

DIRECTORATE FOR EDUCATION AND SKILLS**MORE TIME AT SCHOOL: LESSONS FROM CASE STUDIES AND
RESEARCH ON EXTENDED SCHOOL DAYS****OECD Education Working Paper No. 252**

Thomas Radinger, Luka Boeskens, OECD

This working paper has been authorised by Andreas Schleicher, Director of the Directorate for Education and Skills, OECD.

Thomas Radinger (thomas.radinger@oecd.org)Luka Boeskens (luka.boeskens@oecd.org)**JT03479757**

OECD EDUCATION WORKING PAPERS SERIES

OECD Working Papers should not be reported as representing the official views of the OECD or of its member countries. The opinions expressed and arguments employed herein are those of the author(s).

Working Papers describe preliminary results or research in progress by the author(s) and are published to stimulate discussion on a broad range of issues on which the OECD works. Comments on Working Papers are welcome, and may be sent to the Directorate for Education and Skills, OECD, 2 rue André-Pascal, 75775 Paris Cedex 16, France.

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

You can copy, download or print OECD content for your own use, and you can include excerpts from OECD publications, databases and multimedia products in your own documents, presentations, blogs, websites and teaching materials, provided that suitable acknowledgement of OECD as source and copyright owner is given. All requests for public or commercial use and translation rights should be submitted to rights@oecd.org.

Comment on the series is welcome, and should be sent to edu.contact@oecd.org.

This working paper has been authorised by Andreas Schleicher, Director of the Directorate for Education and Skills, OECD.

www.oecd.org/edu/workingpapers

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank delegates of the OECD Group of National Experts on School Resources for their feedback on the working paper. The country case studies, in particular, benefited greatly from the review of national delegates and ministry officials. These are Bernhard Chabera (Austria), Javier Guevara and Alberto Sthioul (Chile), Juan Camilo Aponte, Mónica Marcela Arboleda, Angélica del Pilar Osorio Gonzalez, Luz Helena Trujillo, Natalia Trujillo Gomez and Natalia Velasco (Colombia), Jon Jespersen, Cecilie Kynemund and Hjalte Meilvang (Denmark), Pedro Abrantes (Portugal) and Gimena Castelao, Melissa Hernández and Cecilia Oreiro (Uruguay). Gratitude is also due to colleagues in national authorities for providing data as input to the case studies. Juan Pablo Valenzuela and José Luis Sánchez provided invaluable feedback on the analysis and suggestions for improvement. The authors also wish to thank Sonja Hall from the Trade Union Advisory Committee to the OECD for her review of the document. The authors are furthermore indebted to the colleagues and external experts whose country review reports, published as part of the OECD School Resources Review, provided the starting point for the case studies in this paper. The paper benefited from the support, guidance and feedback of Deborah Nusche, Paulo Santiago and Andreas Schleicher. The authors gratefully acknowledge the editorial support provided by Daiana Torres Lima and Rachel Linden.

Abstract

Many countries have considered extending their school days to improve students' outcomes, promote equity or support parents to combine work and family lives. Given the impact of such reforms, identifying conditions for their successful implementation is an important concern. This working paper reviews the available evidence and synthesises common lessons from six European and Latin American countries that extended and reorganised their school days. Each case study describes the reform's context and goals, design and implementation, and resource implications. The paper highlights that lengthening the school day might be an efficient strategy for some schools and systems, but not for others, depending on policy goals and alternatives. To reap any potential benefits, reforms need to consider the quality and articulation of the activities taking place and related adjustments to school resources. As the paper suggests, school-day extensions provide an opportunity to rethink schools as places not just for learning, but for holistic student development, engagement and support.

Table of contents

Acknowledgements	3
Abstract	4
1. Introduction	7
2. Insights from research	9
2.1. The rationale for extended school days and instruction time.....	9
2.2. Evidence on the outcomes of extended school days	11
3. Case studies	19
3.1. A comparative perspective on learning time and after-school activities	21
3.2. Austria.....	27
3.3. Chile.....	45
3.4. Colombia.....	61
3.5. Denmark.....	81
3.6. Portugal.....	93
3.7. Uruguay	109
4. Policy implications.....	127
4.1. Reflecting on the goals of a longer school day and developing a pedagogical model fit for these goals, while involving teachers, parents and students	129
4.2. Ensuring quality in the different activities offered as part of the school day, from regular instruction to extracurricular programmes	132
4.3. Implementing reforms gradually and carefully, and monitoring and evaluating their impact..	133
4.4. Estimating costs and adjusting funding mechanisms and governance arrangements to ensure adequate and sustainable financing.....	135
Annex A.	138
References	141

FIGURES

Figure 1. Total weekly learning time at age 15 in regular school lessons, 2018	22
Figure 2. Intended instruction times in compulsory general education at age 7 and 13, 2018	23
Figure 3. Weekly hours spent learning in regular lessons and studying after school, 2015	24
Figure 4. Homework help in disadvantaged and advantaged schools, 2018	25
Figure 5. Selected extracurricular activities offered to 15-year-old students at school, 2018	26
Figure 6. Pedagogical components and use of time in all-day schooling in Austria	36
Figure 7. General objectives and curricular instruments in Chile	47
Figure 8. Pedagogical components and use of time in full-day schooling in Chile	53
Figure 9. School curriculum and study plan in Colombia	64
Figure 10. Pedagogical components and use of time in single-day schooling in Colombia	71
Figure 11. Pedagogical components and use of time in the longer and more varied school day in Denmark	86
Figure 12. Pedagogical components and use of time in full-time schooling in Portugal	102
Figure 13. Pedagogical components and use of time in full-time and extended-time schooling in Uruguay	118
Figure 14. Annual salary cost per student in different types of general secondary education in Uruguay, 2017	125
Figure 15. Model for thinking about school day extension policies	127

TABLES

Table 1. The administration of schools in Austria by school type and level of education	28
Table 2. Possibilities for schools to organise instruction schedules in Austria	30
Table 3. Specific goals for the expansion of all-day schooling in Austria	34
Table 4. Example for a subject timetable based on the national curriculum: weekly hours in primary school in Austria	35
Table 5. Types of staff providing additional contact time in all-day schooling in Austria	37
Table 6. Number and share of schools with all-day schooling in Austria, 2007/08-2020/21	39
Table 7. Student enrolment in all-day schooling in Austria, 2007/08-2020/21	39
Table 8. Pedagogical hours in schools with and without full-day schooling in Chile	52
Table 9. Example for the allocation of instruction time according to study plan in Chile	54
Table 10. Number and share of schools with full-day schooling in Chile, 2013-2019	56
Table 11. Student enrolment in full-day schooling in Chile, 2004-2019	56
Table 12. Adjustments in the school basic grant for full-day schooling in Chile, 2019	58
Table 13. Instruction time in schools with and without single-day schooling in Colombia	70
Table 14. Student enrolment in single-day schooling in Colombia, 2015-2020	74
Table 15. Student enrolment in single-day schooling in Colombia, 2015-2020, by level of education	74
Table 16. Number and share of schools with single-day schooling in Colombia, 2015-2020	75
Table 17. Distribution of annual learning time across different subject areas according to the curriculum in the <i>Folkeskole</i> in Denmark, 2020/21	87
Table 18. Instruction time requirements in different levels of education in Portugal	100
Table 19. Allocation of instruction time according to the curriculum in the first cycle of basic education in Portugal	101
Table 20. Number and share of schools with full-time schooling in Portugal, 2015/16-2020/21	105
Table 21. Student enrolment in full-time schooling in Portugal, 2015/16-2020/21	105
Table 22. Instruction time requirements in the study programme for general lower secondary education in Uruguay	116
Table 23. Learning time for students in different levels and types of education in Uruguay	117
Table 24. Number and share of schools with full-time and extended-time schooling in Uruguay, 2002-2019	122
Table 25. Student enrolment in full-time and extended-time schools in Uruguay, 2002-2019	123
Table 26. Cost estimation for common urban schools and urban full-time schools in Uruguay, 2018	124
Table 27. Goals and objectives of extended school days in case study countries	129
Table 28. Pedagogical design and staffing of extended school days in case study countries	131
Table 29. Scope and target population of extended school days in case study countries	135
Table 30. Financing of extended school days in case study countries	137

BOXES

Box 1. School autonomy for timetabling and the organisation of lessons in Austria	30
Box 2. Additional care and educational and recreational activities for students at the end of the school day and in school holidays in Chile (<i>Programa 4 a 7</i> and <i>Programa Escuelas Abiertas</i>)	51
Box 3. Complementary school days in Colombia (<i>Jornada Escolar Complementaria</i>)	67
Box 4. Summer School Programme in Uruguay (<i>Programa Educativo de Verano</i>)	114

1. Introduction

The time that students spend at school is of critical importance to their acquisition of knowledge and skills, as well as their broader social and emotional development. Supporting schools, teachers and students to make the most of this time is an important objective for policy makers and features prominently in the policy agendas of OECD and other education systems (OECD, 2019^[1]). Over the past two decades, many countries have considered extending and reorganising the time that students spend at school and a number of them, including Austria, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Denmark, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Mexico, Portugal and Uruguay have significantly lengthened the school day in one way or another. Even in countries, such as the United States, where many schools already offer extracurricular activities, policy makers have been considering how to support them more systematically in extending time at school.¹

Extending and rethinking the school day can serve a range of purposes. While some countries have seen the reforms primarily as a means to improve students' learning outcomes, others have sought to make it easier for working parents to combine their family responsibilities and professional lives. For many, longer school days are also an opportunity to improve equity and provide students with more tailored and holistic support in response to their different needs.

