical core”, “collaborative professionalism”, “evaluative thinking”, the “meso” level, and even that of “innovative learning environments” themselves (Poland, Mr. Rouw [Netherlands]). Another theme in responses was the importance of ILE work for policy and the direct impact that it has made in different countries; yet an impact well beyond the policy community itself including in its impact on teacher education or even in higher education, including the creation of a MOOC on innovative learning environments (Ms. Schreiner [Austria], Mr. Skovsgaard [Denmark], Mr. Halasz [Hungary], Mr. Myrdal [Iceland], Mr. Rouw [Netherlands], Ms. Nilssen [Norway]). There was the policy question raised (Mr. Rouw, Netherlands) of strategies and “starters” to prioritise the many different elements in the ambitious policy agenda identified through ILE. There were several expressions of interest in the “ILE Handbook” in preparation (Ms. Scheys [Flemish Belgium], Ms. Nilssen [Norway], Mr. Rouw [Netherlands]), and encouragement to make it available to be used on the ground in different countries. There was also reference made to the value of the original cases gathered and not only the synthesis reports, whether the cases of innovative learning environments or of strategies and initiatives (Mr. Halasz, Hungary). The hope that the work would be continued in some form was echoed by Mr. Myrdal (Iceland) and by the representative from Poland, and that within countries the work is only just beginning to realise with the agenda identified through ILE (Mr. Rouw, Netherlands). There was encouragement of the directions being identified of extending the focus on ITEL to include innovative pedagogies as well as feed into wider Directorate work on Education 2030 (Mr. Inoue [Japan], Ms. Nilssen [Norway]).

95. Mr. Istance thanked the Governing Board for its positive comments on the ILE work, and acknowledged the main themes raised. Mr. Van Damme paid tribute to the quality and impact of ILE, and its importance in getting right inside the practice of teaching, learning and pedagogy including as a specifically CERI contribution that needs to be maintained

9. Innovative Teaching for Effective Learning (ITEL): Progress Report on Profiling Teachers' Pedagogical Knowledge

[EDU/CERI/CD\(2015\)4](#), [EDU/CERI/CD/RD\(2015\)4](#), [EDU/CERI/CD\(2015\)11](#)

96. This item was presented by Ms. Sonia Guerriero. She began by reviewing the evidence base and objectives of the project: (1) What is the nature of teachers' pedagogical knowledge and what are the knowledge dynamics in the teaching profession? (2) How does teachers' pedagogical knowledge relate to learning opportunities? (3) How does teachers' pedagogical knowledge relate to professional competence? In connection with this third objective, Ms Guerriero presented the main findings of a paper commissioned to Professor Fani Lauermann (University of Bonn) who conducted a review of teacher motivation and its implications for the instructional process. Research is showing that teacher motivation is related to better instructional quality and higher student outcomes, and therefore, motivation is part of the conceptual framework for this project. Ms. Guerriero reviewed the conceptual framework,

assessment framework, sampling, and described the next steps for the survey. The conceptual and assessment frameworks will be sent to participating countries for review by key stakeholders, including teachers, teacher educators, policy makers, as well as researchers. Similarly, a pre-selection of items will be conducted over the summer and sent to participating countries for review. She also described the method of work for participating countries, which would take place mainly online via the OECD Communities Clearspace site that has been set up for the project. Participating countries will receive an invitation to the site, which is to remain private for confidentiality purposes.

97. Ms. Guerriero then reviewed other project developments, which include publication of the Symposium book “Teachers Pedagogical Knowledge and the Teaching Profession,” and new research conducted by a Thomas J Alexander fellow (Seong Won HAN) who was mentored collaboratively by Ms. Guerriero and Ms. Francesca Borgonovi (PISA Analyst). This new research, “High-school students who want to be teachers: The role of teacher pay and working conditions in a comparative perspective,” examined cross-national differences in the relationship between teacher salaries, working conditions, and teacher career expectations, and whether these differ across different levels of academic ability in math and reading. Of particular interest was the finding that teacher salaries are positively associated with students’ expectations to work as teachers; however, the positive association between teacher salaries and career expectations is only statistically significant among low- and middle-achieving students. This is a policy challenge that needs to be addressed. Ms. Guerriero ended her presentation by describing how the ITEL Teacher Knowledge Survey fit within the larger programme of work on Teachers, Teaching, and Pedagogy within the Directorate.

