Chapter 5

The teaching workforce in Chile

This chapter is about policies to improve the effectiveness of the teaching workforce. It deals with teacher preparation, recruitment, career development and use of time. Furthermore, it discusses how teachers are incentivised to perform at a high level. The chapter places particular emphasis on areas of priority for Chile such as the low status of the profession, the heavy workload of teachers, shortcomings in teacher preparation and the challenges in addressing teacher underperformance. The chapter also reviews the coherence and consistency of the teacher evaluation framework and the operation of professional development for teachers.

The statistical data for Israel are supplied by and under the responsibility of the relevant Israeli authorities. The use of such data by the OECD is without prejudice to the status of the Golan Heights, East Jerusalem and Israeli settlements in the West Bank under the terms of international law.
This chapter addresses policies to improve the effectiveness of the teaching workforce. Among other things, it analyses the size of the teaching workforce; how teachers are prepared and improve their skills while in the profession (e.g. initial preparation, professional development); how teachers are recruited and distributed across individual schools; how teacher resources and teaching time are allocated to students so that they optimally respond to improvement priorities (e.g. class size, teacher-student ratios, use of teachers’ time); and how teachers are incentivised to perform at a high level (e.g. teacher appraisal, recognition and compensation).

Context and features

In April 2016, the Law that creates the System for Teacher Professional Development (Sistema de Desarrollo Profesional Docente) was enacted (Law 20.903). This law, whose gradual application starts in 2016 and whose full application is expected by 2026, establishes significant modifications to the management of the teaching workforce in Chile. It is planned that all teachers in all publicly-subsidised schools will gradually become part of the System for Teacher Professional Development. The only teachers who are given the option of not joining the new system are those who are ten years from retirement as of 2016. The new law covers four main areas:

1. Initial Teacher Education: new requirements to enter initial teacher education; mandatory accreditation of initial teacher education programmes; and external assessment of student teachers before their graduation to inform the improvement of teacher education programmes.

2. New Career Structure: launch of the National Induction System for beginning teachers; creation of a multistage career structure; and development of a teacher evaluation process to determine progression in the career structure.

3. New Working Conditions: improvement of teacher compensation; creation of incentives to work in disadvantaged schools; and regulation of non-teaching time as part of contract hours.

4. Training for Development: Entitlement to free and pertinent professional development; individual professional development plans informed by the needs of both the teacher and the school; and school principals empowered to define professional development plans for their teaching bodies.

The description below considers the situation at the time of the visit by the OECD review team as well as the new policies resulting from the creation of the System for Teacher Professional Development.

Profile of the teaching workforce

Size of the teaching workforce and its main characteristics

In 2015, there were 224,236 teachers working in pre-primary, basic and upper secondary education in Chile (excluding provision by JUNJI (Junta Nacional de Jardines...
Infantiles – National Board of Kindergartens), Integra Foundation and private providers with no official recognition), an increase of 36.6% relative to 2004. These were performing a range of duties as described in Table 5.1. The distribution of teachers by type of school provider in 2015 was as follows: 43.9% in municipal schools, 45.7% in private-subsidised schools, 9.4% in private non-subsidised schools and 1.0% in schools with delegated administration (the equivalent shares in 2004 were 51.1%, 35.7%, 11.7% and 1.5% respectively). Between 2004 and 2015 the number of teachers increased in the 3 largest sectors and most notably in the private-subsidised sector (rise of 74.8%), followed by the municipal sector (growth of 17.4%) and the private non-subsidised sector (rise of 9.4%) (see Figure 5.1).

Figure 5.1. Number of teachers by type of provider, 2004-15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Municipal</th>
<th>Private subsidised</th>
<th>Private non-subsidised</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data refer to pre-primary, basic and upper secondary education. Data exclude provision by JUNJI, Integra Foundation and private providers with no official recognition. Data include classroom teachers, staff with technical-pedagogical duties, staff in senior management, school directors, teachers with other duties at the school, teachers with other duties outside the school (work for respective education provider on service commission), heads of technical-pedagogical units, general inspectors and counsellors.


In 2015, the large majority of teachers (92.9%) worked in a single school but some teachers worked in two schools (6.2%) or three or more schools (0.8%) (Ministry of Education, 2016). A longitudinal survey of teachers also suggested that in 2005 about 10% of teachers had an additional remunerated job outside teaching (Bravo et al., 2006).

The degree of feminisation of the teaching profession in Chile is slightly below the OECD average: the proportion of females in 2014 reached 99% in pre-primary education (against an OECD average of 97%), 81% in primary education (OECD average of 82%), 68% in lower secondary education (68% within the OECD), 57% in general upper secondary...
education (OECD average of 62%) and 50% in vocational upper secondary education (OECD average of 54%) (OECD, 2016).

The age distribution of the teaching profession in Chile reveals a somewhat younger workforce than in the OECD average country. In 2014, the proportion of teachers aged less than 30 was 23%, 22% and 21% in primary, lower secondary, and upper secondary education respectively, against OECD averages of 13%, 11% and 8% (OECD, 2016). The proportion of teachers aged 50 and over was 27%, 30% and 30% in primary, lower secondary, and upper secondary education respectively, against OECD averages of 30%, 34% and 38% (OECD, 2016). The proportion of secondary teachers aged 50 and over decreased from 33% to 30% between 2005 and 2014 (OECD, 2016). Interestingly, the age distribution of teachers varies across school providers, with the teaching workforce somewhat older in the municipal sector than in the private-subsidised sector (see Figure 5.2).

Figure 5.2. Age distribution of teachers, municipal and private-subsidised schools, 2015

Note: Data refer to pre-primary, basic and upper secondary education. Data exclude provision by JUNJI, Integra Foundation and private providers with no official recognition. Data on teachers include classroom teachers, staff with technical-pedagogical duties, staff in senior management, school directors, teachers with other duties at the school, teachers with other duties outside the school (work for respective education provider on service commission), heads of technical-pedagogical units, general inspectors and counsellors.

In 2015, around 82% of teachers were performing classroom teaching duties in schools with the remaining teachers performing a variety of other duties as depicted in Table 5.1.

In 2015, there were 183,706 teachers with classroom duties working in pre-primary, basic and upper secondary education in Chile (excluding provision by JUNJI, Integra Foundation and private providers with no official recognition). The large majority was...
working in basic education (56.1%), followed by upper secondary education (26.8%), pre-primary education (9.3%), special education (5.6%) and education for adults (2.2%) (see Table 5.2).

Table 5.2. Number of classroom teachers, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of education</th>
<th>Municipal schools</th>
<th>Private-subsidised schools</th>
<th>Private non-subsidised schools</th>
<th>Delegated administration</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-primary education</td>
<td>6 277</td>
<td>7 863</td>
<td>2 923</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17 073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special education</td>
<td>2 404</td>
<td>7 909</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10 320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic education</td>
<td>48 806</td>
<td>44 418</td>
<td>9 866</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>103 116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper secondary education</td>
<td>19 843</td>
<td>21 967</td>
<td>5 509</td>
<td>1 868</td>
<td>49 187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific-humanistic</td>
<td>12 313</td>
<td>16 334</td>
<td>5 501</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>34 474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional programmes</td>
<td>7 530</td>
<td>5 633</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1 542</td>
<td>14 713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education for adults</td>
<td>2 234</td>
<td>1 633</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79 566</td>
<td>83 790</td>
<td>18 456</td>
<td>1 894</td>
<td>183 706</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data exclude provision by JUNJI, Integra Foundation and private providers with no official recognition. See Chapter 3 regarding the role of “traditional educator.”

Qualifications of teachers

According to data from the Ministry of Education, in Chile the vast majority of teachers have a qualification to teach. In 2015, 94.4% of the teachers in pre-primary, basic and upper secondary education had a qualification in education (with similar qualification levels across the main education providers, see Table 5.3); 3.8% had a qualification in other areas; and only 1.7% of the teachers had no qualification (see Table 5.3).

Data from TALIS revealed that, in 2013, 85.7% of lower secondary teachers in Chile had completed a teacher education programme (against a TALIS average of 89.8%) (OECD, 2014a). A different picture, however, emerges for upper secondary education. International data collected by PISA 2012 reveal that a high proportion of upper secondary teachers are not certified for the profession according to school principals’ perceptions (in Chile, 95% of
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As shown in Figure 5.3, in Chile, the percentage of certified teachers according to reports from principals of schools attended by 15-year-olds is only about 20% against an OECD average of 87% (the figure for Chile is the 2nd lowest among PISA participating countries). However, according to principals of schools attended by 15-year-olds, about 92% of teachers had a university-level degree against an OECD average of 86%.

Class size and student-teacher ratio

In 2014, class size was relatively high in Chile at 30 and 31 for primary and general lower secondary education respectively (the OECD average was 21 and 23 for the same educational levels, OECD, 2016). This hides some variation across sectors, as the respective averages were: 29 and 30 for municipal schools; 32 and 33 for the private-subsidised sector; and 24 and 25 for the private non-subsidised sector (see Table 5.4). Maximum class size is

---

Table 5.3. **Distribution of teachers according to their qualification status (%), 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification status</th>
<th>Municipal schools</th>
<th>Private-subsidised schools</th>
<th>Private non-subsidised schools</th>
<th>Delegated administration</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualification in education</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>94.6</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>94.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification in other areas</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not qualified</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing information</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


---

Figure 5.3. **Teacher certification status and educational level based on reports by school principals for PISA 2012, selected countries**

Note: Data are based on the perceptions of the principals of the schools attended by the 15-year-olds who took the PISA assessment and therefore refer to lower and upper secondary education. Data refer to averages across the PISA 2012 sample. Source: OECD (2013a), PISA 2012 Results: Excellence through Equity (Volume II): Giving Every Student the Chance to Succeed, http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264201132-en.

---

---
regulated. In pre-primary, basic and upper secondary education, it cannot exceed 45 students per class. Exceptions are a maximum of 35 students per class in rural schools and a maximum class size of 15 in special education (MINEDUC, ACE and ES, 2016).

Table 5.4. **Class size in Chile and selected countries, 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chile</th>
<th>Brazil</th>
<th>Colombia</th>
<th>Mexico</th>
<th>Portugal</th>
<th>Spain</th>
<th>OECD average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public institutions</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private institutions</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government-dependent private</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent private</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lower secondary education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public institutions</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private institutions</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government-dependent private</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent private</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x: not applicable
..: missing data

Note: Calculations are based on number of students and number of classes. Data for Colombia refer to 2013.

Similarly, student-teacher ratios in Chile are also above those of the average OECD country. In 2014, the average student-teacher ratio was 21, 23 and 24 in primary, lower secondary and upper secondary education respectively, which compare to the following OECD country averages: 15, 13 and 13 (see Table 5.5). Student-teacher ratios are highest in the subsidised private sector (see Table 5.5).

National data reveal that student-teacher ratios have been decreasing steadily within the last decade. Between 2004 and 2015, the student-teacher ratio decreased by about 41% and 28% in the municipal and subsidised private sectors respectively (see Figure 5.4). This results from both the decrease in student numbers (see Figure 1.6 in Chapter 1) and the increase in teacher numbers (see Figure 5.1) during this period. While the overall student-teacher ratio stood at 15.8 in 2015 (for all levels of education and considering both teachers with classroom duties and teachers with other duties), it was 16.6 in urban areas and 10.3 in rural areas (Ministry of Education, 2016). In rural areas of some regions, the student-teacher ratio was below 10: La Araucanía (9.9); Los Lagos (9.9); Maule (9.8); Coquimbo (9.4); Bío bío (9.0); Valparaíso (8.3); Aysén (7.1); and Magallanes (5.7) (Ministry of Education, 2016).

**Initial preparation**

Initial teacher education is a requirement to enter the teaching profession and, as of 2014, can only be provided by universities – which confer qualifications for all levels and areas of education. The following programmes are offered: pre-primary education teacher; basic education teacher; upper secondary education teacher; and special education teacher. Prior to 2014, professional institutes (Institutos Profesionales), non-university tertiary education institutions, were also authorised to grant qualifications to pre-primary and basic education teachers. The number of initial teacher education programmes grew significantly in the last 15 years, from 229 in 1999 to 1 213 in 2015. The latter were provided by 16 public universities, 8 private universities which are part of the Rectors’ Council (Consejo de Rectores de las Universidades Chilenas, CRUCH), 15 professional institutes and
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In 2010, in a total of 107,725 students in initial teacher education, 86% were attending universities while the remaining 14% were attending professional institutes (Santiago et al., 2013).

Until 2016, teacher education institutions used to define the criteria to select their students. In 2015, about 21% of teacher education programmes required a minimum score in the university selection test (Prueba de Selección Universitaria, PSU). However, the 2016 Law that creates the System for Teacher Professional Development stipulates new

### Table 5.5. Student-teacher ratios in Chile and selected countries, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chile</th>
<th>Brazil</th>
<th>Colombia</th>
<th>Mexico</th>
<th>Portugal</th>
<th>Spain</th>
<th>OECD average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public institutions</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private institutions</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government-dependent private</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>. ..</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent private</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>. ..</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lower secondary education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public institutions</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private institutions</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government-dependent private</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>. ..</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent private</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>. ..</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upper secondary education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public institutions</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private institutions</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government-dependent private</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>. ..</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent private</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>. ..</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x: not applicable
.. : missing data

Note: Calculations are based on full-time equivalents.


### Figure 5.4. Student-teacher ratio by type of provider, 2004-15

Note: Data refer to pre-primary, basic and upper secondary education. Data exclude provision by JUNJI, Integra Foundation and private providers with no official recognition. Data on teachers include classroom teachers, staff with technical-pedagogical duties, staff in senior management, school directors, teachers with other duties at the school, teachers with other duties outside the school (work for respective education provider on service commission), heads of technical-pedagogical units, general inspectors and counsellors.

requirements to enter any initial teacher education programme. As of 2017, the requirement is to reach a minimum score in the PSU (500) or to be in the top 30% of the marks' ranking or to have passed a programme to access higher education that is licensed by the Ministry of Education. Requirements to enter initial teacher education programmes will become stricter in 2020 and 2023. Students of initial teacher education are typically not drawn from the top secondary graduates. Beyer et al. (2010) indicate that more than half of the student teachers are drawn from below the 50th percentile in terms of scores in the PSU. However, there is evidence that the average PSU scores of students entering initial teacher education have increased in recent years, possibly as a result of initiatives to improve the attractiveness of teaching (Santiago et al., 2013).