In the context of the COVID-19 pandemic and the resulting closure of schools in many countries, policy makers and researchers have discussed whether and how “lost learning time” at school could be recovered (Kraft and Falken, 2021^[2]; Reimers and Schleicher, 2020^[3]). The debate on the impact of school closures on the learning, development and well-being of different student groups is far from settled (Engzell, Frey and Verhagen, 2021^[4]). Nevertheless, different forms of school-day extensions have been evoked to support struggling students following school reopenings, including additional learning time, participation in after-school activities and targeted tutoring (OECD, 2021^[5]). While this working paper does not directly address how to support students affected by school and class closures, its lessons may provide useful guidance for how such strategies could be designed and the resources this might involve. The working paper also seeks to provide some examples for how a day at school might be reenvisioned to flexibly and holistically support the full range of students' academic, social and emotional needs.

Extending the school day can take many forms and there is significant heterogeneity among countries that implemented longer school days. The reforms considered in this working paper generally involved substantial, rather than marginal extensions of the school day and in most cases added not just regular instruction time to the curriculum, but also other educational and extracurricular offers to students' schedules. Nevertheless, they vary considerably in the amount of time they add to students' schedules, whether they are targeted at specific schools or universal, whether afternoon provisions are academic or non-academic and whether they cover new learning content or serve to deepen previously taught material. While the research on extended school days and added student learning time generally suggests modest positive impacts on learning outcomes, particularly for disadvantaged students, the results vary greatly across contexts. Research on other outcomes of interest is still scarce. Given the significant costs associated with the extension of school days, identifying the conditions under which reforms are likely to be effective

¹ OECD Education at a Glance provides information on the organisation of the school day, including the number of lessons in a standard school day, and additional activities before/after classes. See Table A.A.1 in Annex A for a description of school days in selected OECD countries.

and the factors that matter for their successful implementation is therefore an important concern.

One of the challenges for international research on extended school days has been to analyse how the effects of reforms are shaped by their design and implementation and the wider education policy environment in which they take place. Drawing on evidence from the OECD School Resources Review, this working paper aims to address this gap and to assist policy makers across the OECD and beyond with evidence from in-depth case studies of school day extensions in six European and Latin American countries. Each case study describes the context and goals of the reform, its design and implementation, and its resource implications and financing. By synthesising common challenges and lessons from the case studies, this working paper intends to inform reflections on the potential benefits and drawbacks of school day extensions and decisions about the design of future learning time reforms. It is intended to serve as a resource for policy makers drawing on the international experience in this field.

Based on the insights from research and the experience of the case study countries, the working paper highlights that systems need to evaluate the likely benefits and drawbacks of learning time reforms carefully and consider other possibilities to allocate scarce resources before embarking on such a change. Increasing the length of the school day might be an efficient strategy for some schools and school systems, but not for others. School systems that decide to extend the school day need to set clear and shared goals for their reform, design pedagogical models that support these goals through different activities, spaces and materials, provide adequate resources and staffing, and monitor and evaluate implementation. The paper also showcases that school-day reforms represent an opportunity to re-think schools as places not just for learning, but for holistic student development, engagement and support.

Following the introduction, Section 2 of this working paper provides a brief overview of previous research on the outcomes of extended school days on learning, non-academic and social, and economic outcomes. Section 3 presents in-depth case studies of learning time reforms in six education systems, discussing their context, goals, design and effects. This section also presents some comparative data based on the OECD Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) to put the case studies into context. Section 4 concludes with a reflection on the lessons that emerge from these case studies and that might guide policy makers in their decisions on the design of future learning time reforms. The final section on lessons learned can be read independently, but readers should refer to the case studies for a more in-depth analysis of specific reforms and their implementation. Likewise, Section 2 can be read on its own by readers interested primarily in a brief review of the recent literature.

The case studies presented in this paper were selected based on their involvement in the OECD School Resources Review. The Review was carried out from 2013 to 2020 to provide country-specific and comparative analyses on the efficient and equitable use of resources in school systems. All six countries participated in the project with an in-depth country review, which included a fact-finding mission of a team of experts and the publication of a review report providing tailored policy advice. The case studies expand on and update the analysis on learning time included in these review reports and the related background reports. While some of the participating countries, such as Austria and Colombia, covered learning time and the lengthening of school days as an important part of their participation in the project, others, such as Chile and Portugal, had a different focus given their policy priorities at the time and the fact that school-day reforms had been initiated some time ago and already reached broad coverage at the time of the review. Nevertheless, in all countries, the length and organisation of the school day remain a

pertinent issue, with challenges to extend coverage (e.g. Austria and Colombia) or with plans and ongoing initiatives to extend longer school day models to other levels of education (e.g. Portugal and Uruguay). The case studies also draw on the consultation of national legislation, policy documents, programme evaluations, research reports, international and national data and the review of national and international experts.²

2. Insights from research

2.1. The rationale for extended school days and instruction time

Policies that extend instruction time by lengthening and reorganising the school day or the school year have been advanced for a variety of reasons, including, first and foremost, their expected benefits for students' academic achievement and other skills, but also for their positive impact on families and economic productivity (Patall, Cooper and Batts Allen, 2010_[6]). The time that students spend at school – learning in regular school lessons, in after-school programmes or pursuing extracurricular activities – is of central importance to their acquisition of skills and knowledge and a critical resource in the learning process. Increasing students' instruction time in particular is frequently discussed as a means to improve students' academic achievement since it provides teachers with opportunities to cover the curriculum more broadly or in greater depth. Additional time could also give teachers opportunities to provide more individualised and flexibly paced instruction that accounts for different students' learning speeds.

Furthermore, extended time at school can allow students to pursue additional elective courses that stimulate their talents and interests or to engage in enrichment and extracurricular activities to which they may not have access outside of school. Proponents of extended school days also point to its potential for reducing inequities due to the benefits it may confer on disadvantaged students. This is based on the intuitive assumption that longer school days would provide students with limited family resources some of the social and educational experiences that more advantaged students would have received at home, outside of the regular school day. For some children growing up in difficult circumstances, longer school days would also limit the time that they are exposed to adverse or harmful domestic and community environments (Wu, 2020_[7]). At the same time, not all systems that lengthened the school day provide after-school activities free of charge. In Austria – one of the case study countries – students need to pay a fee to attend optional afternoon activities that are part of the extended day, for example, and many disadvantaged families do not take advantage of them, even though they may be eligible for subsidies.

In some cases, extending the school day or offering afternoon classes has been a response to remedy a specific challenge, for example to make up for lost learning time. Following extended periods of school closures during the COVID-19 pandemic, policy makers in OECD jurisdictions have considered different ways to recover lost learning time by creating additional learning opportunities, either virtually or in newly reopened schools. Suggestions involved the use of summer schools, extending the number of instruction days per week, but also extending the length of the school day (Reimers and Schleicher, 2020_[3]).

² For national legislation, the following websites were consulted: for Austria, <https://www.ris.bka.gv.at>; for Chile, <https://www.bcn.cl/leychile>; for Colombia, <https://www.mineducacion.gov.co/porta/Normatividad>; for Denmark, <https://www.retsinformation.dk>; for Portugal, <https://dre.pt>; for Uruguay, <https://www.anep.edu.uy/normativa>.

However, the relationship between instruction time and student outcomes is complex. A literature review by Gromada and Shewbridge (2016_[8]) highlights that the effect of added instruction time is contingent on a range of factors, including the quality of instruction and the classroom environment. In addition, its effect varies across student groups (Patall, Cooper and Batts Allen, 2010_[6]) and appears to be characterised by diminishing returns to scale (Rivkin and Schiman, 2015_[9]). Beyond a certain point, adding instruction time may cause boredom or fatigue, diminish students' effort and ability to concentrate, or cause a rise in classroom disruptions and absenteeism (Levin and Tsang, 1987_[10]). Especially for students who could also benefit from educationally enriched activities and informal learning opportunities outside of school, adding instruction time may quickly reach a point of diminishing or negative marginal returns. In addition, regardless of their absolute effectiveness, policies that extend students' instruction time consume resources that could be spent on other school inputs. Proponents of extending instruction time therefore not only need to demonstrate its positive effect on students, but also that it is more effective than investing in alternative interventions, such as, for example, providing teacher with additional training or reducing class sizes.

Extending the length of the school day is just one of multiple ways to increase instruction time. Others include adding more days of instruction to the school calendar or providing separate after-school and summer programmes. The way in which additional instruction time is distributed over the school year affects students, parents and teachers alike and each method is associated with distinct advantages and drawbacks. Shortening the summer break, in particular, has sometimes been proposed as an effective means to tackle the relative or absolute learning loss that some students experience during longer breaks in the school calendar (Atteberry and McEachin, 2020_[11]; Quinn et al., 2016_[12]; Cooper et al., 1996_[13]). Yet, in the longer run, shorter breaks may lead to fatigue among both students and teachers and could reduce the attractiveness of working in schools. In addition, keeping schools open during the summer would be associated with an increase in both staff and operating costs.

