

## **PISA**

### **PISA 2015 Results (Volume II): Policies and Practices for Successful Schools,**

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264267510-en>

ISBN (print) 978-92-64-26749-7

ISBN (PDF) 978-92-64-26751-0

© OECD 2016

#### **Chapter 2: Box II.2.1. How PISA defines socio-economically advantaged and disadvantaged schools, Page 53**

The first sentence in the text box should read: “All schools in PISA-participating education **systems** are divided [...]”.

#### **Chapter 3 – The school learning environment, p. 81**

A number 2 superscript is missing at the end of paragraph three under the subheading “Skipping school”. The sentence should read: “On average across OECD countries, students in rural and urban schools were equally to have skipped a day of school, and those in public schools were more likely than students in private schools to have done so.<sup>2</sup>” The superscript 2 corresponds to the endnote on page 104 which reads: “See Boxes II.2.1, II.2.2 and II.2.3 in Chapter 2 for a description of how PISA defines socio-economically disadvantaged and advantaged schools, public and private schools, and urban and rural schools.

#### **Idem, p. 102**

The superscript at the end of the second sentence on the top of the page should be 3 and not 2.

#### **Chapter 4 – School governance, assessment and accountability, Page 124**

The following paragraphs have been updated with the correct data:

“On average across OECD countries, about ~~84~~ **82%** of 15-year-old students attend public schools, about ~~12~~ **14%** attend government-dependent private schools, and slightly more than 4% attend government-independent private schools (Table II.4.7). In Bulgaria, Iceland, Montenegro and the Russian Federation (hereafter “Russia”), virtually all 15-year-old students attend a public school. In Chile, Hong Kong (China), Ireland, Macao (China), ~~and~~ the Netherlands **and the United Kingdom**, more than one in two students attend a government-dependent private school; and in Japan, Lebanon, Peru, Qatar, Chinese Taipei and the United Arab Emirates, at least one in four students are enrolled in government-independent private schools.

#### **Idem, p. 124**

For the first time, in 2015, PISA also asked principals of private schools what kind of organisation (“a church or other religious organisation”, “another not-for-profit organisation” or “a for-profit organisation”) ran their school. Across OECD countries, of the ~~12~~ **14%** of students who are enrolled in private government-dependent schools, around ~~38~~ **39%** of them attend schools run by a church or other religious organisation, ~~54~~ **53%** attend schools run by another non-profit organisation, and 8% attend schools run by a for-profit organisation (Table II.4.7).”

#### **Idem, p. 124**

“Across OECD countries, 86% of 15-year-old students in lower secondary education and 81 79% of students in upper secondary education are enrolled in public schools (Table II.4.10).”

**Figure II.4.14 “Attendance at public school, school characteristics and science performance”, Page 125**

Data for the United Kingdom and the OECD average was changed and a note was added. The order of the countries changed, as well as the counts at the right bottom of the figure.

The correct version of the figure can be found at the StaLink provided below the figure <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933435921>.

**Chapter 4 – School governance, assessment and accountability, Page 126**

The following paragraph has been updated with the correct data:

“However, after accounting for socio-economic status, in 22 education systems, students in public schools score higher than students in private schools, in 8 9 systems they score lower than students in private schools, and on average across OECD countries, students in public schools score higher than students in private schools.”

**Chapter 6 – Resources invested in education, p. 187**

The first sentence of the last paragraph before the subheading “Equity in resource allocation” should read: “Not surprisingly, in about half of the education system that participated in PISA 2015, students score lower in schools whose principals reported that the capacity to provide ~~construction~~ **instruction** is hindered to a greater extent by a shortage of infrastructure and educational materials (Figure II.6.3).”

**Annex A1, p. 242**

**The description of the index of disciplinary climate is incorrect. It should read:** ““The index of disciplinary climate (DISCLISCI) was constructed from students’ reports on how often (“every lesson”, “most lessons”, “some lessons”, “never or hardly ever”) the following happened in their science lessons (ST097): **Students don’t listen to what the teacher says; There is noise and disorder; The teacher has to wait a long time for students to quiet down; Students cannot work well; Students don’t start working for a long time after the lesson begins.**””

**Table II.4.10 “Attendance at public schools, science performance and school characteristics”, Page 341-343**

Data for the United Kingdom and the OECD average changed in all the columns, and a footnote was added to the United Kingdom.

The correct table is available at the StaLink provided below the table (<http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933436498>).

**Table II.5.11 “Change between 2009 and 2015 in grade repetition”, p. 369**

Data for Austria has been modified. The correct data is available at the StatLink provided below the table (<http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933436509>).

**Table II.5.16. "Change between 2009 and 2015 in programme orientation", Page 374**

Data for Austria has been modified. The correct data is available at the StatLink provided below the table (<http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933436509>).