98. The lead speaker was Ms. Florence Lefresne (France) who commented that important progress was made in completing the conceptual framework and beginning of implementation. She reported that the conceptual framework did a good job of capturing that effective teaching practices are linked to the learning context because good teaching is only possible in an actual situation. She questioned why the focus was only on intra-personal competencies and suggested that both intra- and inter-personal competencies are important competencies that should be measured. She wanted to know more about how motivation is sustained, and gave the example of French teachers, who report that they feel good about their teaching, yet claim that the profession is not valued. So what is sustaining their motivation to teach? Finally, she asked how we can ensure that effective teaching is also equitable teaching. For example, how do teachers ensure equitable educational outcomes for low-ability students? Teachers need competencies for teaching diverse students. This is a problem in France where education is highly inequitable. Ms. Lefresne ended her intervention by saying that France is interested in evaluating pre-service teachers undergoing initial teacher education with respect to new reforms that have been implemented.

99. Ms. Scheys (Belgium, Flemish Community) asked how the study will tackle diversity of pedagogical knowledge among different contexts and suggested to expand the scope of 21st century skills and to introduce other subjects in addition to math. The Flemish Community is interested in being intensely involved in the developmental phase. Ms. Schreiner (Austria) announced that they will officially take part in the study and hoped this project will give insight to reform of initial teacher education. She suggested to also include language teachers in addition to math teachers. Mr. Halasz (Hungary) advised not to ignore all the tacit knowledge that is part of teachers’ knowledge and not to limit the model to only intra-personal competencies. He suggested a stronger emphasis on inter-personal competence and measurement of it, as well as reference to the school context. Likewise, he suggested including one more subject in addition to math.

100. Mr. Myrdal (Iceland) commented that this project is of interest to Iceland and that the project is well connected to the research and to TALIS. He suggested to clarify definitions (e.g., ‘knowledge base,’ ‘expert teacher’) and advised caution on dealing with cultural sensitivity as it relates to how pedagogical knowledge is defined across different contexts. Likewise, he suggested to not limit the survey to only math. Mr. Alexander Sidorkin (Russian Federation) asked whether it was possible to use pre-existing instruments such as ETS’s Praxis II assessment. Ms. Stenke (Germany, Lander) asked whether sub-national entities could participate. Mr. Rouw

(Netherlands) asked how we can make policy recommendations given the limitations of the study, e.g., by only focusing only on math? Finally, Ms. Crippa (European Commission) asked whether we could also include administrative data or qualitative data.

101. Ms Guerriero then responded to the interventions. In particular, she clarified that both intra- and inter-personal competencies would be part of the instrument and she would consult with a technical advisor on the statistical consequences of including a subject in addition to math. As for using pre-existing instruments, this is already the case as the pedagogical knowledge items used in the TEDS-M study are being shared with the OECD. Ms Guerriero then thanked everyone for helpful comments and said that they would continue to consider these suggestions as they continue to develop and implement the project.

10. The Future of Skill-Biased Technological Change: Project Plan

[EDU/CERI/CD\(2015\)3](#)

102. This item was presented by Mr. Stuart Elliott, who gave an overview of the written project plan that was provided to the Governing Board. The project was approved by the Governing Board for the current Programme of Work and Budget. It was motivated by the opportunity to use the new data from the Programme for the International Assessment of Adult Competencies (PIAAC) to deepen our understanding of the relationship between skills and productivity. The research context for the planned work is the large literature in economics on “skill-biased technological change,” which looks at how technological change over the past century has been “biased” towards increasing some job skills and decreasing others. This literature addresses crucial policy questions related to the way that the skills developed by education affect productivity and economic growth. PIAAC can give new insights related to this literature by providing direct measures of skill levels and use, in place of the indirect measures of skills (education, occupation or wages) that researchers are typically forced to use. The study will look at employment trends in the skills measured by PIAAC and how those relate to productivity changes by industry in each country. In addition, the study will analyse how computers (ICT) are changing skill demand. This will be done with a novel technique that uses the PIAAC assessment questions to rate the capabilities of ICT. The resulting rating will make it possible to define minimal levels of the PIAAC skills that workers need to have to compete with ICT. These analyses will provide new ways to analyse the skills that education should develop to support future productivity increases and economic growth.