Longer school days, in turn, may provide teachers with more flexibility in designing their lesson plans and the opportunity to cover the curriculum in greater depth during extended blocks of learning time (Rice, Croninger and Roellke, 2002_[14]). At the same time, students may struggle to remain focused in the afternoons and extended school days reduce the time students can spend with their families, friends or engaging in beneficial after-school activities. Like the extension of the school year, longer school days are associated with the cost of keeping school buildings open longer and paying staff and teachers for their time. At the same time, it may generate positive externalities by increasing parents' participation in the labour market and increasing childcare options for them. While direct comparisons of the cost involved in extending the school year vs. the school day are hard to come by and rarely take into account the costs borne by different stakeholders, Gromada and Shewbridge (2016_[8]) conclude that extending the school day is usually cheaper than extending the school year.

Investigating the relative efficacy of lengthening the school year and lengthening the school day is highly relevant for policy makers considering to increase instruction time. Even if the amount of total instruction time remains fixed, an answer to this question could enable system to raise student achievement by rearranging time away from a longer school year and towards a longer school day or vice versa. In one of the few studies that empirically address this subject, Wu (2020_[7]) exploits variations in 80 countries' instruction times across four waves of the Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) (1995-2007) and finds that instruction time added through longer school days had a considerably stronger association with student achievement than time added through longer school years (Wu, 2020_[7]). Leaving aside the relative efficacy of extending the school year

or the school day, this paper will focus on the latter and explore effective strategies to improve student achievement and other desirable outcomes by lengthening the school day in primary and secondary education.

2.2. Evidence on the outcomes of extended school days

Synthesising the evidence on the effects of extended school days is complicated by the wide range of outcomes of interest and the diversity of interventions studied in the literature. The limited number of study designs that allow for the identification of causal effects further diminishes our ability to draw definitive conclusions about the effects of longer school days, as does the limited data (e.g. on the extent to which the time spent at school crowds out other activities). Proponents of longer school days draw on a range of arguments, variously invoking its positive effects on students' learning outcomes, on students' behavioural and other non-academic outcomes, as well as its social and economic benefits for parents and society more widely. In the following, the available evidence concerning each of these outcomes is presented in turn.

As discussed at the beginning of this paper, the extension of school days is a broad concept and can take many different forms (the policies analysed in this working paper have, in different countries, been referred to as “full-day”, “all-day” and “full-time schooling” or simply as “longer school days”). Comparing their effects is therefore far from trivial. The cases considered in the literature vary considerably with respect to the number of hours that are added to students' schedules, as well as the time they had spent at school prior to the intervention. The time added can range from anywhere between a few hours to more than 20 hours per week (e.g. in systems that moved from a double or triple shift system to single-shift “full-day schooling”). Some models of extended school days are mandatory for all students, while others are voluntary or targeted at specific groups, such as low-performing, socio-economically disadvantaged or language-minority students (OECD, 2020_[15]).

The outcomes of extended-day programmes can also be expected to vary based on their design and content (Kraft, 2015_[16]). In some cases, afternoon provisions are primarily recreational and focus on creative extracurricular activities. In others, they provide remedial and homework support or function as a direct extension of the regular school day and instruction in the curriculum. In a growing number of countries, for example, public schools provide academically-oriented after-school programmes that are sometimes aimed at disadvantaged students who do not have access to other forms of supplementary private education (Park et al., 2016_[17]). Likewise, in some countries that are considered in this paper, such as Austria, there was an explicit or implicit understanding that lengthening the school day would reduce the time that students spend learning at home. In other countries, including Chile, observers have noted that students' overall learning time has risen significantly due to the reforms.

Another difficulty in reviewing the literature on extended school days are methodological challenges that limit the ability to make causal inferences about its effects. Many of the earlier studies were based on simple cross-sectional comparisons, which may be biased since schools and students with more hours of instruction are likely to differ from others with respect to both observed and unobserved characteristics. For example, high-performing schools may have the resources and capacity to offer their students additional instruction time and enrichment classes. This would likely cause an overestimation of the effect of instruction time on student outcomes. Conversely, additional instruction time may be targeted at under-performing schools and students as a remedial measure, which would cause an underestimation of its effects based on simple cross-sectional comparisons (Figlio, Holden and Ozek, 2018_[18]).

Those studies that used repeated observations of the same students or schools have tended to estimate the effects of extended instruction time over relatively short periods, thus limiting the conclusions that can be drawn on its longer-term benefits. Furthermore, isolating the causal effect of extended instruction times is complicated by the fact that these interventions tend to be accompanied by other measures that may independently affect student outcomes, including, but not limited to pedagogical reforms. In their review of the evidence published prior to 2010, Patall et al. (2010_[6]) highlight that rigorous research designs were still too scarce to draw definitive conclusions about the effect of school-day extensions and their magnitude, even though the best evidence suggested neutral to small positive effects on academic achievement. Since then, however, a growing number of quasi-experimental and other observational studies have made serious efforts to control for biases.

2.2.1. Learning outcomes

Over the years, several meta-analyses have synthesised the research on student learning time and its effects. Many of the early studies from the 1970s and 1980s, reviewed by Gromada and Shewbridge (2016_[8]), found increased instruction time to have a positive but small effect on student achievement. Meta-analyses of more recent studies have generally confirmed small positive effects of added regular school time and out-of-school learning time on educational achievement, particularly for some student groups, although there is significant heterogeneity across contexts and interventions (Scheerens, 2014_[19]; Patall, Cooper and Batts Allen, 2010_[6]). Evaluations of school day extensions in six Latin American and Caribbean countries, ranging from 10 hours per week (Chile) to 25 hours (São Paulo), also showed positive effects on other educational outcomes such as retention and graduation rates in some countries (Alfaro, Evans and Holland, 2015_[20]). Some of the more recent studies are presented below.

Data from the OECD's most recent PISA test in 2018 show a curvilinear relationship between the instruction time that students received on a specific subject and their performance. For example, across OECD countries, the time that students spent in language-of-instruction lessons was positively correlated with their reading scores, but only among students who spent up to three hours per week in language classes. Beyond this point, the association became insignificant and, for more than five hours per week, negative (OECD, 2020_[15]). This finding is in line with observations from previous PISA rounds (OECD, 2011, pp. 244, Table 4.2a_[21]). However, one must be careful when interpreting these results since the time that students spend on a given subject is likely to be, at least to some extent, endogenous to their ability and interests. It might be, for example, that students receive additional instruction as a remedial measure because they have fallen behind.

Several studies have sought to address these identification problems, also drawing on cross-sectional data. Rivkin and Schiman (2015_[9]), for example, exploit within-school variation in instruction time across subjects or grades and find it to have a positive but gradually diminishing effect on test scores in PISA 2009, with greater benefits in better classroom environments. Wu (2020_[7]) exploits differences in instruction times within 80 countries across four waves of TIMSS data (1995-2007) and finds positive effects of longer school days on student achievement, particularly for disadvantaged students (Wu, 2020_[7]). Using 2006 PISA data from 50 countries, Lavy (2015_[22]) comes to a similar conclusion, finding that additional instruction time disproportionately benefits socio-economically disadvantaged students in a study using student and school fixed effects.

Experimental studies using randomisation to test the effect of extended school days are rare (Fryer, 2017_[23]). Meyer and Van Klaveren (2013_[24]) investigated a three-month

extended-day programme offered to a randomised group of 8-12-year-old students in seven Dutch elementary schools. Selected students participated on a voluntary basis and received, on average, an additional two hours of language instruction, two hours of mathematics instruction and one hour of excursions per week. Neither the assignment to the treatment, nor the participation in the programme had a significant positive effect on mathematics or reading scores (Meyer and Van Klaveren, 2013_[24]). However, a significantly larger cluster-randomised trial involving 90 schools in Denmark found that adding three hours of instruction in reading, writing and literature over 16 weeks significantly increased students' reading test scores (0.15 s.d.) (Andersen, Humlum and Nandrup, 2016_[25]). Quasi-experimental evidence from a small-scale high-intensity intervention for Grade 10 students in Boston charter schools found that two daily hours of individualised tutorials improved students' performance in English by 0.15-0.25 s.d. and raised mathematics achievement among low-performing students (Kraft, 2015_[16]).

Given the paucity of randomised interventions, a number of studies have used regression discontinuity or difference-in-differences designs to try to identify the causal effect of added instruction time. Figlio, Holden and Ozek (2018_[18]), for example, take advantage of an administrative eligibility cut-off to study the effect of an extended school day (ESD) programme in Florida (United States), which mandated the lowest-performing elementary schools to lengthen the school day by one hour of additional literacy instruction starting in 2012. The authors focus on the first year of implementation and find that the additional hour improved reading test scores by 0.05 standard deviations. They also suggest that the expected increase in students' future earnings potential could outweigh the cost of the programme but acknowledge greater uncertainty around these longer-term estimates (Figlio, Holden and Ozek, 2018_[18]).

Bellei (2009_[26]) uses a difference-in-differences strategy to test the effect of a Chilean reform that extended instruction time from a half day to a full day. The programme, which is described in detail in the case study section below, increased school time by about 22% (a little less than half of which was dedicated to academic instruction) and did not mandate changes in pedagogical practices. After two years, the policy had a small and robust positive effect on the language achievement of high school students in Grades 9 and 10 (0.05-0.07 s.d.) and a positive effect on mathematics achievement under some model specifications. The move to full-day schooling had a larger positive effect on rural and public school students, who tend to be more disadvantaged, and also had a stronger effect on students at the top of the achievement distribution (Bellei, 2009_[26]).