Initial teacher education programmes are required to undergo accreditation in the context of quality assurance processes in higher education organised by the National Accreditation Commission (Comisión Nacional de Acreditación). Until 2016, in case a given programme was not accredited, it could not receive any public resources but it could still provide a qualification. By 2015, only about 51% of initial teacher education programmes offered were accredited (MINEDUC, ACE and ES, 2016). However, the 2016 Law that creates the System for Teacher Professional Development establishes that all initial teacher education programmes will need to be accredited in order to provide qualifications for teaching.

Initial teacher education programmes are organised in the context of the pedagogical autonomy granted to higher education institutions. However, in order to be accredited, they need to cover four key training areas: general (social and cultural factors; the education system; ethics and responsibilities); specialised (disciplinary knowledge; curricular content); professional (learning and teaching methods; tools for teaching) and practical (practice in schools). The 2016 Law that creates the System for Teacher Professional Development further specifies that in order to be accredited teacher education programmes will need to meet given requirements in terms of infrastructure, academic staff, improvement plans, and links to schools, among others. On average, the duration of a teacher education programme is of nine semesters. Programmes include mandatory practice in schools and typically a research project (MINEDUC, ACE and ES, 2016).

In addition, the Ministry of Education, through the Centre for Pedagogical Training, Experimentation and Research (Centro de Perfeccionamiento, Experimentación e Investigaciones Pedagógicas, CPEIP), has developed Graduating Teacher Standards specifying what teacher education graduates should know and be able to do as they enter the teaching profession. These standards have been developed for pre-primary education, basic education, upper secondary education and special education. They include both pedagogical standards and disciplinary standards (Santiago et al., 2013). The 2016 Law that creates the System for Teacher Professional Development requires that these standards are used in the accreditation of teacher education programmes.

The 2016 Law that creates the System for Teacher Professional Development also introduces the assessment of student teachers as a new instrument for quality assurance in initial teacher education. Two assessments of student teachers will be introduced as of 2017: i) an assessment conducted by the respective university of its students as they enter an initial teacher education programme in view of organising further support for those who need it so they become adequately prepared for their programme; and ii) an assessment organised by the Ministry of Education at least one-year prior to the students’
graduation whose results will be provided to the National Accreditation Commission in view of providing feedback to teacher education institutions and generating improvements in the delivery of initial teacher education programmes.

In the municipal sector, there is no compulsory probation period associated with an induction programme for beginning teachers even if it might be in place at the initiative of some municipalities. Similarly, such processes might exist in the private sector at the discretion of school owners. However, the new 2016 Law establishes the National Induction System for Beginning Teachers (Sistema Nacional de Inducción para Docentes Principiantes) as a mandatory component of the System for Teacher Professional Development. This involves an induction process for all beginning teachers which includes mentoring at the school by an experienced teacher with a proven record of quality teaching. The induction process will take place either in the 1st or 2nd year of professional experience and have a duration of up to ten months. The induction process – both the additional hours for the beginning teacher and the hours of the mentor – is funded by the Ministry of Education. The induction process has a formative function and is not associated with a probationary period.

Recruitment into teaching

The major prerequisite for entering the teaching profession is having teacher education qualifications from an institution recognised by the state, being qualified in vocational subjects by an accredited institution, or having an equivalent degree from a foreign institution. Exceptions to this are possible when a qualified teacher is not available. Also, teacher education qualifications are not needed to teach practical vocational subjects in upper secondary education. In this case, all that is required is professional experience and a certificate of specialised training in the relevant area (MINEDUC, ACE and ES, 2016). As of 2016, the CPEIP offers pedagogical training to teachers of practical subjects in vocational education. Also, in order to work as a teacher, there is no need to take a qualifying examination following graduation from an initial teacher education programme.

In the municipal school sector, the recruitment of teachers is organised by municipal education authorities and regulated by the Teacher’s Statute (Ley Estatuto de los Profesionales de la Educación, Estatuto Docente). Open public recruitment processes are organised at least once a year with vacancies published in a national circulation newspaper. A selection commission is formed by the Head of the municipal Education Administration Department or the municipally controlled non-profit corporation which runs education within the municipality, the principal of the school associated with the job vacancy and a teacher randomly selected among peers of the concerned discipline/speciality. Applicants are rated according to professional performance, seniority and training taken and are ranked in a list. The municipality’s mayor then appoints the teacher ranked at the top of the list. In the private school sector, schools have discretion in organising their recruitment processes. Hiring processes in the private school sector are regulated by the general Labour Code (Santiago et al., 2013).

As of 2014, the Ministry of Education defined, in its Indicative Performance Standards for Schools and School Providers (Estándares Indicativos de Desempeño para Establecimientos Educativos y sus Sostenedores), performance standards concerning human resources management which includes specific guidance on personnel selection (standard 10.3, “The school implements effective strategies to attract, select and retain competent personnel”).
However, these are not mandatory for schools and school providers to follow but are simply provided as a reference of good practice (MINEDUC, ACE and ES, 2016).

**Employment status, career structure and remuneration**

Teachers in Chile have salaried employee status both in the municipal and private school sectors. Municipalities and private school owners are the employers of teachers in their respective sectors. Teachers can be hired on a permanent contract (Titular) or on a fixed-term contract (Contrata). Most teachers have permanent employment contracts. In 2005, according to a survey of teachers, 86% and 11% had a permanent contract and a fixed-term contract respectively (Bravo et al., 2006). According to TALIS data, in 2013, about 63% of Chilean lower secondary teachers were permanently employed while 18.6% had a fixed-term contract of more than one year and 18.5% had a fixed-term contract of one year or less (OECD, 2014a).

Conditions of service in the municipal sector are set out in the Teacher’s Statute and other general national labour regulations. The Teacher’s Statute regulates the requirements, duties and rights of teaching professionals working in the municipal sector, including their career structure. Within this framework, municipalities and school principals define the specific service conditions at the school. Private school owners have more flexibility in defining teachers’ conditions of service, observing the general Labour Code (Santiago et al., 2013).

As of 2016, in municipal schools, teaching was organised with a unique career stage with a single salary scale. No promotion opportunities within teaching were available. Roles involving promotion were limited to head of technical-pedagogical units, senior management posts and school principal. Private schools have full discretion in organising their teachers’ career structures (Santiago et al., 2013). As of 2017, this situation will be gradually modified as the new career structure is introduced following the adoption of the 2016 Law that creates the System for Teacher Professional Development (see below).

Teachers’ salaries in the municipal sector consist of a basic component (the National Minimum Basic Salary – *Remuneración Básica Mínima Nacional*, RBMN) and a set of salary allowances. The RBMN differs between pre-primary, basic education and special education teachers (in 2015, CLP 12 293 per hour [USD 18.6 at the exchange rate of 1 August 2016]) and upper secondary teachers in both scientific-humanistic and technical-professional programmes (in 2015, CLP 12 935 per hour [USD 19.6 at the exchange rate of 1 August 2016]). The RBMN is indexed to the salary in the public service. In the private-subsidised sector, employers also need to guarantee the RBMN for teachers but can establish higher pay levels at their discretion. In the private non-subsidised sector, salary levels are fully at the discretion of employers provided they comply with the Labour Code. All teachers in the country are covered by the national pension scheme. Men and women can retire at the age of 65 and 60 respectively (Santiago et al., 2013). However, a significant proportion of teachers remain in the profession beyond this age as the level of pensions is low compared to total teacher compensation. The government occasionally incentivises teachers who have reached retirement age to actually retire, as in 2015 with the bonus for voluntary retirement of CLP 21.5 million (over USD 30 000) given to 10 000 teachers (MINEDUC, ACE and ES, 2016).

Teachers benefit from a large set of salary allowances, as listed in Table 5.6. Some of these cover teachers in the municipal sector only (as noted in the table). There are also
special allowances awarded in the context of school- or municipality-level initiatives to reward the merit of teachers.

Table 5.6. **Salary allowances for teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allowance</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Schools covered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience allowance [Asignación por experiencia]</td>
<td>Corresponds to salary increment every 2 years to a maximum of 15 2-year periods [maximum additional amount corresponds to 100% of RBMN]. Rewards length of service.</td>
<td>Municipal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training allowance [Asignación por perfeccionamiento]</td>
<td>This allowance, which can reach 40% of the RBMN, is provided to teachers who undertake professional development activities registered in the National Public Training Registry (Registro Público Nacional de Perfeccionamiento, RPNP).</td>
<td>Municipal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult conditions of work allowance [Asignación por desempeño en condiciones difíciles]</td>
<td>This allowance, which can reach 30% of the RBMN, is given to teachers in isolated, rural, culturally-diverse and disadvantaged schools.</td>
<td>Municipal and private-subsidised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility allowance [Asignaciones por responsabilidad directiva y técnico-pedagógica]</td>
<td>Given to teachers who serve in senior management and technical-pedagogical positions. It corresponds to 25% of the RBMN for school principals, 20% of the RBMN for other management positions and heads of technical-pedagogical units, and 15% of the RBMN for other professionals of the technical-pedagogical units.</td>
<td>Municipal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance of Excellence allowance [Bonificación de Excelencia Académica, Asignación determinada por el Sistema Nacional de Evaluación del Desempeño de los Establecimientos Subvencionados, SNED]</td>
<td>Collective reward for teachers in schools demonstrating high performance in SIMCE (see below).</td>
<td>Municipal and private-subsidised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable Individual Performance allowance [Asignación Variable por Desempeño Individual, AVDI]</td>
<td>Individual reward to teachers with high performance in the teacher performance evaluation system and who succeed in the voluntary AVDI test (see below).</td>
<td>Municipal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation of pedagogical excellence allowance [Asignación de Excelencia Pedagógica, AEP]</td>
<td>Individual reward to teachers who succeed in their voluntary accreditation of pedagogical excellence (see below).</td>
<td>Municipal and private-subsidised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special allowance for teachers who manage rural schools [Bonificación especial de profesores encargados de escuelas rurales]</td>
<td>Given to teachers who manage a rural school with no school principal.</td>
<td>Municipal and private-subsidised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional recognition allowance [Bonificación de Reconocimiento Profesional]</td>
<td>Allowance to reward the qualifications of teachers, with amounts increasing as the level of the degree increases.</td>
<td>Municipal and private-subsidised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone supplement [Asignación de zona]</td>
<td>Allowance given to teachers who work in localities where subsidies for education were increased as a result of the characteristics of those localities.</td>
<td>Municipal and private-subsidised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplementary salary [Planilla complementaria]</td>
<td>Supplementary amount given to some teachers to guarantee teachers receive a minimum salary.</td>
<td>Municipal and private-subsidised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportional allowance [Bonificación proporcional]</td>
<td>Extra amount given to all teachers in proportion to their contract hours by education providers from a public fund to supplement basic salaries.</td>
<td>Municipal and private-subsidised</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The salaries of Chilean teachers remain among the lowest within the OECD area, both at the start of the career and at the top of the scale (see Figure 5.5). Also, as can be seen in Figure 5.6, the ratio of salary at top of scale to starting salary is high in international comparison (2.11 against an OECD average of 1.70). There is good salary progression throughout the teaching career. However, reaching the top of the scale takes 30 years, considerably above the OECD average (25 years) (OECD, 2016).
Figure 5.5. Teacher annual salaries at start of career and at top of the scale, lower secondary education, public institutions, 2014

Note: Salaries are in equivalent USD converted using PPPs for private consumption. Data refer to statutory salaries for teachers with typical qualifications. Data for France include average bonuses for overtime hours. For Denmark, Finland, Japan and Luxembourg statutory salaries include the part of social security contributions and pension-scheme contributions paid by the employers. For Australia and Finland, statutory salaries do not include the part of social security contributions and pension-scheme contributions paid by the employees. For France, data include the average of fixed bonuses for overtime hours for lower and upper secondary teachers. For the United States, data refer to actual base salaries. For Sweden, data refer to actual base salaries for 2013.

Figure 5.6. Ratio of salary at top of scale to starting salary, lower secondary education, 2014

Note: Data refer to statutory salaries for teachers with typical qualifications. For the United States, data refer to actual base salaries. For Sweden, data refer to actual base salaries for 2013.
The new career structure

The 2016 Law that creates the System for Teacher Professional Development introduces a new multistage career structure, with a salary scale for each career stage. All schools receiving public funding will have to gradually adhere to the new career structure. Municipal schools will have to be integrated in the new system by July 2017, with the process of assigning a career stage to current teachers to be completed in 2016. Private-subsidised schools and schools with delegated administration will initiate their certification processes (for the Recognition of Teacher Professional Development) and be integrated in the new system as of 2018. Teachers in early childhood development institutions will be integrated in the system between 2020 and 2025.

The career structure has five stages:

- Three mandatory stages which seek to ensure competencies for good teaching:
  - Initial (Inicial).
  - Early (Temprano).
  - Advanced (Avanzado).

  The Initial stage corresponds to the immersion in the teaching profession during which the teacher receives guidance and support. The teacher is expected to transition to the Early stage of the career at his or her fourth year of professional experience and it is assumed he or she will not stay longer than eight years in the Initial stage. Teachers will have at most two opportunities to access the Early stage (the second opportunity occurs two years after the first attempt) – in case they fail both attempts, they are removed from the education system. In case the teacher is rated as “outstanding” in the evaluation process to access the Early stage, he or she may be given immediate access to the Advanced stage. Access to the Advanced stage grants the teacher the opportunity to access remunerated functions such as mentor teacher, team leader, among others.

- Two voluntary stages to retain effective teachers in the classroom while giving them development opportunities with specific career paths:
  - Expert I (Experto I).
  - Expert II (Experto II).

  Teachers in both these career stages will have preferential access to roles of pedagogical leadership and guidance.

The multistage career structure is associated with a certification system to determine career progression, the System for the Recognition of Teacher Professional Development (Sistema de Reconocimiento del Desarrollo Profesional Docente). Teachers need to undergo this evaluation process to access a new stage of the career. Reaching a given career stage is valid for the rest of the teacher’s career, there is no need for re-certification to stay in a given career stage. The certification system is described below as part of teacher evaluation.