103. Mr. Van Damme provided additional context related to the Governing Board’s adoption of the project, citing two factors. First, the project illustrates an important function that CERI can play with respect to the large survey programmes of the Directorate for Education and Skills by providing big picture analyses that would often not be carried out by the survey programmes themselves. Second, the project responds to the importance of the issue of productivity and the need to develop better insights about the factors that affect it.

104. Mr. Skovsgaard (Denmark), the lead respondent, provided a reflective discussion of the project and the intellectual currents that it responds to. He started out by describing earlier efforts to understand the larger pattern of economic and social change, citing the example of Alvin Toffler. With respect to education, the development of work and society over the past several centuries has been accompanied by a “hidden curriculum” that has shifted as development has occurred, with the importance of loyalty in agricultural economies changing to the importance of discipline in industrial economies and then to the importance of citizenship and entrepreneurship in service and knowledge economies. Mr. Skovsgaard then described the complex factors that influence decisions about how skills and productivity evolve, citing the decision of LEGO to maintain a strong production capability in Denmark and the way that decision has influenced the company’s growth. Finally, Mr. Skovsgaard turned directly to the project itself, saying that it would certainly be a worthwhile project that would help countries understand the larger patterns of changes in skill demand even though it would not provide detailed predictions about specific skills. Mr. Inoue (Chair) responded to Mr. Skovsgaard’s comments by noting the high levels of literacy that developed in 18th century Japan because of the need to coordinate rice production, providing another example of the complex factors affecting the relationship between skills and work.

105. In the general discussion that followed, Mr. Fadel (BIAC) spoke first, with strong support for the project. He began with a demonstration of the language translation capabilities available on a smartphone, using that example to illustrate the kinds of questions that technology can raise about education, in this case with respect to learning foreign languages. He argued that the proposed project will make an important contribution to understanding the effect of technology on skills, but that it should be viewed as only a first step because a complete understanding would require a more detailed analysis at the sector level. Mr. Fadel noted that there is worldwide interest in this issue but that it is often misunderstood. He spoke about several types of complications that need to be considered, such as the importance of communication skills and the way that social acceptance slows down the adoption of new technologies. In written comments after the meeting, BIAC also noted the various challenges facing the project and encouraged further discussions with experts to consider ways of addressing them.

106. A number of members spoke to indicate support for the project, including Mr. Maccarini (Italy), Mr. Will (Canada), and Ms. Kikas (Estonia). Mr. Maccarini raised the issue of high-end skills, citing a Steve Jobs speech that talked about the skills needed to design products that “make the heart sing,” and noting that the bias of skill-biased technological change might work either to lower or to raise skills. Mr. Will noted that technology is bringing big changes to the world of work. Several members offered references to experts or additional data that could help the project.

107. A number of members raised cautions about the project that should be considered. Mr. Stefan Wolter (Switzerland), Ms. Scheys (Belgium – Flemish Community), and Ms. Lefresne (France) all noted the limitations of the skills measured by PIAAC and wondered whether PIAAC data can provide sufficient insight into the changes that are occurring. Ms. Ångmo (Sweden) noted that the PIAAC data on skill use are also limited because they are based on self-report. Mr. Wolter and Mr. Maccarini both pointed out the difficulty in getting causal results from the planned analyses, and Ms. Ångmo mentioned the importance of addressing the full complexity of the factors that influence productivity. Mr. Wolter noted that the proposed analyses assume that skills are hierarchical, suggesting that some changes in skill demand reflect changes to skills that are simply different rather than changes to skills that are higher or more difficult. Mr. Will asked for more detail on the project’s productivity analyses and wondered how those analyses would take the cyclical state of the economy into account.

108. Mr. Inoue summarised the discussion as indicating general acceptance of the project plan but raising cautions that need to be addressed. He also noted the importance of considering other influences on skill demand, such as the need for social welfare workers in an aging society and the need for skills in risk management.