Mixed results from two interventions in Brazil provide further indicative evidence concerning the conditions for successful school day extensions, highlighting the role of quality and resources. The national *Mais Educação* programme implemented since 2008 has financially supported federal states in extending their school days, adding between 1-4 hours of activities after regular classes on some days of the week. In a study combining propensity score matching with a difference-in-differences approach looking at urban 5th and 9th grade students, Almeida et al. (2016_[27]) find that the programme had a negative impact on students' mathematics achievement, no impact on their language achievement and no impact on dropouts. Notably, the effects were more positive in cities with higher GDP. Cruz et al. (2017_[28]) study a separate intervention in Rio de Janeiro (Brazil) that transformed municipal double-shift schools into single-shift full-day schools, adding about two to three hours of instruction each day. The authors find significant positive effects on test scores and pass rates (0.8 s.d.) in middle schools, but only for those that fulfilled certain certification criteria, including a well-structured and integrated full-day curriculum, the provision of teacher training and staff committed to teaching in a single school.

Battistin and Meroni (2016_[29]) study a 2010 reform in Southern Italy, which funded selected under-performing lower secondary schools to offer academic activities outside of regular school hours and increase instruction time in mathematics and language by around a third. Using a difference-in-differences approach, the authors find a positive effect only on mathematics test scores (0.3 s.d.) in the lowest-performing, least advantaged schools but not on language test scores. The findings are in line with the hypothesis that students in more advantaged schools may have reached a point of diminishing returns to learning time. They are also consistent with previous studies suggesting it may be more difficult in some subjects than in others to raise achievement through added instruction (Meroni and Abbiati, 2016_[30]; Zimmer, Hamilton and Christina, 2010_[31]). Consistent with findings from Chile (Bellei, 2009_[26]), the test score improvements in Italy were most pronounced at the upper end of the achievement distribution within disadvantaged schools. The intervention thus increased the inequality within disadvantaged schools, which might suggest that other approaches may be needed to support students who are most at risk of failing (Battistin and Meroni, 2016_[29]).

In Colombia, several studies have estimated the impact of longer school days by comparing different student cohorts in schools that switched from a half-day to a full-day schedule (prior to the large-scale reform discussed in the case study section below). One study estimated that full-day attendance increased students' test scores by around 0.1 s.d. The effects were most pronounced among the poorest schools and those in rural areas, larger for mathematics than for language, and larger for students in Grade 9 than in Grade 5 (Hincapie, 2016_[32]). The move to full-day schooling was also found to reduce the probability of early dropout and grade repetition (García, Fernández and Weiss, 2013_[33]). Similar effects were found for other (at the time) middle-income countries in the region, such as Uruguay, where targeted interventions helped primary schools in poor rural areas move from a half-day to a full-time schedule since the 1990s (discussed in the case study section below). Comparing test scores in the sixth and last year of full-time primary schools with a comparison group matched on propensity scores, one study estimated that students in the most disadvantaged schools scored 0.06 s.d. higher in mathematics and 0.04 s.d. higher in language for each year of full-time instruction (Cerdan-Infantes and Vermeersch, 2007_[34]).

In the early 2000s, Germany promoted the extension of all-day schools and raised the share of schools that provide lunch and at least seven hours of programming on at least three days per week from 16% in 2002 to 65% in 2015 (Steinmann, Strietholt and Caro, 2019_[35]). While there are no experimental or quasi-experimental studies of the reform's effects, several studies have tried to compare the results of all-day and half-day schools, controlling for school characteristics and students' self-selection into after-school programmes. The results of all-day schools have been less promising than those of comparable international initiatives. One analysis of a representative cross-sectional sample of schools, using a matching-procedure, found no significant differences in science, reading or mathematics achievement and no differences in socio-economic achievement gaps (Strietholt et al., 2015_[36]).

A longitudinal study found that achievement gains associated with participation in academic after-school activities were likely driven by self-selection and disappeared once student and school characteristics were controlled for (Steinmann, Strietholt and Caro, 2019_[35]). Interestingly, at the same time as Germany saw an expansion of all-day schooling, many federal states reduced the length of their academic tracks by one year while increasing instruction hours in the remaining school years. Even though the overall effect of the reform is contested, one study found that the increase in weekly instruction time by around two hours (6.5%) had a small positive effect on 15-year-old students' PISA test scores in reading, mathematics and science (0.05-0.06 international s.d.) (Huebener, Kuger and

Marcus, 2017^[37]). The same study, in contrast to most evidence on learning time extensions, also found that increased instruction time in Germany widened the performance gap between high- and low-performing students (Huebener, Kuger and Marcus, 2017^[37]). The content of the added instruction time might explain this result since the added instruction time covered new learning material. By contrast, some of the other extended school day reforms added time for remediation or enrichment classes to help lower-achieving students catch up.

Adding instruction time in Switzerland has also appeared to benefit high-achieving students disproportionately. A study using student and school fixed effects also found wider within-school achievement heterogeneity and stronger achievement gains among students in higher-ability tracks (Cattaneo, Oggenfuss and Wolter, 2017^[38]). This finding could be explained by cumulative learning gains of high-performing students or their capacity to concentrate over extended periods of time. In the specific case of Switzerland, the rise in inequality could also be a result of different learning inputs across tracks (e.g. if classroom discipline is better in higher-ability tracks or their teachers are more qualified and can therefore make more of an additional hour of instruction).

In sum, with some of the aforementioned exceptions in mind, the research has tended to support the hypothesis that added instruction time would be particularly beneficial for socio-economically disadvantaged students and could therefore promote equity in learning outcomes (Gromada and Shewbridge, 2016^[8]; Patall, Cooper and Batts Allen, 2010^[6]; Lavy, 2015^[22]). In practice, the effects of additional instruction time on equity are likely to depend not only on the way this time is used (Kraft, 2015^[16]) (i.e. what content is covered and how teachers adapt their instruction to individual learners' needs), but also on the counterfactual (i.e. how students would have spent their time otherwise). All else being equal, for example, a reform that substitutes supervised learning support at school for time spent on homework (where family inputs play a greater role for students' success) are more likely to reduce inequities than reforms that increase instruction time to cover additional curricular content.

2.2.2. Non-academic and social outcomes

Proponents of extended learning time tend to point to its broader social benefits and its positive effect on students' non-academic outcomes and socio-emotional skills. Since these outcomes have not been the primary goal of school-day extensions, most empirical studies and evaluations of reforms have focused on academic achievement and it is difficult to draw conclusions about other desirable outcomes. Early reviews of the literature have found very few studies prior to 2010 that considered non-academic and social outcomes (Patall, Cooper and Batts Allen, 2010^[6]). In one of them, Bishop et al. (1988^[39]), found evidence that extended school days may improve schools' disciplinary climate. Their evaluation of a schedule extension in a rural high school in Virginia found a drop in the number of disciplinary incidents, student detentions and suspensions while student attendance and dropout rates remained constant (Bishop, Worner and Weber, 1988^[39]).

More recently, a randomised trial in Denmark found added instruction time to reduce students' behavioural difficulties (comprising emotional symptoms, conduct problems, peer relationship problems, hyperactivity and inattention). Although the study's sample was too small to reliably distinguish between results for different student groups, exploratory analyses suggest that the programme may have been more effective in reducing behavioural problems among girls than boys (Andersen, Humlum and Nandrup, 2016^[25]).

Extending the school day reduces students' time for leisure and out-of-school activities, which could have a positive or negative impact on their academic, social and emotional development. In some cases, non-academic after-school programmes have been explicitly

designed to foster students' personal and social skills such as self-awareness, self-management, leadership and responsible decision-making. In a meta-analysis of studies evaluating such programmes in the United States, Durlak, Weissberg and Pachan (2010^[40]) found them to improve students' self-perceptions as well as their bonding to school. They also found evidence of a reduction in problematic behaviour, particularly if programmes followed a set of effective practices, i.e. if they were sequenced, active, focused, and explicit. At the same time, there is a risk that lengthening the school day and reducing students' leisure time could lead to exhaustion, particularly if the added time is dedicated to high-intensity instruction. One difference-in-differences analysis of a German reform, for example, found that added instruction time was associated with a slight increase in stress-related health problems among students (Marcus et al., 2020^[41]).

Longer school days can also keep students busy and supervised during times when they might otherwise engage in risky behaviour or criminal activities. Following the school day extension in Chile, for example, 72% of parents at participating high schools reported that their children spent less time watching TV and 52% reported that they spent less time on street corners (Bellei, 2009^[26]). Berthelon and Kruger (2011^[42]) find that the shift from half-day to full-day schooling in Chile was associated with a drop in adolescent motherhood among poor families. Similar results were seen in Colombia, where the attendance of single-day schooling (seven hours a day) as opposed to half-day schooling (4 hours a day) was associated with a reduction in teenage pregnancy in urban schools (Borrero Escobar, 2017^[43]).

The empirical evidence on the short-term effects of school attendance on crime is mixed. In Chile, full-day schooling appears to have caused a drop in the rates of juvenile property crimes and violent crimes (Berthelon and Kruger, 2011^[42]). Likewise, switching from a half-day to a single-day schedule appears to have reduced crime rates around schools in the Colombian capital city Bogotá (Gómez Fernández, 2019^[44]). By contrast, Jacob and Lefgren (2003^[45]) found that youth engaged in fewer property crimes but more violent crimes on school days, noting the role that social interactions around schools can play in the occurrence of violence. Of course, this does not preclude longer school days from reducing criminal activity through other mechanisms in the long run (e.g. due to the impact that educational attainment has on the relative returns to crime vs. legitimate work) (Hjalmarsson, Holmlund and Lindquist, 2014^[46]).