New teachers enter the career structure in its Initial stage. Current teachers are assigned a specific stage in the new career structure on the basis of years of experience and their previous results in teacher evaluation processes (Teacher performance evaluation system [Sistema de Evaluación del Desempeño Profesional Docente]; the Variable Individual Performance Allowance [Asgnación Variable por Desempeño Individual, AVDI]; and the Accreditation of Pedagogical Excellence Allowance [Asgnación Excelencia Pedagógica, AEP], see below). Access to the Early, Advanced, Expert I and Expert II stages requires the
following minimum years of teaching experience: 4, 4, 8 and 12 respectively. Conditional on years of experience, a teacher is granted access to the different stages as follows:

Table 5.7. Assignment of career stages to current teachers, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result in Portfolio instrument (of either the teacher performance evaluation system or AEP)</th>
<th>Result in the test to assess the disciplinary knowledge of teachers of AVDI or AEP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outstanding</strong> <em>(Destacado)</em> [3.01 to 4 points]</td>
<td>Expert II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competent</strong> <em>(Competente)</em> [2.51 to 3 points]</td>
<td>Expert II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Higher Basic</strong> <em>(Básico superior)</em> [2.26 to 2.50 points]</td>
<td>Expert I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lower Basic</strong> <em>(Básico inferior)</em> [2 to 2.25 points]</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Insufficient</strong> <em>(Insuficiente)</em> [1 to 1.99 points]</td>
<td>Initial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The introduction of the new career structure goes alongside a new remuneration system. The objective is to increase the overall compensation of teachers and reduce the number of components of teacher compensation. Teacher remuneration at the start of the career is expected to be about 30% higher than 2016 salaries of beginning teachers and, as the teacher progresses in the career, he or she will be granted additional allowances associated with additional functions performed. The transition between career stages will involve a salary increase in the form of a Stage Allowance of the System for Professional Development (Asgnación por Tramo del Sistema de Desarrollo Profesional).

A special allowance to work in schools with more vulnerable students is also introduced (Asgnación de Reconocimiento por Docencia en establecimientos de Alta Concentración de Alumnos Prioritarios), whose amount increases the higher is the teacher’s career stage. The current number of salary allowances is reduced with the introduction of the new career structure. For example, the AEP and the AVDI are discontinued as their functions are captured by the certification processes associated with advancement in the new career structure. Salary allowances which are kept include the Experience allowance, the Performance of Excellence allowance and the Professional Recognition allowance.

**Workload and use of teachers’ time**

In Chile, teacher employment is conceived on the basis of a workload system, i.e. regulations stipulate the total number of working hours and define the range of tasks teachers are expected to perform beyond teaching itself. In 2016, the Teacher’s Statute stipulated that teachers should work a maximum of 44 hours a week and that 25% of the hours stipulated in the work contract should be devoted to non-classroom activities. This is being adjusted with the 2016 Law that creates the System for Teacher Professional Development. In 2017, time devoted to non-classroom activities will increase to 30% of contract hours. This will be further increased to 35% in 2019. Also, as of 2019, primary school teachers (Year 1 to 4) employed in schools with over 80% of disadvantaged students will benefit from 40% of contract hours devoted to non-classroom activities. As displayed in Table 5.8, more than 60% of Chilean teachers have a total of 38 contractual hours or
more. This proportion is higher in municipal schools even if the distribution of contractual hours across teachers does not differ greatly among education providers (see Table 5.8).

Table 5.8. Distribution of teachers according to number of contractual hours per week per education provider, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number of contractual hours per week</th>
<th>Municipal schools</th>
<th>Private-subsidised schools</th>
<th>Private non-subsidised schools</th>
<th>Schools with delegated administration</th>
<th>Distinct types of providers</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 30 hours</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 hours</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 31 to 37 hours</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 38 to 43 hours</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 hours or more</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The number of contract hours for each teacher corresponds to the sum of the hours contracted at each of the schools where the teacher works. Data refer to pre-primary, basic and upper secondary education. Data exclude provision by JUNJI, Integra Foundation and private providers with no official recognition. Data refer to all teacher functions listed in Table 5.1. “Distinct types of providers” account for those teachers who work in several schools and whose providers are of a different type.


In 2014, the total annual number of statutory working hours was 2,006 for all education levels, above the OECD averages of 1,577 (pre-primary education), 1,585 (primary education), 1,609 (general lower secondary education) and 1,588 (general upper secondary education) (see Table 5.9) (OECD, 2016). Figure 5.7 reflects self-reports of lower secondary teachers regarding actual hours worked during a week, surprisingly positioning Chilean teachers below the TALIS average (29.2 hours for Chilean lower secondary teachers, against a TALIS average of 38.3 hours). However, another picture emerges when Chilean teachers are asked how many hours they spend per activity (see Figure 5.8).

Regulations stipulate that, for all educational levels, in addition to teaching, the following tasks are expected to be undertaken at the school by teachers with schools having discretion in defining the specified associated required time (OECD, 2014b):

- Individual planning or preparing lessons.
- Teamwork and dialogue with colleagues.
- Marking student work.
- Supervising students during breaks.
- Providing counselling and guidance to students.
- Participating in school management.
- General administrative communication and paperwork.
- Communicating and co-operating with parents or guardians.
- Engaging in extracurricular activities after school.
- Engaging in professional development activities (fully at the discretion of the school).

Figure 5.8 shows the average number of hours lower secondary teachers report having spent on a variety of tasks for both Chile and the average among TALIS countries. It highlights the fact that Chilean teachers spent relatively more time than teachers in other countries on teaching itself while they spent relatively less time in other tasks such as preparation of lessons, marking students’ work, team work and extracurricular activities.
This information also provides a different picture about the total actual working hours of Chilean teachers vis-à-vis the information provided in Figure 5.7.

**Teaching standards**

Chile has developed a national framework defining standards for the teaching profession, the Good Teaching Framework (Marco para la Buena Enseñanza, MBE), as of 2003. The MBE provides a clear and concise statement or profile of what teachers are expected to know and be able to do (Santiago et al., 2013). At the time of the writing of this report, the MBE was being revised. In 2016, a revised version of the MBE was released for public discussion, including with individual teachers. It is expected that the revised MBE will be in use in either 2017 or 2018. The Ministry also intends to develop a version of the MBE adjusted for the specificities of pre-primary teaching.

The MBE specifies the following:

- Domains (4 of them).
- Criteria within domains (20 in total).
- Descriptors for each criterion.
- Performance levels for descriptors.

The four domains are: i) Preparation for teaching; ii) Creation of an environment favouring the learning process; iii) Teaching that allows the learning process of all students; and iv) Professional responsibilities (Santiago et al., 2013). The MBE provides the foundation for each of the criteria and an explanation of each of the descriptors. Rubrics are used to construct performance levels by descriptor (see Santiago et al., 2013, for further details).
Teacher evaluation

Formal teacher evaluation in Chile comprises a range of programmes. Comprehensive mandatory teacher evaluation is organised through the teacher performance evaluation system, covering the municipal school sector only. This system is complemented by a range of reward programmes which involve some type of evaluation: the Programme for the Variable Individual Performance Allowance (municipal sector only) (AVDI); the Programme for the Accreditation of Pedagogical Excellence Allowance (covering the entire subsidised school sector) (AEP); and the National System for Performance Evaluation (SNED), which provides group rewards for teaching bodies of given publicly-subsidised schools. These programmes are described below and additional detail can be found in Santiago et al. (2013).

A recent addition is the certification process associated with the transition of stages in the new career structure: the System for the Recognition of Teacher Professional Development (Sistema de Reconocimiento del Desarrollo Profesional Docente). This system will be implemented as of 2017 and will lead to the discontinuation of the AVDI and the AEP. This certification process is described below.

In addition to the formal programmes outlined above, private schools (both subsidised and non-subsidised) autonomously organise their own performance teacher evaluation

---

Note: A "complete" calendar week is one that was not shortened by breaks, public holidays, sick leave, etc. Also includes tasks that took place during weekends, evenings or other off-classroom hours. The sum of hours spent on different tasks may not be equal to the number of total working hours (shown in Figure 5.7) because teachers were asked about these elements separately. It is also important to note that data presented represent the averages from all the teachers surveyed, including part-time teachers.

systems and any school is free to organise extra internal systems of teacher evaluation. The latter tend to be informal processes of feedback for improvement but can also be part of internal management tools established by the school principal in the context of the 2011 Quality and Equality Education Law.

**Teacher performance evaluation system**

The teacher performance evaluation system (also referred to in Chile as Docentemás) was established in 2003 following a tripartite agreement between the Ministry of Education, the Chilean Association of Municipalities (Asociación Chilena de Municipalidades, AChM) and the Teachers’ Association (Colegio de Profesores) and consists of a formal system of external teacher evaluation in the municipal school sector (see Avalos and Assael, 2006, for an account of its implementation).

The teacher performance evaluation system is aimed at improving teachers’ practice and promoting their continuing professional development in view of improving student learning. It covers all classroom teachers in municipal schools (as well as those in schools with delegated administration) who have at least one year of professional practice. Teachers are assessed every four years, unless their previous evaluation identified poor performance (in which case, they are evaluated more often, see below). The CPEIP, within the Ministry of Education, co-ordinates the whole teacher performance evaluation while the implementation has been undertaken since the inception of the system by the Docentemás team of the Measurement Centre of the Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile.

The following instruments and information sources are used in assessing the performance of a teacher: i) Self-evaluation (teacher rates his or her performance across 12 areas proposed in a questionnaire, with no open-ended questions); ii) Peer evaluator interview (peer evaluator rates the answers of the teacher to a pre-established set of questions); iii) Third-party reference report (rating of the teacher by both the school principal and the head of the technical-pedagogical unit of the school across a range of performance areas); and iv) Teacher performance portfolio (trained markers rate a portfolio composed of a set of pedagogical materials prepared by the teacher and a video recording of a class). The weights of each of the instruments for the final evaluation rating are 10%, 20%, 10% and 60% respectively. Teachers are evaluated against reference standards established by the Good Teaching Framework (Marco para la Buena Enseñanza) (Santiago et al., 2013).

The final decision on each teacher’s performance rating is taken by the Municipal Evaluation Commission. The commission brings together the municipality’s peer evaluators and is typically co-ordinated by the Head of the municipal Education Administration Department or the municipally controlled non-profit corporation which runs education within the municipality. For each evaluated teacher, the commission’s decision is based on a review of the results obtained by the teacher in each of the assessment instruments as well as background information on the concerned teacher. Figure 5.9 summarises the organisational structure of the teacher performance evaluation system:

Teachers are rated into four distinct performance levels:

- Outstanding (Destacado).
- Competent (Competente).
- Basic (Básico).
Unsatisfactory (Insatisfactorio).

The more formal consequences of the teacher performance evaluation system are as follows (other consequences exist for the certification process associated with the new career structure, see below):

- Teachers who are rated Outstanding or Competent are eligible to voluntarily apply to the Variable Individual Performance Allowance programme (Programa Asignación Variable por Desempeño Individual, AVDI), a programme requiring an extra national test to assess the disciplinary and pedagogical knowledge of teachers and which confers monetary rewards based on the results of both the teacher performance evaluation and the AVDI test (see below for further details). Teachers rated as Outstanding or Competent also have priority access to certain professional development opportunities such as internships abroad, professional workshops or academic seminars.

- Teachers who are rated Basic are required to participate in Professional Development Plans (Planes de Superación Profesional, PSP) specifically designed and implemented for them by municipal education authorities and which are supposed to address the development opportunities identified in the evaluation. As of 2011, a Basic rating requires a new evaluation two years later.

- Teachers who are rated Unsatisfactory are also required to participate in targeted Professional Development Plans (Planes de Superación Profesional, PSP) developed by municipal authorities. This rating also entails a new evaluation the following year. As of 2011, if a second consecutive Unsatisfactory rating is given to the teacher, he or she is removed from the teaching post. Also, following the Quality and Equality of Education
Law of 2011, school directors are able to annually dismiss up to 5% of the teaching’s staff among those teachers who were rated as *Unsatisfactory* at their most recent evaluation.

The professional development plans targeted at teachers who obtain a *Basic* or *Unsatisfactory* rating are funded by the Ministry of Education through earmarked resources transferred to municipal education authorities. The design and implementation of Professional Development Plans (PSP) by municipal education authorities require the annual approval by the CPEIP. The CPEIP directly or through Education Regional Secretariats (SEREMI) and Education Provincial Departments (*Departamentos Provinciales de Educación*, DEPROV) inspects and reviews the relevance, timeliness and effectiveness of PSPs, including through surveying the concerned teachers (Santiago et al., 2013).

The teacher performance evaluation system, as of 2014, had covered 83% of municipal teachers (Ministry of Education, 2014). Figure 5.10 displays the distribution of teacher ratings in the teacher performance evaluation system since its inception. The proportion of teachers rated as *Unsatisfactory* or *Basic* has fluctuated between about 24% and 40% while the proportion of teachers rated as *Outstanding* is typically below 10% (Santiago et al., 2013; Ministry of Education, 2014).

**Figure 5.10. Distribution of teacher ratings in the teacher performance evaluation system, 2003-14**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Competent</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Programme for the Variable Individual Performance Allowance**

The Variable Individual Performance Allowance programme (*Programa Asignación Variable por Desempeño Individual*, AVDI), created in 2004, is a voluntary annual reward programme accessible only to those municipal teachers who obtained the classification of
either “Competent” or “Outstanding” in the teacher performance evaluation system. The AVDI aims at strengthening the quality of education through rewarding the strongest performers among those identified as high performing by the teacher performance evaluation system. Eligible teachers can apply only once within the three years that follow a “Competent” or “Outstanding” rating in the teacher performance evaluation system (Santiago et al., 2013).

The single instrument used for the AVDI is an annual national standardised test to assess the disciplinary and pedagogical knowledge of teachers. The test is designed in reference to the MBE and the national curricular framework. AVDI test results are provided into four distinct performance levels: outstanding (Destacado); competent (Competente); sufficient (Suficiente); not approved (No tiene AVDI). Results of the AVDI programme are used to award monetary rewards to teachers who succeed in their application. The amount of the monetary reward depends not only on the AVDI rating but also on the teacher’s rating in the performance evaluation system. A teacher granted an ADVI reward receives an extra annual amount of between 5% and 25% of his or her annual national minimum basic salary, paid in four instalments. The duration of the AVDI reward varies between two and four years (Santiago et al., 2013). With the introduction of the certification process associated with the new career structure in 2017, the AVDI will be discontinued.

Programme for the Accreditation of Pedagogical Excellence Allowance

The programme for the accreditation of pedagogical excellence allowance (Programa de Acreditación para la Asignación de Excelencia Pedagógica, AEP), introduced in 2002, is a voluntary annual programme to recognise the pedagogical excellence of teachers and reward them with one dedicated allowance. Teachers in both municipal and private-subsidised schools are eligible to apply for the programme. The objective of the AEP is to strengthen the quality of education through the recognition of the pedagogical excellence of classroom teachers (Santiago et al., 2013).

The AEP is based on two main instruments: i) a test to assess the disciplinary and pedagogical knowledge of the teacher (weight of 30%); and ii) a portfolio to demonstrate the extent to which the teacher meets standards (weight of 70%). The portfolio has five distinct components: planning and implementation of a learning unit; student assessment strategy; class (video recorded); analysis of videotaped class; and reflection about teaching practice. The AEP is designed in reference to the MBE and the national curricular framework (Santiago et al., 2013).