109. Mr. Elliott thanked the members for their comments about the design and importance of the project, as well as their suggestions of relevant experts and data. In responding to member comments, he started by noting that the topic of skills and productivity is very broad and that a single project necessarily cannot hope to address all of the relevant issues. The PIAAC data are obviously limited, but they concern a set of skills that are of broad importance across the economy and they allow novel analyses about how those skills relate to productivity and technology. Acknowledging the large set of factors that affect the application of new technology, he said that the analysis of capabilities of ICT will show the range of possible changes that could occur, although whether and how quickly those changes take place will depend on interactions with the other factors mentioned in the discussion. Responding to the request from Mr. Will about detail on the productivity analyses, Mr. Elliott explained that he has not yet had time to work directly with available productivity data and so cannot describe the analyses in further detail at this time. With respect to the comment from Mr. Maccarini about high-end skills, he noted that the vast majority of workers could be affected by ICT with capabilities that fall substantially below the high end. With respect to the comment from Mr. Wolter about whether skills are arranged hierarchically, Mr. Elliott pointed out that in the context of the present project the capabilities of technology provide an objective measure of differences in skill difficulty, with tasks involving simpler algorithms – such as calculating cosines or square-roots – being objectively easier than mathematical reasoning that cannot be captured by such simple algorithms.

110. The Director, Mr. Schleicher, closed the session by noting that the project is addressing big questions despite its small size. He encouraged the Governing Board to help the project contribute to the overall OECD portfolio on skills by connecting it with other related work.

111. The Governing Board:

- **COMMENTED** on the proposed approach to the overall project;
- **PROVIDED** suggestions for carrying out the work; and
- **IDENTIFIED** relevant experts who can provide additional insights for carrying out the project.

11. Innovation Strategy in Education and Training

[EDU/CERI/CD\(2015\)9](#), [EDU/CERI/CD\(2015\)10](#),

112. Mr. Stéphan Vincent-Lancrin presented this item to inform the Governing Board about progress with the CERI project “Innovation Strategy for Education and Training”. After a quick overview of the advancement of various parts of the project (e.g. the ongoing survey on education research, horizontal work on inclusive innovation, new work on creativity and critical thinking), the progress report focused on the development and use of longitudinal information systems in the education sector and how they can support continuous improvement and innovation.

113. Acting as a lead discussant, Mr. Easton (United States) welcomed the report and noted that it provides a range of valuable examples of innovative uses of education information systems. Mr. Easton explained how the United States put a strong emphasis on developing longitudinal education data systems over the last decade, including a federal grant programme of over USD 500m to support states in establishing these systems. While these investments yielded important results, building capacity for an effective use of data proved more difficult. The adoption of data standards and use of longitudinal information has nonetheless enabled a large number of states to analyse data for full student cohorts and thereby gain a better picture of high school graduation rates and the determinants of student success. Current policy priorities include promoting the integration of K-12 data with data from early childhood education and higher education and further developing common data standards and interoperability. Progress in these areas is regularly mapped by the non-profit organisation Data Quality Campaign. Since 2013 the Federal government has also taken steps to facilitate the use of administrative data for research and evaluation purposes. Mr. Easton argued that longitudinal education information systems can support ‘continuous improvement’ initiatives where evidence-based and data-driven decision making play a central role, and cited the examples of the University of Chicago Consortium on Chicago School Research and the Kids Integrated Data System (KIDS) in Philadelphia. In both cases, the integration of longitudinal data helped improve research, reporting and operational capacity. However, fully reaping the benefits of education data will require additional investments to understand and promote the conditions that optimise the use of data systems and avoid risks such as student stereotyping, piecemeal education based on too narrow skill development or neglecting the professional judgement of teachers. The experience of the United States suggests that investments in longitudinal data systems must be accompanied with greater efforts to build capacity for data use in schools.