2.2.3. *Economic outcomes*

Arguments for a longer school day have not only focused on students' learning outcomes and their social development, but also on its impact on the economy. Proponents argue that extending the school day or the school year could lower expenditures on social programmes and remedial education later on while increasing students' employment prospects, productivity and future earnings (Brown et al., 2005^[47]). The number of studies that empirically investigated the long-term impact of school day extensions on students' labour market outcomes remains very small. Llach et al. (2009^[48]), cited in (Alfaro, Evans and Holland, 2015^[20]), studied the extension of primary school days from four to eight hours in Buenos Aires (Argentina), in the 1970s. They found no significant impact on students' earnings or employment rates 30 years after their graduation. By contrast, another study found that exposure to full-day primary and secondary schooling in Chile was associated with increased earnings in adulthood (partly driven by occupational choices), though not with higher college graduation rates (Dominguez and Ruffini, 2018^[49]).

Extending the school day or school year can also be considered an indirect childcare subsidy that reduces parents' expenditures on or responsibilities to engage in after-school care. In 2018, on average across the OECD, 17% of all children aged 0-17 were living with

a single parent. In single-parent households, 55% of children aged 0-14 had a parent working full time. In two-parent households, at least 63% of children had two working parents and 47% had both parents working full time. On average across the OECD, 30% of single-parent children aged 0-14 were living in households without a working adult, compared with just 5% of children in two-parent households (OECD, 2018_[50]).³ Lengthening the school day is therefore frequently discussed as a means to ease the burden on double breadwinners and single parents and could have positive effects on the labour market participation, particularly of mothers (Gromada and Shewbridge, 2016_[8]).

None of the studies included in earlier meta-analyses have considered the impact of longer school days on female labour market participation (Patall, Cooper and Batts Allen, 2010_[6]), but more recent analyses have found that school day extensions had a positive effect on female labour supply in multiple countries. Most of these have focused on the primary level, where effects are expected to be more pronounced. Contreras and Sepúlveda (2017_[51]) estimate that the extension of primary school days in Chile has increased the labour market participation among the main beneficiaries (single mothers with children aged 8 to 13 years and no younger children) by 5%. Likewise, access to extended-day school and after-school care was found to have a positive effect on the rate of full-time employment among mothers in Switzerland (Felfe, Lechner and Thiemann, 2016_[52]), as well as on mothers' employment rates and working hours in Mexico (Padilla-Romo and Cabrera-Hernández, 2019_[53]). In Germany, the expansion of all-day schooling was found to have had an impact on both the extensive and intensive margins of maternal labour supply, increasing both the number of mothers in the work force and the amount of time they worked. One study found that lengthening primary school days by two hours increased mothers' likelihood to enter the labour market (Shure, 2019_[54]). Another study of the same reform also found an increase in the working hours among mothers who already worked prior their child's school entry (Gambaro, Marcus and Peter, 2019_[55]).

2.2.4. Summary of findings and limitations

To summarise, although the evidence on the effect of school day extensions remains limited, much of it suggests that school-day extensions can have a small positive effect on some academic outcomes (see for example (Andersen, Humlum and Nandrup, 2016_[25]; Figlio, Holden and Ozek, 2018_[18]; Bellei, 2009_[26]). Nevertheless, the null-effects identified for multiple initiatives are a reminder that the context and implementation of school day extensions matter, even though the empirical literature is yet to converge on a set of conditions that moderate their success (Strietholt et al., 2015_[36]; Almeida et al., 2016_[27]). The case studies in this paper aim to contribute to identifying such conducive conditions.

Recent evidence is broadly consistent with the hypothesis that there are diminishing marginal returns to extended instruction time and that those effects are stronger for disadvantaged students (or that advantaged students more quickly reach a point of diminishing returns) (Bellei, 2009_[26]). Some studies find that additional instruction time may be less effective in raising learning outcomes for the lowest-performing students (Huebener, Kuger and Marcus, 2017_[37]; Battistin and Meroni, 2016_[29]).

The impact of school day extensions on equity might therefore vary across different dimensions of inequality, just as its general effect on learning outcomes can be expected to

³ These data are based on the OECD Family Database indicator "The labour market position of families (LMF)" (http://www.oecd.org/els/soc/LMF_1_1_Children_in_households_employment_status.xlsx) and indicator "The structure of families (SF)" (http://www.oecd.org/els/family/SF_1_1_Family_size_and_composition.xlsx).

vary across student groups and school systems, conditional on factors such as the content and delivery of added learning time as well as the system's prior amount of learning time. In light of the null-effects for specific subjects and student groups, the authors of some studies have also cautioned about the dead-weight loss of interventions that are implemented without regard to schools' contexts and the specific needs of their student populations (Battistin and Meroni, 2016_[29]). For some student groups, learning time extensions may not confer additional educational benefits and therefore constitute an unwise use of public resources at best.

Evidence on the non-academic, social and economic outcomes of school day extensions remains scarce and limited to a small number of contexts. Many evaluations of reforms, also in the case study countries covered in this working paper, have focused on a narrower set of academic outcomes. Nevertheless, some studies suggest that extended school days could reduce some forms of juvenile delinquency and risky behaviour (Berthelon and Kruger, 2011_[42]). Evidence also suggests that longer school days could improve maternal labour market participation (Padilla-Romo and Cabrera-Hernández, 2019_[53]; Felfe, Lechner and Thiemann, 2016_[52]; Gambaro, Marcus and Peter, 2019_[55]). At the same time, there is some indication that long instruction hours need to be weighed against students' experience of stress and reduced time for recreation (Marcus et al., 2020_[41]), a risk that will be more acute if longer school days are not accompanied by a reduction in homework and other forms of after-school learning. Research on other desirable outcomes, including students' socio-emotional skills and well-being, but also students' long-term economic returns to extended school days is limited and no definitive conclusions seem warranted at this point. It should also be noted that there are likely to be other, more targeted and cost-effective means to improve these social outcomes whose analysis is beyond the scope of this paper.

One of the crucial limitations to the quantitative research on school-day extensions concerns the role that pedagogical change and the implementation process play in moderating their effects. Particularly in the early days of a reform, various implementation challenges may impair its effectiveness. In Chile, for example, 19% of participating high schools extended their instruction time by less than the programme prescribed and 47% of principals reported that teacher shortages impaired their ability to lengthen the school day (Bellei, 2009_[26]). Other frequent implementation challenges include the reconfiguration of physical spaces to enable extended school days, as well as teachers', students' and families' difficulty to adjust to their new schedules. Any number of these issues can impair the effectiveness of longer school days. The case studies presented in this paper seek to shed light on these complexities and help to contextualise the results presented above.

Other factors that mediate the impact of school-day extensions include whether the added time is used for academic instruction or other activities, whether school-day extensions are accompanied by new pedagogical practices and whether they lead to an improvement or deterioration of teaching quality (Fredrick and Walberg, 1980_[56]). It remains a challenge for empirical studies to identify these changes in the classroom or to rule out that they occurred, even if policies did not ostensibly seek to instil pedagogical change. As many scholars have argued (Kraft, 2015_[16]), the effect of extended school days will depend on how the additional time is used, i.e. on the content and the instructional strategies deployed.

Whether increased instruction time is an efficient policy or not ultimately needs to be considered in relation to stated goals and in comparison to other ways of allocating resources. Even if added instruction time has a positive effect on learning outcomes, it might take funds away from policies with an even greater impact. Although few attempts have been made to compare the cost-effectiveness of different educational interventions, evidence from the United States suggests that extending instruction time is not the most

efficient investment, at least if average student learning is the primary outcome of interest (see (Levin, 1986_[57]) cited in (Gromada and Shewbridge, 2016_[8])).

According to Wu (2020_[7]), the effects of increased instruction time on learning outcomes are broadly of the same magnitude as those identified for alternative interventions, such as reductions in class size (Dee and West, 2011_[58]), small-group tutoring or intensive feedback to teachers (Dobbie and Fryer, 2013_[59]). However, a meta-analysis also found that less resource-intensive time-related interventions (e.g. homework assignments or the optimisation of existing learning time) had similar or larger effects on student achievement than extended instruction time and out-of-school programmes (Scheerens, 2014_[19]). Cost-effectiveness estimates of the reform in Uruguay point in the same direction (Alfaro, Evans and Holland, 2015_[20]) and the case studies presented in this paper make an effort, wherever possible, to compare the impact of reforms to the cost involved in their implementation.

Nevertheless, as discussed above, the effects of school day extensions and instruction time are contingent on the target population and other contextual factors (Wu, 2020_[7]). It might therefore well be that increasing the length of the school day is an efficient strategy for some schools and even school systems, while others might be better off, for example, trying to improve the quality of instruction by investing in teachers' professional learning and the continuous improvement of their practice.

3. Case studies

The six case study countries presented in this paper were selected based on their participation in the OECD School Resources Review and because they represent a wide range of experiences in lengthening the school day. They provide valuable lessons for other countries and for each other on how extended school-day models can be designed, staffed and financed to achieve a range of policy goals.

Although all case studies are based on reforms in Europe and Latin America, they represent vastly different contexts and school systems. For example, the school systems range in size from about 850 000 students in Denmark and 1 million students in Uruguay, to about 2.9 million students in Chile and 9.4 million students in Colombia. The size of the private sectors differs too, with government-dependent private provision playing an especially important role in Chile and to some extent in Denmark, but less so in Austria, Colombia, Portugal and Uruguay. The systems also have different governance structures, vesting local authorities and schools with varying levels of authority to manage their resources and take curricular or pedagogical decisions, all of which influences the implementation and financing of extended school days. Contrast for instance the highly decentralised school system in Denmark with the centralised governance of school education in Uruguay.