Teachers who succeed in their application to the AEP are provided with a monetary reward (Excellent Teacher Allowance) and the possibility to apply to the “Maestros” Teacher Network. The monetary reward is broadly equivalent to an extra monthly salary per year for ten years (distributed in two annual instalments). The names of the teachers who obtain the Excellent Teacher Allowance are publicly disclosed. To keep the reward, accredited teachers must be practising classroom teachers in either a municipal or a private-subsidised school and be rated as “Outstanding” or “Competent” by the teacher performance evaluation system during the corresponding period (Santiago et al., 2013). With the introduction of the certification process associated with the new career structure in 2017, the AEP will be discontinued.
National System for Performance Evaluation

The National System for Performance Evaluation (Sistema Nacional de Evaluación de Desempeño, SNED), which started operating in 1996, is a system for evaluating school performance which rewards teachers and education assistants within a school for their performance in the System to Measure the Quality of Education (Sistema de Medición de Calidad de la Educación, SIMCE), the full-cohort national standardised assessment of student performance across the country. The SNED is organised every two years and covers the subsidised sector, i.e. municipal schools, private-subsidised schools and schools with delegated administration (Santiago et al., 2013).

The SNED reward is based on the SNED performance index which is determined, for each individual school, as a weighted average of the following factors (weight indicated in parentheses) (Santiago et al., 2013):

- Effectiveness: SIMCE performance level (37%).
- Progress: Growth of SIMCE results over time (28%).
- Initiative: Ability of the school to introduce educational innovations and draw the support of external agents to their teaching activities (6%).
- Improvement of working conditions and adequate functioning of the school: compliance with regulations and statistical processes (assessment by inspection of the Ministry of Education) (2%).
- Equality of opportunities (22%).
- Participation of teachers and parents in the development of the school’s educational project (5%).

In order to ensure greater fairness, in each region, schools are ranked according to the SNED performance index within homogeneous groups, i.e. groups of schools which are broadly comparable in terms of the socio-economic characteristics of their student populations and other school-level characteristics. The variables used to define the groups are the following: region; geographical area (urban or rural); level and type of education (primary education only; secondary education with or without primary education, special education); Schooling Vulnerability Index (Índice de Vulnerabilidad Escolar, IVE); average household income of students’ families (SIMCE questionnaire to parents); and average schooling of parents (SIMCE questionnaire to parents) (Santiago et al., 2013).

Schools within the top 35th percentile (of student population within each homogeneous group) receive the “Subsidy for Performance of Excellence”, with the level of the subsidy depending on the position in the ranking: 100% of the subsidy if the school is within the top 25th percentile; and 60% otherwise. Rewards are distributed among teachers and education assistants within each rewarded school. Regulations specify that 90% of the Subsidy for Performance of Excellence is to be distributed to teachers in proportion to the number of individual contract hours. The remaining resources may be distributed according to special incentives programmes designed by individual schools (Santiago et al., 2013).

Certification as part of the new career structure

Progression in the new career structure is associated with a certification process, the System for the Recognition of Teacher Professional Development (Sistema de Reconocimiento
del Desarrollo Profesional Docente). This evaluation process, to be implemented as of 2017, will take into account the following dimensions:

- Disciplinary and pedagogical competencies and knowledge.
- Experience.
- Activities other than teaching such as collaborative work with other teachers and interaction with students and parents.
- Pedagogical innovation and the development of teaching materials.
- Pertinent professional development activities.

Two evaluation instruments will be used:

- An instrument to evaluate pedagogical and specific knowledge (test), to be organised by the Agency for Quality in Education. If the teacher reaches one of the two top rates, he or she will no longer need to take this test during his or her career.
- A professional portfolio of pedagogical competencies, which will evaluate classroom teaching; the teacher’s responsibilities in and outside the classroom; collaborative work with other teachers; pedagogical innovation; and professional development activities. If a teacher reaches a high rate in this instrument, it may not need to undergo the same portfolio evaluation at the next evaluation process.

Teacher evaluation internal to the school

Education providers (municipalities, delegated administrations and private owners) are free to design and implement teacher evaluation processes that complement the formal evaluation processes described previously. Many municipal schools (and schools with delegated administrations) organise extra evaluation procedures, which tend to be more informal processes of feedback for improvement. To a great extent there is an expectation that school leaders in all schools undertake regular internal evaluations of the teachers in their school. Private schools also organise their own performance teacher evaluation systems (Santiago et al., 2013).

Teacher professional development

Teachers in Chile have access to a variety of professional development activities with more traditional forms, such as courses, subject specialisations and seminars coexisting with other forms that are provided in schools or municipalities, such as municipal workshops and internship projects as well as postgraduate studies provided in institutions of higher education. Professional development activities are typically chosen individually by the teacher. The CPEIP co-ordinates the supply of professional development in the country, defines priority areas, and supplies key offerings. It also accredits professional development courses for teachers, which are then listed in the National Public Training Registry (Registro Público Nacional de Perfeccionamiento, RPNP). The RPNP functions as a large database with information on accredited offerings. A variety of providers exists: the CPEIP, autonomous higher education institutions and providers accredited by the CPEIP such as labour associations, education consulting companies and municipal training centres. Municipal teachers benefit from a training allowance for attending courses in this Registry, which requires approval by the municipal educational authority. Participation in such activities typically occurs outside of term time (Santiago et al., 2013).
A significant initiative in relation to professional development was the creation in 2002 of the “Maestros” Teacher Network. The principle is to benefit from the expertise and experience of teachers who received the accreditation of pedagogical excellence (AEP, see above). In order to be members of the “Maestros” Teacher Network, AEP teachers need to go through a selection process which requires giving evidence, through the submission of a portfolio, that they have the skills to work well with their peers. The Network members design projects aimed at working with other teachers outside school hours (Santiago et al., 2013). The “Maestros” Teacher Network operates an Internet platform where its members can share their experiences. Members of the network are certified to provide pedagogical advisory services to individual schools. As of 2014, 1 222 teachers were part of this network (MINEDUC, ACE and ES, 2016). Another example of collaborative learning among Chilean teachers is the set of networks of English teachers co-ordinated by the “English Opens Doors” Programme ([Programa Inglés Abre Puertas], PIAP) of the Ministry of Education which aim to promote effective English teaching practices (MINEDUC, ACE and ES, 2016).

An important opportunity for collaborative learning in rural areas is provided by the rural micro-centres ([Microcentros Rurales]), which are local networks of teachers from multigrade schools. The objective is to share experiences and develop teaching and learning strategies that meet local socio-cultural conditions. As of 2015, there were 374 rural micro-centres with teachers from 2 400 multigrade rural schools developing teaching and learning strategies pertinent for their specific context with the support from the Ministry of Education.

The 2016 Law that creates the System for Teacher Professional Development ([Sistema de Desarrollo Profesional Docente]) introduces significant adjustments to the provision of professional development for teachers. It guarantees the availability of free and pertinent professional development activities to assist teachers in their career progression. The CPEIP will co-ordinate these activities and be the main provider in collaboration with other organisations licensed to provide professional development for teachers. The offer of professional development activities as well as the choice for individual teachers will be informed by both the System for the Recognition of Teacher Professional Development and school improvement plans ([Plan de Mejoramiento Educativo], PME). In addition, schools will be incentivised to develop own development plans for their teaching bodies to promote collaborative work and pedagogical feedback within the school. These plans should become part of the school improvement plan (PME). By the end of 2017, the CPEIP will organise a unit within each DEPROV called Local Committee for Teacher Professional Development ([Comité Local de Desarrollo Profesional Docente]) in view of identifying teacher professional needs within each province.

**Strengths**

**Clear standards of practice provide a solid reference for teacher policy**

The Good Teaching Framework ([Marco para la Buena Enseñanza], MBE) provides a clear definition of what constitutes good teaching, based on a solid research foundation. It encompasses all the important aspects of teaching such as planning, creating a classroom environment conducive to learning, effective teaching, and professional responsibilities. The MBE is intended to be used as the common benchmark for understanding teaching practice and align the different components of teacher policy. The shared understanding of the MBE, if it is truly shared, enables a common language to develop around the definition
of good teaching, and, with that, professional conversation. None of this is possible without clear standards of practice, which are widely understood and whose underlying values are shared by both academics and practitioners (Santiago et al., 2013).

The establishment of teaching standards that provide a clear and concise profile of what teachers are expected to know and be able to do is a major source of strength. Teaching standards are essential mechanisms for clarifying expectations of what systems of teacher education and professional development should aim to achieve, offering the credible reference for making judgements about teacher competence, guiding teacher professional development, and providing the basis for career advancement. Clear, well-structured and widely supported teaching standards are a powerful mechanism for aligning the various elements involved in developing teachers’ knowledge and skills (OECD, 2005).

A positive development is the ongoing revision to the MBE. The revised MBE, which should be in place in 2017 or 2018, reviews the criteria and performance levels to ensure they reflect the most recent research regarding good teaching practice. It is essential that the MBE reflects the specific aspects of teaching which show the highest correlations with student learning as reflected by recent educational research. Important innovations of the draft revised MBE undergoing public discussion at the time of writing of this report include the integration of student assessment into instruction and student active engagement in learning. Also, an important step in aligning initial teacher education to the MBE was the development of the Graduating Teacher Standards. These were developed to guide the content and structure of initial teacher education programmes and define the set of competencies and knowledge all graduates should acquire as part of their initial teacher education.

**A new competency-based career structure is being introduced and teachers have opportunities to diversify their roles at schools**

A multistage career structure based on the acquisition of competencies is being introduced. This is a positive move to get away from the previous single stage career structure with no promotion opportunities within teaching. The new competency-based career structure presents a range of advantages.

**The multistage career structure provides opportunities for recognition**

The existence of a multistage career structure accomplishes the important function of recognising experience and advanced teaching skills with a formal position and additional compensation. As teachers demonstrate further competencies, they are given access to new stages of the career in which they make better use of their competencies while remaining in the classroom. The new career structure conveys the important message that the guiding principle for career advancement is merit and has the benefit of rewarding teachers who choose to remain in the classroom. However, the career structure does not include a probationary process upon entrance into the teaching profession, a typical process in other countries before full certification or a permanent teaching post is awarded. The career structure model, as currently designed, allows an underperforming teacher to remain in the profession for eight years before removal can be considered (see below).
Career stages are associated with formally recognised roles and tasks within schools

The new career structure provides greater potential to better match teachers’ skills to the roles and responsibilities needed in schools. As teachers access the Advanced stage, the teacher is granted the opportunity to access functions such as mentor teacher, team leader, among others. As teachers access the voluntary stages of Expert I and Expert II, they are given preferential access to roles of pedagogical leadership and guidance. Hence, as they access higher stages of the career structure, teachers are expected to have deeper levels of knowledge, demonstrate more sophisticated and effective teaching, take on responsibility for curricular and assessment aspects of the school, assist colleagues and so on. Given the potential greater variety of roles in schools as the teacher goes up the career ladder, the career structure has the potential to generate greater career diversification. These roles, which do not necessarily involve differentiated pay but instead release time from classroom teaching, provide more opportunities and recognition for teachers and meet school needs (OECD, 2005).

Career progression is achieved through a certification process

Progression in the career structure involves an evaluation of the teacher through a certification process, the System for the Recognition of Teacher Professional Development (Sistema de Reconocimiento del Desarrollo Profesional Docente). It is a competency-based process, i.e. it directly assesses whether a teacher has acquired the competencies needed to perform at the different stages of the career, using as a reference teacher professional standards (Good Teaching Framework).

It is adequate that access to higher stages of the career structure involves a formal certification process. Such certification processes that are linked to career development can help provide incentives for teachers to perform at their best, bring recognition to effective teachers, support professional learning, and help recognise and spread good practice more widely. Given the high stakes of teacher certification, it is appropriate to use a national framework and standards procedures as well as an external component (external markers of a professional portfolio and a standardised written assessment) to ensure objectivity and fairness (Santiago and Benavides, 2009). The teacher certification model also intends to have good links to teaching practice, in particular through the analysis of a teacher portfolio which will include classroom observation. The certification model also intends to cover the broad responsibilities of teachers beyond classroom teaching.

However, it is less clear why certifying a teacher as fit to perform at a given career stage should be valid for the rest of the teacher’s career. As currently planned, there is no need for re-certification to stay in a given career stage. This can be problematic as the teacher will lack incentives to update his or her knowledge and skills continuously. This might be a source of concern particularly for teachers not progressing beyond the Advanced stage as many years with no challenge to his or her competencies might result in non-identified underperformance.

Induction into the profession becomes an integral part of teacher development

Another positive feature of the new career structure is that beginning teachers are supposed to benefit from an induction process which includes a mentoring process with duration of up to ten months. This will provide teachers with support and additional
training as they enter the profession. Beginning teachers are to be assigned a more experienced colleague as a mentor during this period. TALIS 2013 data seem to indicate that this practice is indeed not yet widely spread across Chilean schools. In TALIS 2013, 59.9% of Chilean lower secondary teachers were in schools where the principal reported that no formal induction programme was available for new teachers, compared to the international average of 34.2% (OECD, 2014a). There is ample evidence suggesting that there are benefits beginning teachers gain from mentoring while mentors also derive substantial benefits from the mentoring experience (OECD, 2005).

The new career structure simplifies teacher compensation

The new career structure provided an opportunity to simplify teacher compensation in Chile. The teacher incentive system, in addition to the basic salary, includes a large set of salary allowances. It results in a rather complex and fragmented system of incentives for teachers. It seems that the various incentive mechanisms were created at different times for different reasons, but such a scattered approach dilutes the focus on identifying and rewarding Chile’s best teachers (Santiago et al., 2013). Given that advancement in the career structure goes alongside greater compensation (through the Stage allowance) which recognises good performance, the rationale for keeping certain salary allowance was reduced. The AEP and the AVDI will be discontinued as their functions are replaced by those associated to the certification process to access the higher career stages. In the end, the set of salary allowances will be considerably reduced resulting in a teacher compensation system which sends clearer incentives to teachers.

Further recognition is given to activities other than teaching

In Chile, teacher employment is conceived on the basis of a workload system, whereby compensation is associated with a teacher’s working load. This is likely to improve efficiency in the teacher labour market. This is in contrast with countries which conceive teacher employment on the basis of a teaching load only. Employment under a workload system recognises that teachers need time for engaging in a range of other tasks, including the adequate preparation of lessons. This is likely to make the profession more attractive, by recognising the variety of tasks a teacher performs, and to reduce the number of teachers seeking a high teaching load if pay was directly associated with the number of teaching hours. At the same time, this allows teachers to engage in activities other than teaching, in light of school priorities, including through the requirement to stay at the school outside teaching hours (and within working hours). This also fosters teacher engagement at the school and provides greater opportunities for collaboration among teachers.