114. Ms. Scheys (Flemish Community of Belgium) congratulated the project team for the report and highlighted the categorisation of systems as a useful way of thinking about their benefits. In Flanders, good practices in education data use have been implemented across all the proposed categories but additional work is needed to solve privacy problems, to overcome the reluctance of some schools and teachers to participate in data collection and to develop expertise in the use of data systems. Therefore Flanders would welcome further discussion to develop international guidelines for the design of data systems and guidance on how to improve data collection procedures. Ms. Scheys also remarked that cross-sectional data remain helpful to inform policy and practice and should be seen as complementary to the increasing focus on longitudinal data.

115. Ms. Kikas (Estonia) expressed her appreciation for the report and noted connections between this work and the recent conference organised in Tallinn by the Estonian Ministry of Education and Research and the CERI project GCES on the role of data in education governance. The meeting promoted a practical understanding of how to use data systems for a variety of education processes. Estonia wished to thank CERI and the GCES team in particular for their contributions to the conference.

116. Mr. Meneses Ponzini (Chile) welcomed the report and explained how Chile has been able to carry out important research combining education, health and labour market data thanks to the development of different longitudinal datasets. In order to address privacy concerns, Chile is looking for technical solutions to reduce student identification risks and further enhance the access of researchers to data. The country would thus welcome CERI guidance in these areas. Mr. Meneses Ponzini also stated Chile's interest in further involvement in the work on inclusive innovation in education carried out by the Innovation Strategy project.

117. Mr. Halasz (Hungary) praised the capacity of the project to integrate new areas of work and provide a comprehensive picture of the innovation ecosystem in education. He argued that Big Data will be one of the key drivers of innovation in education in the coming years and that a coherent innovation strategy for the education sector should consider how to harness data. Hungary designed its own innovation strategy with the support of CERI two years ago and a positive result has been the introduction of a new teacher education programme that includes a specific track to train teachers in using data for research purposes. This example illustrates how an innovation strategy can translate in specific education policies. Mr. Halasz asked the team to draft a final "innovation strategy" for education and training to guide countries' policy in this area based on the rich knowledge gathered and produced by the project. He also welcomed the development of guidelines about next-generation information systems.

118. Mr. Siskovic (Slovak Republic) echoed the appreciation of the report expressed by other members of the Board. The Slovak Republic plans to develop the linkage of data from secondary and tertiary education levels and would welcome OECD advice on how to address challenges such as interoperability and data anonymisation.

119. Mr. Inoue (Chair) concluded that the Board shares the views expressed in the report about the potential of longitudinal education data systems but also the need to address privacy concerns, and that it welcomes the development of guidelines supporting countries in addressing these important topics.

120. Mr. Vincent-Lancrin thanked the members of the Board for their comments. He acknowledged the need to give careful consideration to the possible dangers of the new generation of information systems. The aim of the work carried by CERI is to show the important role that longitudinal information could play in the innovation ecosystem of the education sector by improving knowledge flows and shaping relations between stakeholders, not to present them as a panacea. In line with the views expressed by the Board, the reports produced by this strand of the project highlight privacy concerns as a major issue but also provide examples of technical solutions that can help overcome this problem. He argued that developing effective data management and visualisation tools is as important as the complementary approach to promote data literacy, and that putting timely and relevant data in the hands of practitioners and decision makers is a first step towards promoting more effective education data use practices. Mr. Vincent-Lancrin invited countries to participate in a meeting that will take place in the United States in the autumn of 2015 to discuss and refine a first draft of international guidelines for the design and use of longitudinal data systems and their role in an innovation strategy for the education sector.

12. Trends Shaping Education 2016

[EDU/CERI/CD\(2015\)7](#),

121. This item was presented by Ms. Tracey Burns. The Trends Shaping Education work has been a fixture of the CERI work programme since the first book was published in 2008, as an offshoot of Schooling for Tomorrow project. The work itself is designed to be a tool to inspire creative and future thinking about trends outside of

education that might have an impact on education in the mid- to long-term future. The book is not a statistical compendium or a prescription for policy. The Trends Shaping Education series has sold very well, with increasing dissemination for each edition. The 2013 edition has now been downloaded from the OECD iLibrary 20 000 times. The work is used in a number of ways, including: day-long Ministry retreats structured around chapter themes in Flanders, a presentation of the trends in the Swedish Parliament, inclusion in the curriculum in teacher education in Iceland, use as a textbook in university courses in a variety of countries, use as a basis for a futures thinking exercise in a school in South Australia and more. In order to continue to build the relevance and usefulness of the work, the Secretariat is presenting to the Board at this juncture as it prepares the upcoming 2016 edition of the publication.