As highlighted in the introduction, the case study countries represent a range of approaches to the reorganisation and extension of the school day. While some case study countries have focused more on the social benefits for working families (e.g. Austria and Portugal), others have put greater emphasis on extended-day school as a strategy to foster student learning and development (e.g. Chile, Colombia and Denmark). Equity has been an important dimension of the longer school day across case study countries. The case study countries have also varied in the coverage of their reforms. Some have extended the school day across all levels of education (e.g. Chile and Colombia), while others have targeted specific stages (e.g. Austria and Denmark) or targeted the early years first before beginning to extend the school day in secondary education as well (e.g. Portugal and Uruguay).

The amount of time for activities added to the school day differs across case study countries (and sometimes across schools within countries) from 1 hour per day, on average, plus time for lunch in Portugal and about 1.4 hours in Chile and Denmark, to 3.5 hours in Uruguay (which includes lunch and breaks). In Colombia, schools are required to offer one more hour of learning per day, but additional activities are to be offered as defined by schools, while in Austria, the school day should offer additional activities until 16:00. Also, regulations about the beginning and the end of the school day differ, giving schools and local authorities varying levels of influence over these aspects of their schedule.

Across case study countries, there is also variation in the way the additional time as part of the extended school day is to be used, and who is responsible for running the activities provided in that time, also depending on the goals of the reform. In some contexts, the longer school day has a clear focus on extracurricular and enrichment activities (e.g. Austria, Portugal and Uruguay), in others there is a greater focus on learning and instruction in the curriculum and core subjects, while also providing different and new types of activities as part of the longer school day (e.g. Chile, Colombia and Denmark). In Austria and Portugal, the extended-day schedule does not alter the number of stipulated hours of regular instruction that schools should dedicate to specific curricular subjects or disciplines. Similarly in Uruguay, where central regulations only specify total instruction time for pre-primary and primary education rather than the distribution of hours across disciplines, the activities in the longer day provide curricular enrichment distinct to regular lessons.

This is different to Denmark, where the longer school day provides more lessons in particular subjects, such as Danish and mathematics, while introducing new concepts such as supported learning and an “open school”, and incorporating daily exercise, among others. Also in Chile, the additional time in the school day as part of the full-day schedule is allocated to more instruction hours in specific subjects within the central regulations on instruction time, but schools also have a time allocation to define at their discretion. The situation is comparable in Colombia, with time added to both regular instruction and extracurricular activities, although here legislation only specifies a minimum share of pedagogical hours that must be used for teaching mandatory and fundamental subject areas, but that are then defined in the schools’ study plans and educational projects.

The case study countries also took different approaches to the organisation of their extended school days, including the time for relaxation, breaks and meals. In some of these countries, traditional instruction alternates with other forms of activities throughout the school day (e.g. Denmark), while others provide regular instruction in the morning and other types of learning and recreation in the afternoon (e.g. Portugal and Uruguay), although this may differ across schools. Some countries have used the longer school days to integrate time for remedial teaching, tutoring or homework (e.g. Austria, Denmark and Portugal).

Depending on the type of activities that are provided, and how they are integrated in the school day and linked with regular instruction, students can choose to take part in the additional activities in some countries, although they typically commit to participating for the full school year once signed up (e.g. Austria, Portugal and Uruguay). In others, they cannot opt out of attending the longer school day and should typically participate in the different activities on offer when enrolled in a school offering an extended day (e.g. Colombia and Denmark). The organisation of the school day also influences staffing as well as infrastructure and space requirements, and the resources required for supporting the necessary changes. Some case study countries rely mainly on teachers to provide additional learning time in the day (e.g. Chile and Colombia). Others, employ a broader range of staff to run different activities, including educators, pedagogues, monitors and workshop leaders (e.g. Austria, Denmark, Portugal and Uruguay), although their responsibilities may be

limited to specific parts of the school day and exclude time for subject-related learning, as is the case in Austria and Denmark, for example.


3.1. A comparative perspective on learning time and after-school activities

This section presents data from the OECD PISA survey to illustrate the diversity of approaches to students' learning time taken by OECD countries and the systems selected for the case studies. It should be stressed, however, that this data does not provide an exhaustive picture of countries' school-day policies, nor does it reflect the impact of their learning time reforms discussed in the case studies that follow. For example, the PISA data only describe the situation of 15-year-olds, while the reforms in Portugal and Uruguay were so far mainly targeted at the early stages of school education, although both countries have more recently also started extending the school day in secondary schools (Uruguay) or developing plans for doing so (Portugal). Furthermore, as explained in more detail in the case studies, reforms to lengthen the school day usually involve a range of pedagogical interventions and activities that enrich the curriculum beyond the regular hours of instruction while the data presented below focus primarily on students' learning time in regular lessons.

With that in mind, data from the 2018 PISA survey suggest that there is significant heterogeneity in the length of the school day among the case study countries. In Colombia and Denmark, 15-year-old students reported to have close to the OECD average of 27.5 hours of instruction in regular lessons per week. By contrast, in Uruguay students reported to have only 23.2 hours, while students in Austria, Portugal and Chile all reported to spend on average 28.8 hours and more in regular lessons (see Figure 1). Since all of the reforms discussed in the case studies took place prior to 2018, the data presented in Figure 1 is not indicative of the situation that motivated the lengthening of school days. In Colombia, for example, where the coverage of single-day schooling is still relatively low and targets all levels of school education, the ongoing roll-out of the reform might be expected to cause learning times to rise further above the level reflected here. Neither does the data on weekly learning time reflect students' overall learning time since the length and number of school years differs across countries.

Figure 1. Total weekly learning time at age 15 in regular school lessons, 2018

In hours; including all school subjects. Based on reports of 15-year-old students




Note: Countries and economies are ranked in ascending order of the weekly learning time. Case study countries are marked in a different colour. Data is based on reports of students attending public and private schools. The data was collected before Costa Rica joined the OECD, so the country is not included in the OECD average.
Source: OECD (2018^[60]), PISA 2018 Database, Table V.B1.6.1, <https://www.oecd.org/pisa/data/2018database> (accessed 14 February 2021).

Since some of the reforms discussed in this working paper (notably those in Austria, Portugal and Uruguay) were targeted at levels below upper secondary education, Figure 2 shows complementary system-level data on the intended instruction times at different ages in compulsory education. As can be seen, the intended annual instruction hours for 7-year-old students vary significantly across the case study countries, with Austria reporting 690 annual hours of instruction, compared to 774 in Uruguay and 1080 in Portugal (although it should be noted that the instruction times in Austria do not include non-compulsory hours, which account for 270 hours of Portugal’s annual intended instruction time).

Figure 2. Intended instruction times in compulsory general education at age 7 and 13, 2018

Number of hours per year in public institutions



Note: Countries and economies are ranked in ascending order of the intended instruction time at age 7. Case study countries are marked in a different colour. Based on system-level data provided by country authorities.

1. Refers only to compulsory instruction time.

2. Estimated instruction time per age, as the allocation of instruction time across multiple grades is flexible.

3. Year of reference 2017.

4. For Colombia, the data provided from PISA and Education at a Glance have been updated by the authors.


Sources: OECD (2018_[60]), PISA 2018 Database, Table B3.2.2, <https://www.oecd.org/pisa/data/2018database> (accessed 14 February 2021) and OECD (2018_[61]), *Education at a Glance: OECD Indicators 2018*, Table D1.4, <https://doi.org/10.1787/eag-2018-en>.

A common motivation for extending the school day is to reduce the time that students learn at home and instead provide them with opportunities to take enrichment or remedial classes at school and complete their homework in a supervised environment. Even though students in all OECD countries, spend more time learning at school than at home, in 2015, 15-year-old students reported to spend on average 17 hours per week on homework, additional instruction or private study. There is significant heterogeneity in the time students spend studying after school with averages ranging from 12 hours or less in Finland and Germany to more than 21 in Greece, Italy and Turkey (see Figure 3).

As can be seen in Figure 3, at the system level, there appears to be no trade-off between whether learning takes place inside or outside of school. Within countries, PISA data suggests that socio-economically advantaged students and students who attend socio-economically advantaged schools tend to spend more time doing homework (OECD, 2014_[62]) and evidence suggests that assigning homework can amplify achievement inequalities (Rønning, 2011_[63]). The complementarity between homework and other home inputs, such as a quiet space to study, access to a computer and the internet, and parental support may explain why disadvantaged students spend less time doing homework and appear to benefit less from it (OECD, 2016, p. 214_[64]; OECD, 2020, p. 142_[15]). It has therefore been argued that increasing the time students spend learning at school relative to their out-of-school learning could reduce inequities.

Figure 3. Weekly hours spent learning in regular lessons and studying after school, 2015

Based on reports of 15-year-old students




Note: Time spent studying after school includes time spent on homework, additional instruction, private study etc. Data is based on reports of students attending public and private schools. The OECD average reflects membership of countries in the OECD at the time, excluding Colombia, Costa Rica, Latvia and Lithuania.

Source: OECD (2015_[65]), PISA 2015 Database, Tables II.6.32 and II.6.37, <https://www.oecd.org/pisa/data/2015database> (accessed 14 February 2021).