This is particularly relevant in the context of Chile which is characterised by high working loads and a considerable proportion of teaching hours (see below). The 2016 Law that creates the System for Teacher Professional Development improves teachers’ working conditions and gives further recognition to activities other than teaching. It increases the proportion of non-teaching hours within the regulated working hours. This potentially fosters teacher engagement at the school and increases the opportunities for collaboration among teachers. At the same time, the certification process to grant access to the different career stages is being designed so that activities other than teaching are given due importance.
Efforts to raise teacher salaries send important signals about the importance of teaching

The 2016 Law that creates the System for Teacher Professional Development involves considerable efforts on the part of the Chilean government to increase teacher salaries. Teacher salaries at the start of the career have been planned to be about 30% higher than 2016 salaries for beginning teachers. The career structure is also designed to provide significant salary increases as the teacher transitions to a higher stage. This reflects a commitment to bring teacher salaries to more adequate levels. There is a clear awareness that the salaries of Chilean teachers remain among the lowest within the OECD area, both at the start of the career and at the top of the scale (see Figure 5.5). Salaries of Chilean teachers relative to those of tertiary-educated workers aged 25-64 in Chile are also among the lowest among the OECD for which there are data (see Figure 5.11): for lower secondary teachers, they only reach 73% of the average salary of tertiary-educated workers (OECD, 2016). This is confirmed by national data. According to statistics from the Higher Education Information Service, in 2013, five years after graduation, on average, the salaries of teachers reached only about 80%, 30% and 27% of the earnings of university-educated individuals with a technical career, civil engineers and medical doctors respectively (MINEDUC, ACE and ES, 2016). Salaries of teachers, five years after graduation, are at about the same level of those of individuals with a technical career who obtained their qualifications from a technical training centre (Centros de formación técnica, tertiary non-university institutions offering two- to three-year technical programmes) (MINEDUC, ACE and ES, 2016).

Figure 5.11. Teachers’ actual salaries relative to those of tertiary-educated workers aged 25-64, public institutions, pre-primary and lower secondary education, 2014

Note: Data refer to the ratio of salary, using annual average salaries (including bonuses and allowances) of teachers in public institutions relative to the wages of full-time, full-year workers with tertiary education, for the 25-64 age range. For Finland, France and Sweden the reference year is 2013.

The teacher policy framework is progressively including the publicly-subsidised private sector

The 2016 Law that creates the System for Teacher Professional Development is an opportunity to include teachers in private-subsidised schools into the national teacher policy framework. Private-subsidised schools will initiate their certification processes (for the Recognition of Teacher Professional Development) and be integrated in new career system as of 2018.

Currently, there are no national requirements for teachers in private-subsidised schools to undergo an evaluation process. The typical approach for teacher evaluation in the private school sector consists of giving independence to school providers to run their own procedures, which are not validated externally by public education authorities. This means that there is no public assurance that the majority of teachers in Chile (who work in the private school sector) have their work evaluated once they enter the profession. The risk of a limited integration is that there is little guarantee that teacher evaluation procedures in the private sector rely on the agreed national understanding of good quality teaching (the Good Teaching Framework) and are sufficiently aligned with student learning objectives and educational targets at the national level (Santiago et al., 2013).

Given that private-subsidised schools receive public funds for their operation, it is perfectly legitimate that the new law integrates them to some degree into a national teacher policy framework. This will be progressively achieved while respecting the freedom of organisation of private schools. A complementary valuable development is the fact that the Agency for Quality Education is now required to externally validate internal teacher evaluation processes conducted by private schools. This is in a context where broader external school evaluation processes by the Agency and the Education Superintendence (Superintendencia de Educación) already include private-subsidised schools (see Chapter 4).

Initial teacher education benefits from a range of positive initiatives

There is a clear awareness among stakeholders of the need to improve the quality of initial teacher education. It is recognised that a key objective for teacher policy is attracting talent to initial teacher education and offering student teachers a preparation of high quality so they fulfil their potential as future teachers. There is evidence showing that the quality of entrants into initial teacher education is low and the perception that the proliferation of initial teacher education programmes in the country (1,213 in 2015) inevitably means that some do not meet the required standards.

In this context, it is commendable that the 2016 Law that creates the System for Teacher Professional Development includes a range of initiatives to improve the quality of initial teacher education graduates. First, it establishes new requirements to enter initial teacher education programmes – only secondary graduates reaching a given threshold level in entrance tests will be given access. This is adequate as there is room for initial teacher education to be more selective as there is no overall quantitative shortage of teachers in Chile. Second, institutions of teacher education can no longer provide qualifications for teaching if their teacher education programmes are not formally accredited. In addition, a range of new accreditation requirements were added in terms of infrastructure, academic staff, improvement plans and links to schools. Third, the introduction of the external assessment of student teachers before their graduation will
provide useful information to monitor the quality of initial teacher education programmes and devise improvement plans for the delivery of the programmes.

In addition, a number of initiatives are likely to stimulate the decision to engage in initial teacher preparation. The Teacher Vocation Scholarship (Beca Vocación de Profesor, BVP) provides academically talented secondary education graduates with a scholarship and other benefits if they choose teacher education as a higher education degree and teach in a subsidised school at least three years. The extent of the benefit depends on the score obtained in the university selection test (PSU). In 2015, 9,413 scholarships were awarded (MINEDUC, ACE and ES, 2016). A further initiative is the “Choose to Teach” (Elige Educar) campaign, a partnership between the Ministry and the Elige Educar non-governmental organisation, which seeks to promote teaching through a variety of actions, including the monitoring of the social status of teaching, scholarships for individuals with experience outside education who would like to join teaching, and interventions to raise awareness among school agents of the importance of teaching as a profession (Santiago et al., 2013). The decision to limit to universities the provision of initial teacher education programmes is also likely to improve the status of teaching.

**Teacher evaluation is well-established and considerable experience has been accumulated**

In Chile, teacher evaluation is recognised as an important policy lever to improve student learning and is central in the overall school policy framework. This is reflected in the substantial work on teaching standards, the very comprehensive approach to teacher evaluation in municipal schools and the multitude of reward programmes in the subsidised school sector. Over ten years of experience with formal teacher evaluation have produced a conviction among most teachers about the need for teachers to be evaluated, receive professional feedback, improve their practice and have their achievements recognised. The recognition of teacher evaluation as a positive and necessary process by most teachers is an important outcome of the experience thus far with teacher evaluation (Santiago et al., 2013).

A significant experience has been accumulated in the use of a variety of instruments and sources of information. This includes classroom observation, assessment of pedagogical materials, self-evaluation, peer evaluation and written assessments of the disciplinary and pedagogical knowledge of teachers. The different models have considerably built on research evidence. The Docentemás team, based in the Measurement Centre of the Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, brings technical expertise, academic rigour and research evidence into the implementation of teacher evaluation. It also investigates the functioning and impact of teacher evaluation as with the publication La Evaluación Docente en Chile (Manzi et al., 2011). This translates into desirable independence vis-à-vis the range of stakeholders with an interest in teacher evaluation and the potential to introduce modifications on the basis of identified best practices. In addition, the Ministry of Education through the CPEIP and its Planning unit conduct a range of studies about the impact of educational policies, including teacher evaluation, and best practices in teaching and learning (Santiago et al., 2013).

**Selection and recruitment processes are regulated to ensure their transparency**

The selection and recruitment of municipal teachers offer some guarantees of transparency while ensuring local agents are involved to better account for the needs of
the concerned school. Teaching vacancies need to be widely advertised in a national circulation newspaper and a selection committee formed of representatives of the employer (the municipality), representatives of the concerned school (the school principal), and representatives of the profession (a randomly selected teacher among peers of the same specialty) is formed. The mayor is required to select the teacher ranked at the top of the list by the selection committee. The participation of local stakeholders in the recruitment of teachers has considerable advantages. It allows a better match between individual applicants’ characteristics and schools’ specific needs. Applicants are also in a better position to identify with the school’s educational project. In this context, it is suitable to have in place processes providing some transparency as to avoid opportunities for favouritism in teacher selection by schools. Given that private-subsidised schools receive public funds for their operation, their selection and recruitment approaches could also be regulated to ensure levels of transparency similar to those observed in municipal schools.

**Incentives to teach in disadvantaged schools are improving**

The 2016 Law that creates the System for Teacher Professional Development recognises the challenging working conditions of disadvantaged schools and introduces new incentives for individual teachers to work in them. A special allowance to work in schools with more vulnerable students is introduced (Asignación de Reconocimiento por Docencia en establecimientos de Alta Concentración de Alumnos Prioritarios), whose amount increases the higher is the teacher’s career stage. This reinforces the current allowance for difficult conditions of work given to teachers in isolated, rural, culturally-diverse and disadvantaged schools. Also, as of 2019, primary school teachers employed in schools with over 80% of disadvantaged students will benefit from 40% of contract hours devoted to non-classroom activities. These measures improve the ability of schools and the system as a whole to address staffing problems in disadvantaged schools. As analysed later, there are indications of an inequitable distribution of teachers across schools.

**There are opportunities for professional development**

There is a range of in-service professional development activities to which teachers have access. Particularly important in this respect is the contribution of the Centre for Pedagogical Training, Experimentation and Research (Centro de Perfeccionamiento, Experimentación e Investigaciones Pedagógicas, CPEIP), which co-ordinates the supply of professional development activities, defines priority areas and provides professional development programmes. The CPEIP is in a particularly good position to identify teacher professional development needs and subsequently inform the supply of professional development programmes through its contact with Ministry’s local representatives, namely the Education Provincial Departments (DEPROV) which have a direct interaction with schools and their needs.

Teachers also have facilitated access to information on professional development opportunities through the National Public Training Registry (Registro Público Nacional de Perfeccionamiento, RPNP), an Internet-based platform managed by the CPEIP. The RPNP brings together the professional development programmes accredited by the CPEIP, a function that ensures minimum quality standards in the provision of professional development for teachers. Municipal teachers also benefit from a training allowance. However, there appears to be little culture of professional development in Chile (see below).
The 2016 Law that creates the System for Teacher Professional Development states promising principles for teacher professional development likely to increase its effectiveness. It aims to offer an entitlement for free and pertinent professional development; it proposes individual professional development plans informed by the needs of both the teacher and the school; and it empowers school principals to develop a plan for professional development at the school in alignment with the school improvement plan. The objective is to move to a system whereby teachers have the incentive to undertake professional development to gain the competencies needed to access the higher stages of the teaching career and perform new roles at schools.

Challenges

The status of the teaching profession is low

Many of the stakeholders interviewed by the OECD review team commented on the low status of the teaching profession. There is a feeling among some Chilean teachers that society does not value their work. According to TALIS 2013 data, 33.5% of lower secondary Chilean teachers reported that they agree or strongly agree that the teaching profession is valued in society, slightly above the TALIS average (30.9%). A good proportion of them (31.9%) also wonder whether it would have been better to choose another profession (against a TALIS average of 31.6%). Nonetheless, 94.6% of Chilean lower secondary teachers also reported that they are satisfied with their job, against a TALIS average of 91.2% (OECD, 2014a).

National studies confirm the low status of the teaching profession. Only 47% of the general population state that being a teacher is a source of pride (Cabezas and Claro, 2011) and about 80% of teachers state that social recognition of teaching as a profession is medium or low (Ávalos and Sevilla, 2010). Clearly, there are concerns about the image and status of teaching in Chile, and teachers often feel that their work is undervalued. This is related to the low relative salaries of teachers (see above) which, to a great extent, determine the teaching profession’s social standing. As a result, the teaching profession is not competitive in the labour market, causing difficulties in attracting young people and males to the teaching profession and in keeping motivated those already on the job (see OECD, 2005, for evidence on the impact of salaries on the supply of teachers). There are also concerns regarding working conditions, namely in terms of heavy workloads (see below). It is also unclear the rationale for upper secondary teachers to earn more per hour worked than pre-primary, basic education and special education teachers given that the level of qualifications for teaching is the same among all teachers and demands on teachers are similar across educational levels.

There are concerns about teacher quality

There are concerns about shortages of good quality teachers. According to TALIS 2013 data, Chilean principals of schools providing lower secondary education identify the shortage of qualified and/or well-performing teachers as the main resource issue hindering the school’s capacity to provide quality instruction, a problem perceived as much more acute than in other countries participating in TALIS (an issue affecting 56.7% of Chilean lower secondary teachers, the fourth highest figure among TALIS countries, with a TALIS average of 38.4%) (see Figure 5.12). The equivalent figure for shortage of vocational teachers is 46.4%, also much higher than the TALIS average of 19.3% (OECD, 2014a). A similar picture emerges for upper secondary education. According to PISA 2012 data, the
percentage of 15-year-old students in schools whose Chilean principals reported that the lack of qualified teachers in mathematics, science, language of instruction and other subjects hindered student learning “to some extent” or “a lot” was 43%, 42%, 27% and 33% respectively, considerably above the OECD averages of 17%, 17%, 9% and 21% (OECD, 2013b).

Also, in 2014, about 23% of teachers evaluated by the teacher performance evaluation system were rated below “Competent” (see Figure 5.10).

**Teachers have heavy workloads with a great proportion of contact hours**

In international comparison, Chilean teachers have both high teaching time and high statutory working time. Teaching time in Chile is considerably above the OECD average with 1 146 maximum annual teaching hours at all education levels compared to OECD averages of 1 005, 776, 694 and 644 hours in pre-primary, primary, lower secondary and upper secondary programmes respectively (see Table 5.9). Similarly, statutory working hours are considerably above OECD averages for the different educational levels (see Table 5.9). As seen earlier, more than 60% of Chilean teachers work 38 hours or more (see Table 5.8). There is also evidence that Chilean teachers spend a greater proportion of their working time in classroom teaching (see Figure 5.8).
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**Figure 5.12. Resource issues hindering quality instruction, lower secondary education, Chile and TALIS average, 2013**

Note: Data correspond to the percentage of lower secondary teachers whose school director reports that the resource issues depicted above hindered quality instruction “a lot” or “to some extent”.


This suggests that Chilean teachers have less room to spend time in lesson preparation, student assessment, professional development or teacher collaboration than peers in other countries. This is not desirable as it can be detrimental for teachers’
professional growth. During its visit, the OECD review team saw few examples of communities of practice on schools where teachers share strategies, reflect as a team and collaborate in specific projects. This is likely to at least partly result from the time demands of teachers’ jobs.