122. Ms. Burns presented the plans for the new edition and asked the Board to comment on the current structure and planning as well as suggest any new trends that could usefully be included. One currently underdeveloped area is the interactions between the trends themselves, and developing a more systemic view of trends and their impact on education (and conversely, education's impact on these trends). Possible areas for new work include: more work on technological trends, inequality and poverty, economic and global financial trends, and health and well-being. The floor was then opened for discussion and comment.

123. The representative from New Zealand encouraged the Secretariat in this work and supported the upcoming publication. They place a priority on working to "future-proof" the education system, to try and avoid getting caught up in solving the problems of today. Some of the areas that they are working on in their own work (although these are trends in education not trends shaping education from the outside) include trends in student achievement and attainment, and the level of parents education, especially maternal education. Their work concentrates on the link between these trends and students outcomes, and how they might be used to design policy. Representatives from countries including Australia, Canada, France and Sweden, among others, then took the floor and thanked the Secretariat for an engaging and informative presentation, and for the usefulness of the Trends work.

124. Mr. MacDonald (Canada) encouraged the publication's move towards greater analysis and the complementary development of the Trends Spotlights. He highlighted the inclusion of economic and global financial trends, including youth unemployment and the impact of government financial strength, as important trends to keep in mind. Mr. MacDonald expressed the desire for the Trends publication to not be limited by the availability of comparable data, but instead be willing to include less comprehensive data on trends that may have the highest impact. Mr. Donaldson (Australia) expressed an interest in various trends including technology, health and well-being, student assessments, holistic education including methods for linking preschool with higher education, inclusive education to improve outcomes of the disadvantaged, and the radicalization and disengagement of youth. He discussed linking student assessments to modern labour markets by understanding the types of skills and aptitudes tested, the types of testing conducted, and the skills considered important by individual countries.

125. The expert from BIAC, Mr. Fadel, suggested the identification of trends which are the most informative and have the largest impact on society. He was also interested in including linkages between trends. Ms. Angmo (Sweden) supported the continuation of linking the trends to the field of education and increased analysis in the next edition. She suggested the next edition address media, access to news, and criticism of news sources, which could be easily linked to technology, as well as changes in values and radicalization. Mr. Wolter (Switzerland) encouraged the use of other OECD committees and working parties in order to take advantage of their expertise and sectors. Ms. Lefresne (France) echoed these comments and also suggested a greater emphasis on the impact these trends have on students. A greater focus on families and children by age group, for example, such as done by Eurostat, could be useful.

126. In response Ms. Burns thanked the Governing Board for their ongoing support and helpful comments. The Secretariat will now continue with the production of the upcoming Trends Shaping Education volume, scheduled for launch in January 2016. Outside expertise will be included, both from other OECD Directorates and also through workshops with a small group of multidisciplinary researchers. The Trends team will look into the feasibility of including the trends suggested in the Governing Board discussion, with a specific focus also on the interaction of the trends itself. The Trends team looks forward to presenting the final product to the Board in early 2016.

127. The Governing Board:

- **NOTED** the upcoming publication of Trends Shaping Education 2016;
- **COMMENTED** on the proposed trends suggested for inclusion in paragraph 10 of the GB document and **SUGGESTED** other trends that might be usefully included in the 2016 edition; and
- **DISCUSSED** the questions listed under paragraph 13 of the GB document.

13. Any Other Business

[EDU\(2015\)1](#)

128. There was nothing to report nor any comments raised under this Item.

- Dates of next Governing Board meetings
 - 93rd session – 19-20 November 2015
 - 94th session – 12-13 April 2016
 - 95th session – 17-18 November 2016
- Other meetings: Consult the meetings list document

ANNEX LIST OF PARTICIPANTS/LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS

Please refer to the document [EDU/CERI/CD/M\(2015\)1/ANN](#).