Many school-day extension reforms not only aim at lengthening regular instruction times. They usually also seek to enrich students’ time at school by expanding access to after-school activities, academic support and extracurricular activities. In some cases, these initiatives have been motivated by concerns over students’ unequal access to such activities. For example, PISA 2018 data suggests that systems vary significantly in the extent to which their staff can provide 15-year-old students with homework support and in some countries there are marked differences in access between advantaged and disadvantaged schools (see Figure 4). In Colombia, homework help is significantly more widespread among advantaged than disadvantaged schools, which can be a source of inequity. By contrast, the opposite is the case in Chile, which might indicate that provision of homework help is targeted at disadvantaged schools.

Figure 4. Homework help in disadvantaged and advantaged schools, 2018

Percentage of 15-year-old students in schools where principals reported that help is provided




Notes: Countries and economies are ranked in ascending order of the prevalence of homework help in disadvantaged schools; The bars for case study countries are marked in a different colour; Statistically significant values in advantaged schools are shown in darker tones; A socio-economically disadvantaged (advantaged) school is a school in the bottom (top) quarter of the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status (ESCS) in the relevant country/economy; Data covers public and private schools. The data was collected before Costa Rica joined the OECD, so the country is not included in the OECD average

Source: OECD (2018^[60]), PISA 2018 Database, Table V.B1.6.19, <https://www.oecd.org/pisa/data/2018database> (accessed 14 February 2021).

Figure 5 shows how widespread selected extracurricular activities were in the case study countries in 2018. Some systems place greater emphasis on creative and musical activities, such as school bands, choirs or orchestras while schools in other systems more frequently offer opportunities to work on school newspapers or engage in volunteering activities. On average across OECD countries, creative extracurricular activities were more frequently offered in advantaged than in disadvantaged schools (as was the case in Austria and Colombia), in urban than in rural schools (as was the case in Colombia and Uruguay), and in private than in public schools (as was the case in Austria and Colombia). By contrast, in Portugal, creative extracurricular activities were more widespread in public than in private schools. There has been no clear trend in the offer of extracurricular activities between 2009 and 2018 and all case study countries expanded some activities while reducing others (with the exception of Chile, which saw no significant decreases in any activity) (OECD, 2020, p. 146 f.^[15]).

Figure 5. Selected extracurricular activities offered to 15-year-old students at school, 2018

Percentage of students in schools whose principal reported that the school offers the following activities



Note: Countries ranked in ascending order of the percentage of students in schools offering a band, orchestra or choir. Data covers public and private schools. For Colombia, less than 75% of the population was covered. The data was collected before Costa Rica joined the OECD, so the country is not included in the OECD average.
Source: OECD (2018^[60]), PISA 2018 Database, Table V.B1.6.22, <https://www.oecd.org/pisa/data/2018database> (accessed 14 February 2021).

3.2. Austria

Summary

School governance in Austria is characterised by a complex distribution of responsibilities for administration and funding between the federal government and the provinces and municipalities, depending on the type of school and level of education. Schools have traditionally had limited responsibility for managing their resources, but have recently received greater autonomy in this respect. Schools also have considerable levels of pedagogical autonomy, while teachers are free to choose their methods to implement the national curricula.

Schools have traditionally operated in the mornings only ever since the country ended its provision of double-shift schooling, but following first school pilots of extended school days in the 1970s, “all-day schooling” was extended to the regular school system in 1993. Since 2008, successive governments have made the expansion of all-day schooling in primary and lower secondary education an important priority, to support families in meeting their needs for childcare and to improve quality and equity in school education.

The extended school day in Austria does not extend the number of hours of regular instruction in the curriculum, but provides other forms of contact time in the school day, opening up spaces for pedagogical innovation. Additional contact time consists of learning time and leisure time (including lunch), which can be integrated with instruction, or be offered separately in the afternoon, and be provided by different types of staff besides teachers, such as educators.

Within Austria’s complex distribution of responsibilities, the organisation of all-day schooling is the responsibility of the different school maintainers. Schools play an important role in the preparation, planning and implementation of extended school days. Participation of children in all-day school is voluntary, and a minimum number of students is required for an all-day school to be established. To support the expansion of all-day schooling in all school types, including those under the responsibility of provinces and municipalities, different financing mechanisms have been put in place, and, as a result, coverage and provision have expanded substantially.

National research has overall, supported the expansion of all-day schooling, but suggested to pay more attention to quality, which should include consideration of working conditions for all types of staff and their integration into the school day. Strengthening the monitoring of the implementation of all-day school models has also been an issue raised by researchers.

3.2.1. Context

Governance of the school system and recent reforms

Austria is a federal state based on the principle of local self-administration, divided into four administrative tiers: the federation (*Bund*), the provinces (*Länder*), the districts (*Bezirke*), and the municipalities (*Gemeinden*). The governance of school education in Austria has traditionally been characterised by a complex distribution of responsibilities between the different tiers of government (Nusche et al., 2016_[66]).

The Federal Ministry of Education, Science and Research (*Bundesministerium für Bildung, Wissenschaft und Forschung*, BMBWF) bears the executive authority for all aspects pertaining to school education, including compulsory, technical and vocational, and

higher-level secondary education. Federal laws provide the general regulatory and legislative framework for school education, and the ministry develops and proposes legislation on education standards, curricula and teaching, teachers' service, remuneration, training and retirement as well as private schools and general administration. The federal legislative framework is then complemented by legislation developed in the provinces for the schools they manage.

The responsibilities for the administration and financing of individual schools are distributed between levels of governance according to school type, namely federal and provincial schools (*Bundes- und Landesschulen*) (see Table 1). Federal schools comprise academic secondary schools and vocational schools and colleges (*allgemein bildende höhere Schulen und berufsbildende Schulen*). They are financed directly by the federal government. Provincial schools comprise general compulsory and vocational compulsory schools (*allgemeinbildende und berufsbildende Pflichtschulen*). General compulsory schools are financed by the provinces and municipalities, using funds which are, however, to a significant extent raised at the federal level and transferred to the provinces in line with the Fiscal Adjustment Act (*Finanzausgleichsgesetz*), the country's system for sharing revenues between tiers of governance. The provinces then provide the teaching staff.

Most tasks associated with the provision of school buildings, infrastructure and non-teaching staff, such as janitors, in provincial schools have in practice been devolved to the municipalities as school maintainers (*Schulerhalter*), although the provinces support municipalities in carrying out these duties. In the case of vocational compulsory schools, which are part of dual apprenticeship training schemes and co-financed by employers, the financing responsibility is shared equally between the federal and the provincial levels (Nusche et al., 2016^[66]).

Following the adoption of a school governance reform in 2017, which has come into effect gradually, the administration of the different school types has been the responsibility of federal-provincial authorities, the Boards of Education (*Bildungsdirektionen*). Since January 2019, these authorities have been responsible for the organisation and management of teachers at federal and provincial schools, the external school organisation, administrative staff and the school inspection.

Table 1. The administration of schools in Austria by school type and level of education

Level of administration	School type		ISCED level
Federal schools (<i>Bundesschulen</i>)	Academic secondary schools (<i>Allgemein bildende höhere Schule, AHS</i>)		ISCED 2-3
	Vocational schools and colleges (<i>Berufsbildende mittlere Schule, BMS, Berufsbildende höhere Schule, BHS</i>)		ISCED 3 / ISCED 5
Provincial schools (<i>Landesschulen</i>)	General compulsory schools (<i>Allgemeine Pflichtschule, APS</i>)	Primary schools (<i>Volksschule, VS</i>)	ISCED 1-2
		General secondary schools (<i>Mittelschule, MS</i>)	
		Special needs schools (<i>Allgemeine Sonderschule, ASO</i>)	
		Pre-vocational schools (<i>Polytechnische Schule, PTS</i>)	ISCED 3
	Vocational compulsory schools (<i>Berufsbildende Pflichtschule, BPS</i>)	Part-time vocational schools (<i>Berufsschule, BS</i>)	ISCED 3

Note: The International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED) provides a comprehensive framework for organising education programmes and qualifications. For further information, see: OECD (2018), *OECD Handbook for Internationally Comparative Education Statistics 2018: Concepts, Standards, Definitions and Classifications*, <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264304444-7-en>.

Source: Adapted from Federal Ministry of Education, Science and Research (BMBWF), <https://www.bmbwf.gv.at/Themen/schule/schulsystem/sa.html> (accessed 22 November 2020).

Schools in Austria have generally had a limited degree of autonomy for managing their resources. However, as part of the reform, schools have been given greater influence over the selection and development of their teaching staff. Federal schools, moreover, have a certain degree of budgetary autonomy as they can rent out school facilities to generate additional discretionary revenue (Nusche et al., 2016_[66]). The management of the school is the responsibility of the school principal (in schools with at least ten teachers). Teachers, parents, and students in the case of secondary schools, are involved in school decision making (e.g. school events, career counselling) through school boards (*Schulforum/Schulgemeinschaftsausschuss*). School boards also provide advice on issues related to teaching and learning (Eurydice, 2020_[67]).

While the Austrian federal constitution defines the general objectives of the education system and educational goals of specific school types, the federal School Organisation Act (*Schulorganisationsgesetz*, SchOG) regulates the educational mandate of schools based on subject curricula, broad educational objectives and goals for cross-curricular competencies. The curricula and cross-curricular competencies are developed by the federal education ministry with the involvement of experts (e.g. from universities and university colleges of teacher education). They provide the basis for teachers' autonomous teaching practice and orientation for children and parents as to the knowledge and skills that students should acquire (Eurydice, 2020_[67]; Nusche et al., 2016_[66]).