In addition, the size of classes is relatively high in Chile at 30 and 31 for primary and general lower secondary education respectively against OECD averages of 21 and 23 respectively (OECD, 2016). This adds to teachers’ workload and further reduces their ability to engage in collaborative work and reflective practice.

**Table 5.9. Teachers’ working time in Chile and selected countries, hours per year, public institutions, 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Net teaching time</th>
<th>Chile</th>
<th>Brazil</th>
<th>Colombia</th>
<th>Mexico</th>
<th>Portugal</th>
<th>Spain</th>
<th>OECD average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-primary education</td>
<td>1 146</td>
<td>1 200</td>
<td>1 047</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>1 005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary education</td>
<td>1 146</td>
<td>1 000</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>776</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower secondary education</td>
<td>1 146</td>
<td>1 200</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>694</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper secondary education</td>
<td>1 146</td>
<td>1 200</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>694</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total statutory working time</th>
<th>Chile</th>
<th>Brazil</th>
<th>Colombia</th>
<th>Mexico</th>
<th>Portugal</th>
<th>Spain</th>
<th>OECD average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-primary education</td>
<td>2 006</td>
<td>1 600</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1 412</td>
<td>1 425</td>
<td>1 577</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary education</td>
<td>2 006</td>
<td>1 600</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1 586</td>
<td>1 425</td>
<td>1 585</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower secondary education</td>
<td>2 006</td>
<td>1 600</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1 442</td>
<td>1 425</td>
<td>1 609</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper secondary education</td>
<td>2 006</td>
<td>1 600</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1 442</td>
<td>1 425</td>
<td>1 588</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x: not applicable
.. : missing data

Note: Data for lower and upper secondary education refer to general programmes. Data for Chile and Portugal refer to maximum teaching time; data for Colombia, Mexico and Spain refer to typical teaching time.


There are some challenges to the preparation of teachers

Initial teacher education raises a range of concerns. First, there is evidence indicating that initial teacher education is not attracting the best candidates from school education. This reflects the loss in the attractiveness of teaching as a result of low salaries, difficult working conditions and the low status of the profession. However, the 2016 Law that creates the System for Teacher Professional Development is introducing a range of initiatives (e.g. more selective entry into teacher education; better remuneration) that are likely to improve the attractiveness of the teaching profession.

Second, there are indications that teachers in mainstream schools are not adequately prepared to instruct students with special educational needs. Chilean lower secondary school principals identify the shortage of teachers with competencies in teaching students with special needs as the second main resource issue hindering the school’s capacity to provide quality instruction, a problem perceived as more acute than in other countries participating in TALIS (an issue affecting 51.5% of Chilean teachers against a TALIS average of 48.0%) (see Figure 5.12).

Third, teaching students with special needs, teaching in a multicultural or multilingual setting and student career guidance and counselling have been identified by Chilean lower secondary teachers as their main needs for professional development, according to TALIS (see Figure 5.13), which might potentially indicate some under emphasis in these areas in initial teacher education and professional development programmes.
Finally, the OECD review team formed the impression that teachers receive little preparation for multigrade teaching (i.e. simultaneously teaching students who are in different school years) and teaching in rural schools. The regular preparation of teachers does not seem to include special training to deal with rural contexts, or to provide special strategies for teaching in multigrade classes.

Figure 5.13. Teachers’ needs for professional development, lower secondary education, Chile and TALIS average, 2013

Note: Data correspond to the percentage of lower secondary education teachers indicating they have a high level of need for professional development in the areas displayed.

Teacher underperformance is not adequately addressed in the first few years of the career

While a comprehensive teacher evaluation system has been established in Chile, the identification of teacher underperformance, particularly in the early stages of the career, remains limited. The introduction of a mentoring process upon entry into the teaching is a positive development but it is not associated with a probationary period. This considerably reduces the scope for beginning teachers and their employers to assess whether teaching is the right career for them. The introduction of the new career structure was a missed opportunity to include a probationary period as the first major step in gaining certification.
for the teaching profession. At present, the school system can only respond to specific instances of teacher underperformance in two situations:

- Teachers are given two opportunities to access the Early stage of the new career structure, with a failure at the second opportunity (two years after the first attempt) leading to dismissal from the education system. This means that a teacher can perform below standards at least during six years. The teacher is placed in the Initial stage of the career as he or she enters the profession and is not required to undergo certification to access the Early stage until his or her fourth year of experience.

- The teacher performance evaluation system provides for the dismissal of underperforming municipal teachers in case the teacher is rated Unsatisfactory two consecutive times. The evaluation cycle is four years while a rating of Unsatisfactory leads to a new evaluation the following year. School principals can also dismiss up to 5% of the teaching's staff among those teachers who were rated Unsatisfactory at their most recent evaluation. This means that a teacher may remain in the profession at four or five years while performing below standards. The teacher performance evaluation system is designed to deal with the most critical cases of sustained underperformance in municipal schools.

In addition, once they have reached the Advanced stage of the new career structure, teachers no longer need to go through an evaluation to confirm their certification at these stages of the career. As a result, teachers may perform at a level lower than expected at the concerned career stage for a number of years. While it is a strength of the system that processes exist to move ineffective teachers either out of the school system or into non-teaching roles, there remain opportunities for underperforming teachers to remain in the system for long periods of time. If sustained underperformance by teachers is not tackled this has adverse consequences not only on student learning but also on the reputation of both schools and the teaching profession.

There is considerable overlap between teacher evaluation for certification and the teacher performance evaluation system

The introduction of the new career structure is leading to the establishment of an evaluative certification process to determine teacher transition across career stages. While the broad features of this new component of teacher evaluation have been defined, its more specific characteristics are still to be determined. At the same time, Chile has had extensive experience with its teacher performance evaluation system whose major functions considerably overlap with those attributed to teacher evaluation for career certification. Hence, in order to reduce duplication in the overall teacher evaluation system, it is important to define the functions of each of these two components of teacher evaluation and identify how they can inform each other.

To begin with both the teacher performance evaluation system and teacher evaluation for certification are high-stakes teacher evaluation processes with accountability as their dominant function. The teacher performance evaluation system gives access to monetary rewards to the best rated teachers (through AVDI – even if this will be discontinued as the new Law that creates the System for Teacher Professional Development is implemented) and can lead to dismissal for underperformance. Similarly, teacher evaluation for certification monetarily rewards teachers through access to higher salary scales and may lead to dismissal if the teacher is unable to access the Early certification stage. Also, both teacher evaluation processes use a professional portfolio with classroom observation as
their main evaluation instrument. Clearly, there is considerable duplication across both processes. At the same time, there is considerable potential for the teacher performance evaluation system to inform certification processes, as is the case with the assignment of career stages in the new career structure to current teachers.

**There are a number of concerns about the operation of professional development**

In international comparison, the participation rates of Chilean teachers in professional development are low. According to TALIS 2013 data, 71.7% of Chilean lower secondary teachers reported having participated in at least one professional development activity in the previous 12 months, the lowest figure among TALIS participating countries, against a TALIS average of 88.4% (OECD, 2014a). Chilean lower secondary teachers in 2013 reported the highest levels of participation in activities such as courses or workshops, individual or collaborative research (the only activity with an average above the TALIS average) and education conferences and seminars (see Figure 5.14).

**Figure 5.14. Type of professional development recently undertaken by lower secondary teachers, Chile and TALIS average, 2013**

![Figure 5.14](image_url)

Note: Data correspond to participation rates for each type of professional development reported to be undertaken by lower secondary education teachers in the 12 months prior to the survey.


The low levels of engagement in professional development have a variety of reasons. No incentives for participating in professional development, the unaffordability of courses, the lack of relevance of teacher professional development activities and conflicts with the work schedule seem to be important barriers for some Chilean teachers to engage in professional development. This is what Chilean lower secondary teachers expressed in TALIS 2013, as shown in Figure 5.15: respectively 73.1%, 72.8%, 63.6% and 62.3% of them...
agreed or strongly agreed with these four barriers, against TALIS averages of 48.0%, 43.8%, 39.0% and 50.6% respectively. The heavy workload and lack of an entitlement for free professional development in Chile do not facilitate the engagement in teacher professional development. Also, free professional development is guaranteed mostly in the context of the Professional Development Plans (Planes de Superación Profesional, PSP) which are mandatory when the teacher’s performance is evaluated as Basic or Unsatisfactory by the teacher performance evaluation system. In addition, there is no budget for professional development at the school level. However, the 2016 Law that creates the System for Teacher Professional Development is addressing these concerns. It intends to guarantee the availability of free and pertinent professional development activities for teachers as identified by individual teachers and their schools. In addition, the increase of the proportion of non-teaching hours within the regulated working hours, as planned by the 2016 Law, will facilitate the participation of teachers in professional development activities.

Some other important aspects to the organisation of professional development are problematic. The use of results from school-based teacher evaluation to inform the teacher’s professional development plan seems limited in international comparison. According to TALIS 2013 data, in Chile only 58.3% of lower secondary teachers agree or strongly agree that the teacher evaluation and feedback systems in their school are used to establish a development or training plan to improve their work as a teacher, against a TALIS...
average of 59.1% (OECD, 2014a). However, 68.3% of lower secondary Chilean teachers report a moderate or large positive change in the amount of professional development after they received feedback on their work at school, against a TALIS average of 45.8% (OECD, 2014a). There is room in Chile for better linking teacher evaluation to individual professional development, which is desirable given that teacher development is one of the main goals of teacher appraisal (OECD, 2013c). The 2016 Law that creates the System for Teacher Professional Development intends to reinforce such link – school principals are empowered to define professional development plans for their teaching bodies on the basis of information provided by school self-evaluation and teacher evaluation.

Also, even if schools organise internal processes for teacher evaluation, there might be no systematic alignment to school development plans. According to TALIS 2013 data, 78.3% of school directors of lower secondary schools reported having worked on a professional development plan for the school in the 12 months prior to the survey, against a TALIS average of 79.1% (OECD, 2014a). The link between, teacher appraisal, teacher professional development and school development is essential to ensure teachers give priority to acquiring those competencies that better fit the needs of the schools (OECD, 2013c). The 2016 Law that creates the System for Teacher Professional Development is following this principle with teacher professional development plans being created in the context of school improvement plans under the leadership of the school principal.

**The formative function of teacher evaluation remains limited**

A recent OECD review of teacher evaluation (Santiago et al., 2013) concluded that teacher evaluation in Chile is mostly perceived as an instrument to hold municipal teachers accountable. Furthermore, it concluded that “The feedback for improvement teachers receive from the Docentemás evaluation is limited, there is little professional dialogue around teaching practices that occurs as a result of teacher evaluation, teacher evaluation results are not systematically used to inform a professional development plan for all teachers and the concept of feedback is not yet fully ingrained among school agents” (Santiago et al., 2013). The introduction of teacher evaluation for certification to determine career progression within the new career structure reinforces this situation as it is an evaluation process with mostly accountability purposes.

While the new 2016 Law that creates the System for Teacher Professional Development places considerable emphasis on teacher professional development, including in terms of its links to teacher evaluation and the importance of professional development plans for individual teachers, it does not propose a component of teacher evaluation predominantly with formative purposes. It is not clear from the strategy it proposes what teacher evaluation processes will inform the future professional development plans for teachers. As it stands the System for Teacher Professional Development is limited in its emphasis on formative teacher evaluation. As a result, there are risks that teacher evaluation remains perceived as an instrument for accountability and control leading to little professional dialogue. There are also no guarantees that teachers receive proper professional feedback at the individual level.

**There are indications of some inequitable distribution of teachers across schools**

In Chile, there are some indications from TALIS and PISA data that there is an inequitable distribution of teachers across schools and school locations. The likelihood of teacher shortages (as perceived by school principals) in schools attended by 15-year-olds is
considerably higher in public schools, socio-economically disadvantaged schools and in schools located in a rural area (fewer than 3 000 people) (Table IV.3.11, OECD, 2013b). Also, the proportion of lower secondary teachers with a highest level of education of ISCED (International Standard Classification of Education) 5B (tertiary degrees shorter than university degrees) or below in schools whose directors report that more than 30% of the students are from socio-economically disadvantaged households is 22.8% while the proportion of such teachers in schools whose directors report that 30% or less of the students are from socio-economically disadvantaged households is 11.8% (OECD, 2014a).

However, according to TALIS 2013 data, the proportion of lower secondary teachers with 5 years of experience or less working in schools located in areas with 15 000 people or fewer was 31.1%, only slightly above the equivalent proportions in schools located in areas with 15 001 to 100 000 people (30.0%) and in schools located in areas with more than 100 000 people (29.3%) (OECD, 2014a). Also, the proportion of lower secondary teachers with 5 years of teaching experience or less in schools whose directors report that more than 30% of the students are from socio-economically disadvantaged households is 30.1% while the proportion of such teachers in schools whose directors report that 30% or less of the students are from socio-economically disadvantaged households is 32.0% (OECD, 2014a). It should however be said that, in Chile, less experienced teachers might often be preferred by schools as there is the perception that they are better prepared than teachers who entered the profession a few generations ago.

**Policy recommendations**

**Ensure the successful implementation of the System for Teacher Professional Development**

**Raise quality expectations in initial teacher education**

The implementation of the System for Teacher Professional Development, which recognises initial teacher education as the key stage providing the foundations for teacher competency development, is an opportunity to raise quality expectations in initial teacher education. Accreditation processes will need to send clear signals about the quality standards initial teacher education programmes need to reach. This will require a rigorous application of the accreditation standards to be achieved in terms of academic staff, quality of teacher education programmes, links to school practice, research orientation of programmes and mechanisms for the continuous improvement of programmes. In practice, this should lead accreditation processes to remove the range of low quality initial teacher education programmes that are deemed to be currently offered.

It would also be beneficial to align the accreditation of initial teacher education programmes to Graduating Teacher Standards. This could involve making them mandatory for teacher education providers and assess whether or not graduates reached these standards through the assessment conducted by the Ministry of Education towards the end of the programme. This would ensure accreditation processes evaluate whether or not graduates acquire, as part of initial teacher education, the necessary set of competencies to enter the teaching profession. In addition, initial teacher education providers should be required to establish internal quality assurance processes to ensure their programmes are continuously improving in light of evaluation exercises and new research relevant for teacher education.
In order to ensure that efforts to improve the quality of initial teacher education are sustained, it is important to ensure that the quality of entrants into teacher education continues to improve. This will depend on the overall attractiveness of teaching and on specific incentives to attract high-quality secondary graduates. Fee waivers, scholarships and forgivable loans are some of the financial incentives to be provided to high-quality entrants as is currently the case with the Teacher Vocation Scholarship (Beca Vocación de Profesor, BVP).

**Ensure a rigorous implementation of progression within the new career structure**

The effective establishment of the new career structure requires the further definition and implementation of a number of elements. First, the operational features of the National Induction System need to be further defined as it is systematically applied across the system. The crucial importance of induction programmes for new teachers in the early years of their teaching careers is now widely acknowledged (OECD, 2005; Jensen et al., 2012). Well-designed induction programmes help new teachers apply the more theoretical knowledge acquired in their teacher preparation programmes to the complexity of teaching in the classroom. In successful programmes mentor teachers in schools provide guidance and supervision to beginning teachers in close collaboration with the initial teacher education institution. Mentors must have a level of professional expertise that goes beyond being a source of emotional support and practical information. They should be able to provide not only a good role model, but also offer the help necessary to establish the beginners as competent professionals. Mentors provide on-the-job support, diagnose deficits in subject matter knowledge, classroom management strategies and other pedagogical processes. Central to the success of induction and mentoring programmes are the resources dedicated to the programmes and the quality of mentor training. Often schools that would need to provide the most support to beginning teachers are the least capable of delivering high-quality induction programmes. Effective partnerships between teacher education institutions and schools are particularly important in this respect (OECD, 2005).

Second, the System for the Recognition of Teacher Professional Development, the certification process to determine progression in the career structure, needs to be fully designed and established. The considerable experience with the teacher performance evaluation system, the AVDI and the AEP will be very helpful as a range of teacher evaluation instruments have been tested, validated and extensively used in Chile. As the new career structure is implemented, it will be crucial for the established certification process to send clear signals of rigour in identifying both good performance at the different stages of the career and underperformance as a teacher. This is a necessity if the career structure is to be perceived as credible in differentiating levels of experience and skills across teachers. An important issue will be to resolve the current duplication between the certification process associated with the career structure and the teacher performance evaluation system. Given the similar functions both processes seek to achieve, a possibility would be for the teacher performance evaluation system to become the certification process for career progression with some adjustment to its instruments. For instance, as originally planned for the certification process, the test to assess the pedagogical and specific knowledge of teachers would be added on the basis of the experience of the similar test used in the AVDI and the AEP. To take advantage of the continuous character of the teacher performance evaluation system (organised every four years for each teacher) and
to address the need for teachers to continuously show they are fit for the profession at the
different levels of the career structure, it could be considered introducing the requirement
for re-certification at a given career stage. The re-certification process could be organised
in a simplified manner relative to the evaluation process associated with progression into
a new career stage.

Third, there is a need to reflect on the linkages between the different career stages of
the new career structure and the teaching standards (the Good Teaching Framework, Marco
para la Buena Enseñanza, MBE). An important policy objective should be to align the
definition of expected skills and competencies at different stages of the career (as reflected
in teaching standards) and the tasks and responsibilities of teachers in schools (as reflected
in the career structure). This would strengthen the incentive for teachers to improve their
competencies, and reinforce the matching between teachers’ levels of competence and the
tasks which need to be performed in schools to improve student learning. Such alignment
can be achieved by developing teaching standards which reflect different levels of the
teaching expertise needed in schools; and ensuring levels of teaching expertise match the
key stages of the career structure (teaching standards with different levels of performance
for each of the career stages). An alternative is to use a single set of teaching standards
with certification criteria specific to the distinct career stages. This would recognise the
variety of responsibilities in today’s schools, the acquired knowledge, skill sets and
expertise developed while on the job. Certification criteria for higher career stages would
also have the distinct function of guiding teachers’ improvement of skills and
competencies and steering their aspirations to responsibilities.

**Maintain efforts to improve teacher remuneration**

As further resources become available to the school system and as efficiency gains
are realised, a top priority for the allocation of the newly available resources should be
the improvement of teachers’ compensation and working conditions. The objective is to
improve the status of the teaching profession, attract better candidates to teaching,
retain quality teachers in the profession and ensure teachers have adequate incentives to
be effective in their daily practice. This need is well recognised by the Chilean
government as shown in recent efforts to improve teachers’ salaries as the new career
structure is introduced. These efforts should be sustained in the years to come and result
in the significant improvement of teacher salary conditions. However, it is important that
the increase of salaries conveys the expectation of an improvement in the quality of
teachers’ work – a good strategy to achieve this is to ensure access to further career
stages is associated with significant salary raises. In addition, it is important to provide
significant incentives for quality teachers to work in schools located in disadvantaged or
remote areas. This is essential to ensure an equitable use of teacher resources across
schools.

**Design strategies for professional development that give greater prominence
to formative teacher evaluation and professional dialogue**

The implementation of the System for Teacher Professional Development is also an
opportunity to raise the profile of formative teacher evaluation and improve the
effectiveness of teachers’ continuous learning. A competency-based career structure
provides teachers’ with a clear rationale to engage in professional development activities.
These become the main vehicle for teachers to acquire the competencies needed to
progress in the career structure. As a result the whole new approach to the teaching career will not deliver its promise if teachers are not provided with the opportunity to engage in meaningful and well-informed professional development. As explained in greater detail below, this will require allocating the necessary resources for teacher professional development, give teachers individual professional development entitlements, and ensure professional development activities are informed by teachers’ individual needs as well as the needs of their schools. These will need to be further articulated as the System for Teacher Professional Development is implemented.

**Achieve the improvement function of teacher evaluation predominantly through the consolidation of school-based developmental teacher evaluation**

As explained earlier, the new System for Teacher Professional Development is limited in its emphasis on formative teacher evaluation. At the same time, it reinforces the high stakes of teacher evaluation as it becomes associated with the progression in the teaching career. In Chile, there are clear risks that the developmental function of teacher evaluation is hampered by high-stakes teacher evaluation – clearly dominant through the career progression certification process, the teacher performance evaluation system, the AVDI and the AEP. Since the System for Teacher Professional Development indeed seeks to develop a professional learning culture among Chilean teachers, it is all the more important to give a prominent role to formative teacher evaluation. Hence, as originally suggested in an earlier OECD review of teacher evaluation in Chile (Santiago et al., 2013), it is proposed that a component predominantly dedicated to developmental evaluation, fully internal to the school, be created.

This developmental teacher evaluation would have as its main purpose the continuous improvement of teaching practices in the school. It would be an internal process carried out by line managers, senior peers, and the school leadership. The reference standards would be the Good Teaching Framework but with evaluation rubrics developed at the school level to better account for the school objectives and context. The main outcome would be feedback on teaching performance and the whole contribution of the teacher to school development which would lead to a plan for professional development. It can be low-key and low-cost, and include self-evaluation (possibly through the preparation of a portfolio), classroom observation, and structured conversations and regular feedback by the leadership and experienced peers. It should include a qualitative analysis of student results. It could be organised once a year for each teacher, or less frequently depending on the previous assessment of the teacher. The key aspect is that it should result in a meaningful report with recommendations for professional development and not involve a quantitative rating (Santiago et al., 2013).

In order to guarantee the systematic and coherent application of developmental evaluation across Chilean schools, it would be important to undertake the external validation of the respective school processes for developmental teacher evaluation. An option is that the Agency for Quality Education, in its monitoring of the quality of teaching and learning in individual schools, includes the audit of the processes in place to organise developmental teacher evaluation, holding the school director accountable as necessary. The Agency for Quality Education and municipal education authorities would play an important role of support ensuring that schools develop ambitious developmental teacher evaluation processes to be properly documented in school activity reports (Santiago et al., 2013).
**Give the Agency for Quality Education a prominent role in supporting teacher evaluation**

As suggested in a previous OECD review of teacher evaluation in Chile (Santiago et al., 2013), the Agency for Quality Education is well placed to situate teacher evaluation within the broader evaluation and assessment framework, shaping its specific role in the broader evaluative context and articulating it with other components of the evaluation and assessment framework (i.e. student assessment, school evaluation, school leader evaluation, education system evaluation) to build complementarities, avoid duplication of efforts and ensure consistency of objectives (Santiago et al., 2013). First, the Agency is in a good position to undertake the external audit of school-based teacher evaluation procedures and, in particular, of the teacher developmental evaluation processes recommended above. This should include both the municipal and private school sectors. There is already a good basis for the Agency to perform this function as Standard 10.4 of the Indicative Performance Standards for Schools and School Providers (Estándares Indicativos de Desempeño para Establecimientos Educacionales y sus Sostenedores) is “The school has an evaluation and feedback system of staff performance” (one of nine standards of personnel management).

However, this might require the Ministry of Education to develop more detailed and explicit standards for school-based teacher evaluation. Second, the Agency should have an important role in supporting agents in the implementation of teacher evaluation procedures. This includes supporting education providers and individual schools in the development of their capacity for educational evaluation (e.g. for designing frameworks for teacher evaluation), giving feedback to schools on how they can improve their internal approaches to teacher evaluation (in the context of school evaluation), and developing functions such as school leadership and the monitoring of teaching and learning which directly influence teacher evaluation. Third, the Agency should have an eminent role in modelling, identifying and disseminating good practice in teacher evaluation and in using relevant research to improve evaluation practices (Santiago et al., 2013).

Also, another major function of the Agency for Quality Education is to articulate the different components of the evaluation and assessment framework. A particularly important link is the one between teacher evaluation and school evaluation, which needs to be strengthened in the Chilean school system. Analysis from TALIS (OECD, 2009) suggests that school evaluations can be an essential component of an evaluative framework which can foster and potentially shape teacher evaluation and feedback. Given that the systems of school evaluation and teacher evaluation and feedback have both the objective of maintaining standards and improving student performance, there are likely to be great benefits from the synergies between them. To achieve the greatest impact, the focus of school evaluation should either be linked to or have an effect on the focus of teacher evaluation (OECD, 2009). This indicates that the external evaluation of schools should comprise the monitoring of the quality of teaching and learning, including the observation of classes. Also, as indicated above, school evaluation should comprise the external validation of the processes in place to organise developmental teacher evaluation, holding the school director accountable as necessary. As part of school evaluation, attention should also be paid to the school's use of teacher evaluation results for school development. In the context of school self-evaluation, it is also important to ensure the centrality of the appraisal of teaching quality and the evaluation of individual teachers (Santiago et al., 2013).
Consider the introduction of a probationary period

As explained earlier, teacher underperformance is not adequately addressed in the first few years of the career. A beginning teacher, who is not necessarily fit for the profession, can remain in the system for several years until his or her underperformance is addressed. This is not desirable for both the beginning teacher and the school system. Hence, a formal probationary process for new teachers should be introduced as part of the new career structure. There is considerable evidence that some beginning teachers, no matter how well prepared and supported, struggle to perform well on the job or find that it does not meet their expectations. A formal probationary process can provide an opportunity for both new teachers and their employers to assess whether teaching is the right career for them. The satisfactory completion of a probationary period of one to two years teaching should be mandatory before moving into the Initial stage of the new career structure. At the same time, beginning teachers should be given every opportunity to work in a stable and well-supported school environment, and the probation decision should be taken by a panel which is well trained and resourced for assessing new teachers. The successful completion of probation should be acknowledged as the major initial step in the teaching career.

Improve the provision of initial teacher education

Make initial teacher education more selective

Overall, Chile is not facing shortages. This is an opportunity to be more selective about those who are employed and those who enter the profession and initial teacher education. If salaries are increased, as currently planned, and better candidates are attracted to initial teacher education, it is clear that entry into preparation programmes can be much more selective to ensure only high-quality graduates fill the available teaching posts. Potentially useful initiatives include: providing more information and counselling to prospective student teachers so that better informed enrolment decisions are made; procedures that try to assess whether the individuals wanting to become teachers have the necessary motivation, skills, knowledge and personal qualities (specific assessments in addition to the university entrance examination); incentive schemes to recruit candidates with high-level competencies (such as higher education grants, as is currently the case); and flexible programme structures that provide students with school experience early in the course, and opportunities to move into other courses if their motivation towards teaching changes. This should go alongside continuous efforts to improve the quality of initial teacher education programmes, as monitored by accreditation processes.

Improve the preparation of teachers to support students with special educational needs

There is a clear need to strengthen the preparation of teachers to instruct students with special educational needs. This is an important dimension to the current efforts to integrate students with special needs in mainstream schools through the School Integration Programme (Programas de Integración Escolar). It calls for initial teacher education institutions to ensure that special needs becomes a regular area for the initial education of any teacher, regardless of the type of school at which he or she will teach. This would respond to a strong need in schools for these particular skills. In addition, it is also important to foster professional development programmes targeted at developing skills to integrate special needs students in mainstream schools.
**Provide better foundations to work in rural schools and address cultural diversity**

Given the characteristics of its territory, Chile has a large number of remote and rural schools for which teachers need specific skills. This calls for initial teacher education programmes to include in their curriculum specific aspects targeted at teaching in remote and rural schools such as strategies for teaching in multigrade classes, forming high expectations of student performance in rural contexts, and effective approaches to interact with the school community. The latter might require adequate strategies to teach in a multicultural or multilingual setting, another area in which teachers have significant professional development needs.

**Rethink teachers’ use of time**

It is recognised that, in Chile, teachers have heavy workloads and a high proportion of teaching time as part of their overall workload. The 2016 Law that creates the System for Teacher Professional Development provides for a lower proportion of teaching time as of 2017 (70% of the workload) and 2019 (65% of the workload). This is a step in the right direction and will require considerable resources to be implemented. However, the extent to which the use of the extra non-teaching time will be effective will depend on the ability of individual schools to organise teachers’ non-teaching activities in ways that maximise their impact on student learning.

A priority should be the requirement for teachers to use the extra non-teaching at the school premises. This allows teachers to further engage in other activities at the school such as collaboration with colleagues, reflection on own practices, mentoring of less experienced teachers, communication with parents and professional development. It also favours their further engagement with students. This would be part of the effort for Chile’s schools to develop as professional learning communities. In line with research on effective organisational learning, many schools in a range of countries are adopting new ways of working that focus on collegial and collaborative teaching, conducted in teams and larger professional learning communities. This requires teachers to adapt to collaborative work cultures based on shared goals, continuous professional development, reflective practice, peer observation, feedback and quality improvement (OECD, 2013c). Less teaching time should also give the opportunity for teachers to more thoroughly prepare their classes and give extra support for students with greater learning difficulties.

**Improve the framework for professional development provision**

**Conceive professional development as the main instrument to acquire the new competencies necessary for career advancement**

There is a clear need for professional development to become a more regular practice among teachers in Chile, with an adequate time entitlement, greater diversity of activities, led by school development plans, informed by teacher evaluation and with a supply which reflects teachers’ developmental needs. There must be an explicitly stated expectation that every teacher engages in a career-long quest of improved practice through professional development activities. Professional development should be understood by teachers as the main instrument to acquire the new competencies necessary for professional growth and career advancement as part of the new career structure. Teachers’ motivation to engage in professional development should not be achieving better salary prospects per se. This approach requires providing teachers with more dedicated release time and financial support for professional development than is currently the case. It is important that the
professional development system benefits all teachers in the school system. Hence, the focus for teacher professional development should not be those teachers identified as underperforming.

**Align teacher professional development with school development plans**

Teacher professional development also needs to be associated with school development if the improvement of teaching practices is to meet the school's needs. To be most effective, professional development programmes should be co-ordinated at the school level in association with school development plans, so that teachers are aware of the learning goals pursued by their colleagues and potential areas for collaboration. Such joint efforts can contribute to establishing learning communities within schools. This could benefit from the provision to individual schools of a budget dedicated to professional development.

**Systematically use teacher evaluation results to inform professional development activities**

There is also a need to improve linkages of teacher evaluation to professional development. Professional development is only fully effective when it is aligned with recognised needs, for both individual teachers and for schools as a whole. Professional development in Chile appears at the moment to be a matter for individual teachers to pursue and it is to a great extent de-coupled from the results of teacher evaluation. Linking professional growth opportunities to evaluation results is critical if evaluation is going to play a role in improving teaching and learning. Chile does not have a system in place to ensure that the feedback provided to teachers is systematically used to guide improvement plans (Santiago et al., 2013). The recommended school-based developmental teacher evaluation component proposes a direct link between formative teacher evaluation and an individual professional development plan.

**Improve the relevance of professional development programmes**

Chilean teachers raise doubts about the relevance of professional development programmes that are on offer. This indicates that the supply of programmes does not fit teachers’ needs, possibly because providers are not successful in forming an accurate picture of the actual professional needs of teachers and schools. As a result, suppliers of professional development programmes need to better connect to the professional development of teachers. This suggests a range of possible actions: better interaction between professional development providers and individual schools; an assessment on the part of the Agency for Quality Education of the professional development needs of teachers on the basis of the information collected through external school evaluations; or strategies to directly survey teachers about their professional development needs. The CPEIP plays the key role in ensuring the supply of professional development programmes meets the needs of the Chilean teaching workforce. It should continuously assess supply gaps, conduct a review of teacher specific needs, and evaluate the quality of courses they have attended in view of improving them.
Note

1. TALIS is the OECD Teaching and Learning International Survey, which was implemented in 2008 and in 2013, covering lower secondary education and with the participation of 24 and 34 countries respectively. TALIS 2013 enabled countries to also conduct the survey in their primary and upper secondary schools. Chile participated in the 2013 edition of TALIS with a sample of teachers restricted to lower secondary education. The results derived from TALIS are based on self-reports from teachers and directors and therefore represent their opinions, perceptions, beliefs and their accounts of their activities. Further information is available at www.oecd.org/edu/school/talis.htm.
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ANNEX A

The OECD Review of Policies to Improve the Effectiveness of Resource Use in Schools

The OECD Review of Policies to Improve the Effectiveness of Resource Use in Schools (also referred to as the School Resources Review) is designed to respond to the strong interest in the effective use of school resources evident at national and international levels. It provides analysis and policy advice on how to distribute, utilise and manage resources so that they contribute to achieving effectiveness and efficiency objectives in education. School resources are understood in a broad way, including financial resources (e.g. expenditures on education, school budget), physical resources (e.g. school buildings, computers), human resources (e.g. teachers, school leaders) and other resources (e.g. learning time).

Seventeen education systems are actively engaged in the review. These cover a wide range of economic and social contexts, and among them they illustrate quite different approaches to the use of resources in school systems. This will allow a comparative perspective on key policy issues. Participating countries prepare a detailed background report, following a standard set of guidelines. Some of the participating countries have also opted for a detailed review, undertaken by a team consisting of members of the OECD Secretariat and external experts. Insofar, the participating countries are (in bold those that have opted for an individual review): Austria, Belgium (Flemish Community), Belgium (French Community), Chile, Colombia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Iceland, Kazakhstan, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Portugal, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and Uruguay. A series of thematic comparative reports from the OECD review, bringing together lessons from all countries, will be launched as of 2017.

The project is overseen by the Group of National Experts on School Resources, which was established as a subsidiary body of the OECD Education Policy Committee in order to guide the methods, timing and principles of the review. More details are available from the website dedicated to the review: www.oecd.org/education/schoolresourcesreview.htm.
ANNEX B

Composition of the review team

**Ariel Fiszbein** is Director of the education programme at the Inter-American Dialogue. Prior to joining the Inter-American Dialogue, Fiszbein was Chief Economist for the World Bank’s Human Development Network, where he has helped develop strategies for work worldwide on education, health, nutrition, population, social protection, and labour. Fiszbein has over 20 years of experience working on education and other social policy issues in Latin America and globally. A native of Argentina, he has a Ph.D. in economics from the University of California, Berkeley.

**Sandra García Jaramillo** is Associate professor at the School of Government at the Universidad de los Andes in Colombia, where she teaches Policy Evaluation, Social Policy, and Poverty, Inequality and Public Policy. She is currently the co-Principal Investigator of a nationwide research project on secondary schooling funded by the Colombian Ministry of Education. During 2014 she was the Principal Investigator for the impact evaluation of *Todos a Aprender* programme, an educational intervention that is targeted to low-performing schools and provides in-site teacher training and textbooks. She has also conducted research on topics that include impact of conditional cash transfers on educational and health outcomes, determinants of early school leaving and teacher quality. Her research has been published in numerous international peer reviewed journals and she is co-author of “*Tras la excelencia docente: Cómo mejorar la calidad de la educación para todos los Colombianos*” (2014). She received her PhD in Social Work from Columbia University in 2007 and her MPA in 1999 from the same university.

**Thomas Radinger**, a German national, is a Policy Analyst with the OECD Directorate for Education and Skills. He joined the Organisation in September 2011 to contribute to the OECD Review on Evaluation and Assessment Frameworks for Improving School Outcomes. Thomas is a co-author of the project’s final synthesis report “*Synergies for Better Learning*” (2013) and took the lead in the analysis of school leader appraisal. Between October 2012 and January 2015, he was involved with the development of the OECD Education GPS, an online platform to disseminate OECD data and research on education to a broader audience. Since February 2015, Thomas has been working with the OECD School Resources Review team. He co-authored five country review reports and the project’s first thematic report on “*The Funding of School Education: Connecting Resources and Learning*”.

**Paulo Santiago**, a Portuguese national, is the Head of the Policy Advice and Implementation Division in the OECD Directorate for Education and Skills, where he has been since 2000. He was the co-ordinator of the OECD School Resources Review between January 2013 and July 2016. He has previously assumed responsibility for three major
cross-country reviews, each with the participation of over twenty countries: a review of teacher policy (2002-05), leading to the OECD publication “Teachers Matter”; the thematic review of tertiary education (2005-08), leading to the OECD publication “Tertiary Education for the Knowledge Society”; and a review of evaluation and assessment policy at the school level (2009-13), leading to the OECD publication “Synergies for Better Learning”. He has also led reviews of teacher policy, tertiary education policy and educational evaluation policy in over 25 countries. He holds a Ph.D. in Economics from Northwestern University, United States, where he also lectured. He co-ordinated the review and acted as Rapporteur for the review team.
## ANNEX C

### Visit programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuesday, 22 September 2015, Santiago</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:30-10:30</td>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Education Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30-11:15</td>
<td>Ministry of Education:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Head of International Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Head of Advisors to Minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Head of Studies' Centre, Planning and Budget Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30-12:45</td>
<td>Thematic Discussion: School Funding – Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Head of the Planning and Budget Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Head of the Financial Resources Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Head of Unit in charge of School Grants System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Ministry Auditing Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:15-15:30</td>
<td>Thematic Discussion: Human Resources – Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Head of the Centre for Pedagogical Training, Experimentation and Research (CPEIP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Co-ordinator and representative of the National Teacher Plan (Plan Nacional Docente)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Head of the Higher Education Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Head of the School Leadership Co-ordination Unit, General Education Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:30-16:15</td>
<td>Thematic Discussion: School Infrastructure – Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Head of the School Infrastructure Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:30-17:30</td>
<td>Thematic Discussion: Educational Policy Planning – Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Deputy-Head of the Planning and Management Control Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Head of Studies’ Centre, Planning and Budget Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:30-18:15</td>
<td>Implementation of Teacher Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Director of the Measurement Centre at the Catholic University of Chile (MIDE UC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Co-ordinator of the teacher performance evaluation system (Docentemás), MIDE UC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wednesday, 23 September 2015, Santiago</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00-11:30</td>
<td>New System of Public Education (New Public Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Ministry of Education Team in charge of developing the new System of Public Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45-13:00</td>
<td>Agency for Quality Education (Agencia de la Calidad de la Educación)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Executive Director and Advisor of the Agency for Quality Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:15-15:30</td>
<td>Education Superintendence (Superintendencia de Educación)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Education Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:30-16:15</td>
<td>Thematic Discussion: Indigenous Education – Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Ministry units in charge of Indigenous education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:30-17:30</td>
<td>Ministry of Finance (Ministerio de Hacienda), Budget Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Evaluation Unit, Public Management Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:30-18:30</td>
<td>Court of Auditors (Contraloría General de la República)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Municipalities Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Administrative Audit Unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Thursday, 24 September 2015, Temuco

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 11:00-12:00 | Municipal Authorities: Temuco  
- Director of Education for the Temuco Municipality  
- Director of Finance for the Temuco Municipality |
| 12:00-12:45 | Education Provincial Department (DEPROV): Province of North Cautín |
| 14:00-17:00 | SCHOOL VISIT 1: Alonso De Ercilla school (Temuco, La Araucanía), Municipal school, pre-primary, basic and secondary education  
- School management  
- Group of teachers  
- Group of students  
- Representatives of parents |
| 17:15-18:00 | Education Regional Secretariat (SEREMI): Region IX (La Araucanía) |

### Friday, 25 September 2015, Nueva Imperial and Temuco

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 08:45-10:35 | SCHOOL VISIT 2: Escuela Básica Santa María De Borrosa (Nueva Imperial, La Araucanía), Municipal school, Pre-primary and basic education  
- School management  
- Group of teachers  
- Group of students  
- Representatives of parents |
| 11:00-12:00 | Municipal Authorities: Nueva Imperial  
- Deputy Director of the Municipal Education Department of the Municipality of Nueva Imperial  
- Head of Finance of the Education Department of the Municipality of Nueva Imperial |
| 14:00-16:20 | SCHOOL VISIT 3: Colegio Augusto Winter (Temuco, La Araucanía), Private-subsidised school, Pre-primary and basic education  
- School management  
- Group of teachers  
- Group of students  
- Representatives of parents |
| 16:35-17:35 | Meeting with Representatives of the Indigenous Peoples |

### Sunday, 27 September 2015, Santiago: Review Team Meeting

### Monday, 28 September 2015, Graneros and Santiago

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 09:30-11:40 | SCHOOL VISIT 4: Colegio Particular Nuestra Señora (Graneros, O'Higgins), Private-subsidised school, Pre-primary, basic and secondary education  
- School management  
- Group of teachers  
- Group of students  
- Representatives of parents |
| 14:45-15:30 | Preferential School Subsidy (Subvención Escolar Preferencial, SEP) – Ministry of Education  
- National Co-ordinator of the Preferential School Subsidy |
| 15:30-17:00 | Education Committee of the Chamber of Deputies (Comisión de Educación de la Cámara de Diputados)  
- President of the Education Committee of the Chamber of Deputies  
- Deputies of the Chamber |

### Tuesday, 29 September 2015, La Pintana and Santiago

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 08:45-10:35 | SCHOOL VISIT 5: Liceo Centro Educacional La Pintana (La Pintana, Metropolitan Region of Santiago), Municipal school, Pre-primary and basic education  
- School management  
- Group of teachers  
- Group of students  
- Representatives of parents |
| 11:15-12:15 | Chilean Association of Municipalities (Asociación Chilena de Municipalidades)  
- Co-ordinator of Education |
| 12:15-13:30 | Associations of Teachers and Other Education Professionals  
- President and representatives of the Teachers’ Union (Colegio de Profesores)  
- President and representatives of the Association of Workers of the National Board of Kindergartens (Asociación de funcionarias de la Junta Nacional de Jardines Infantiles, AJUNJI)  
- President and secretary-general of the National Council of Teaching Assistants (Consejo Nacional de Asistentes de la Educación) |
| 14:30-15:30 | Secondary Student Organisations  
- Representatives of the Co-ordinating Assembly of Secondary Students (Asamblea Coordinadora de Estudiantes Secundarios, ACES) |
| 15:30-16:30 | International Organisations based in Chile  
- UNESCO Office in Santiago, Regional Bureau for Education in Latin America and the Caribbean  
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), Santiago office |
<p>| 16:30-19:00 | Review Team Meeting |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08:00-08:45</td>
<td>Thematic Discussion: Educational Resources – Ministry of Education</td>
<td>Head of the Procurement Unit, General Administration Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Manager of the Purchasing Portal Chile Compra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:45-09:30</td>
<td>Thematic Discussion: Technical-pedagogical support – Ministry of Education</td>
<td>Co-ordinator of the system of independent private consultant services (Asesorías Técnicas Educativas, ATE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30-11:15</td>
<td>Thematic Discussion: Educational Support – Ministry of Education</td>
<td>Ministry Unit in charge of textbooks and pedagogical resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ministry Unit in charge of National Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ministry Unit in charge of school libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ministry Unit in charge of rural education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30-12:30</td>
<td>Representatives of Initial Teacher Education</td>
<td>President of the Association of Deans of Faculties of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30-13:30</td>
<td>Associations representing the interest of Children with Special Educational Needs</td>
<td>National Institute of Child Rehabilitation (Instituto Nacional de Rehabilitación Infantil)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:30-15:15</td>
<td>Education Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs)</td>
<td>“Teach Chile” (Enseña Chile)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Choose to Teach” (Elige Educar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education 2020 (Educación 2020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Stop SIMCE” (Alto al SIMCE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:15-16:45</td>
<td>Meetings with Education Researchers in Chile</td>
<td>Beatrice Ávalos, Universidad de Chile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cristián Bellei, Universidad de Chile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cristián Cox, Universidad Diego Portales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alejandra Falabella, Universidad Alberto Hurtado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Juan Pablo Valenzuela, Universidad de Chile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:00-18:30</td>
<td>Final Delivery by Review Team: Preliminary Impressions</td>
<td>Representatives of Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Representatives of the Agency for Quality Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Representatives of the Education Superintendence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>