Since 2008, national education standards, which formulate attainment targets for specific subjects at the end of primary and lower secondary education, guide teaching, learning and assessment practices (Nusche et al., 2016_[66]). Based on these standards, the Federal Institute for Quality Assurance in the Austrian School System (*Institut des Bundes für Qualitätssicherung im österreichischen Schulwesen*, IQS) provides a diagnostic tool for teachers in primary and secondary education to evaluate and develop their teaching and the level of learning of their students (*Informelle Kompetenzmessung*, IKM) (IQS, 2020_[68]).

Schools and teachers in Austria have considerable levels of pedagogical autonomy, and particularly so in secondary education. Within the national framework curricula, schools can develop their own specific profile and set priorities by modifying the number of instruction hours for subjects, introduce additional compulsory or non-compulsory subjects and offer tutoring (*Förderunterricht*). In addition, teachers have full autonomy in choosing the methods they deem appropriate to implement the curricula and achieve set learning objectives. As part of the more recent governance reforms, the pedagogical autonomy of schools has been extended further to include the definition of class and group sizes and greater scope of the design of timetables (Box 1) (Nusche et al., 2016_[66]).

School development planning and self-evaluation have been compulsory since 2012, supported by the School Quality in General Education process (*Schulqualität Allgemeinbildung*, SQA). This initiative has strong links with the educational standards and seeks to foster more individualised and competence-oriented teaching and learning. School inspections are the responsibility of the federal government for all levels of education, although the framework for monitoring quality somewhat mirrors the existence of different school types. Teachers are evaluated primarily by their school leader through sporadic classroom visits and observations of teaching (Nusche et al., 2016_[66]).

Box 1. School autonomy for timetabling and the organisation of lessons in Austria

As part of a major school reform package adopted in 2017, steps were taken to further increase the pedagogical and organisational autonomy of schools (BMBWF, 2019^[69]; Nusche et al., 2016^[66]). A “school autonomy package” (*Schulautonomiepaket*) created new possibilities for schools to organise instruction in terms of timetabling and student grouping, with the overall objective of facilitating new pedagogical methods such as project-based learning.

Whereas schools had to organise instruction in lessons of 50 minutes each, schools have since been able to lengthen or shorten the duration of a particular lesson, while leaving the total instruction time for particular subjects set in the curriculum unchanged. For example, where the curriculum foresees three weekly lessons for the compulsory subject of German language of 50 minutes each, so a total of 150 minutes, this time can be split into anything from one to three units (Table 2). Another option lies in “blocking” time (*Stundenblockung*). For instance, the curriculum foresees two lessons of 50 minutes each for the compulsory subject of Geography and Economics, so a total of 100 minutes. This time can be split into a weekly lesson of 60 minutes, with the remaining 40 minutes accumulating and being used for an 80 minute lesson every second week (BMBWF, 2018^[70]).

Together with the school community, schools have also been given greater flexibility to organise their opening times (e.g. the start of the school day) and to set days without classes (*schulfreie Tage*), within certain limits. For federal schools, this is established in the Federal School Time Law (*Schulzeitgesetz*). For provincial schools, the general provisions are laid down in the same federal law, but the specifics are defined in implementing legislation of the individual provinces (BMBWF, 2019^[71]).

Table 2. Possibilities for schools to organise instruction schedules in Austria

Example 1: Number of weekly lessons in German language: 3 lessons of 50 minutes (total of 150 minutes)					
Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
Monday	30 minutes	Monday	80 minutes	Tuesday	150 minutes
Tuesday	50 minutes	Wednesday	70 minutes		
Thursday	60 minutes				
Total time	150 minutes		150 minutes		150 minutes

Example 2: Number of weekly lessons in Geography and Economics: 2 lessons of 50 minutes (total of 100 minutes) therefore, for 2 weeks, 4 lessons of 50 minutes (total of 200 minutes)			
Week A	Monday	60 minutes (1st unit)	Difference: 40 minutes
Week B	Monday	60 minutes (1st unit)	Difference: 40 minutes
	Thursday	Blocked time of 80 minutes (2nd unit)	
Total time		200 minutes	

Source: BMBWF (2018^[70]), "Informationen zum Schulrecht. Handbuch Erweiterung der Schulautonomie durch das Bildungsreformgesetz" [Information on school legislation. Handbook on the Extension of School Autonomy through the Education Reform Act], p. 26, <https://www.bmbwf.gv.at/dam/jcr:349f2d1c-695e-4637-9480-712ceb4c5d0d/autonomiehandbuch.pdf> (accessed 10 December 2020).

Structure and organisation of the school system

School education in Austria is characterised by early selective transitions, a large vocational sector, and a high degree of differentiation, particularly in upper secondary education (Nusche et al., 2016_[66]). The school system is organised in three stages: primary, lower secondary and upper secondary education.

Prior to entering the school system, children can attend early childhood education and care (which is the responsibility of the provinces). While attendance of kindergarten is optional and typically subject to a fee, half-day kindergarten has been compulsory from the age of 5 and provided free of charge since 2010 (Nusche et al., 2016_[66]). In the school year 2019/20, a total of 1 135 519 students were enrolled in Austrian schools. There were 4 999 public institutions providing school education (Statistik Austria, 2021_[72]).⁴

Compulsory school education lasts for 9 years, from age 6 to 15, and begins with enrolment in a 4-year primary school (*Volksschule*) (ISCED 1). Children who are considered “not ready” for primary education but have attained compulsory school age can attend a pre-school year (*Vorschulstufe*) for one to two years. In some schools, the pre-school year and primary education are integrated in the same classes. The completion of primary school (typically at age 10) is followed by four years of lower secondary education (ISCED 2). During this first transition, students enter either the lower level of academic secondary school (*Allgemein bildende höhere Schule – Unterstufe*, AHS-U) or general secondary school (*Mittelschule*, MS), previously known as new secondary school (*Neue Mittelschule*, NMS). While academic secondary school aims to prepare students for progression to higher education through an in-depth general curriculum, general secondary school offers a general curriculum and competence-based approach.

Upper secondary education (typical ages 14 to 18, ISCED 3) comprises a range of general and vocational programmes, and through this second transition, students enter one of the following schools:

- pre-vocational school (*Polytechnische Schule*, PTS), a one year programme designed to prepare students for part-time vocational schools or an occupation with completion of compulsory education
- the upper level of academic secondary school (*Allgemein bildende höhere Schule – Oberstufe*, AHS-O), i.e. the continuation of the lower academic secondary school (AHS-U), lasting four years
- part-time vocational school (*Berufsschule*, BS), providing part-time specialised education to complement students’ company-based apprenticeships for a period of up to four years
- secondary technical and vocational school (*Berufsbildende mittlere Schule*, BMS), providing one to four years of specialist vocational training in fields such as engineering, commerce, or the arts

⁴ The student enrolment numbers include general compulsory schools, part-time vocational schools, academic secondary schools and vocational schools and colleges (*Allgemeinbildende Pflichtschulen*, *Berufsschulen*, *Allgemeinbildende höhere Schulen*, *Berufsbildende mittlere Schulen*, *Berufsbildende höhere Schulen*). The number of public schools includes all school types, excluding federal sports academies and schools in health care (*Bundessportakademien*, *Schulen im Gesundheitswesen*). When these two school types are included, there are 5 207 public schools in Austria.

- colleges for higher vocational education (*Berufsbildene höhere Schule*, BHS), lasting five years and offering students a higher-level general and vocational education (Nusche et al., 2016_[66]).

To take account of increasing demands to participate in society and the labour market, a training obligation (*AusBildung bis 18*) was put into place from the school year 2017/18 to ensure that all young people under 18 undertake some form of education or training beyond compulsory schooling (Eurydice, 2020_[67]).

Students with special educational needs can receive integrated education in regular schools or attend a special needs school (*Allgemeine Sonderschule*, ASO). Special needs schools cover nine years, parallel to primary and lower secondary school, followed by an additional year of pre-vocational school. The creation of a more inclusive school system was one of the goals of a cross-sector National Action Plan 2012-2020. The country's private school sector is relatively small, and most private schools, which can charge tuition fees, are government-subsidised. There are about 600 private schools in Austria, attended by around 10% of all students (Eurydice, 2020_[67]; Nusche et al., 2016_[66]; Bruneforth et al., 2015_[73]).

Since 2018/19, schools can form a school cluster under joint management, which involves the Boards of Education, school leadership, the school maintainer (for provincial schools) and the school community in the decision making process and requires the development of a "cluster plan". School clusters group between two to eight schools of the same or different school types in close proximity, and seek to encourage the development of innovative pedagogies and the effective use of school resources. The school cluster management takes over the tasks of the previous school management and receives a cross-site leadership function (BMBWF, 2019_[69]; Eurydice, 2020_[67]).

3.2.2. All-day school: *Ganztagsschule*

Goals, design and implementation

Context and goals

In Austria, schools have traditionally operated in the mornings only ever since the country ended its provision of double-shift schooling (*geteilter Unterricht*) in the early 20th century, with half-day schools only sometimes providing support and care in the afternoon and typically charging a fee for this. In the wake of an increasing debate in society and education policy in the 1960s and the first school pilots of all-day schooling in the 1970s, all-day forms of school education increasingly found their way into the Austrian school system. Following changes to the Federal School Organisation Act (*Schulorganisationsgesetz*, SchOG) and related federal legislation (which together provide the regulatory framework for school education) in 1993, the possibility for all-day schooling (*Ganztätig geführte Schulen*, GTS) was extended to the regular school system (Scheipl et al., 2019_[74]; Bruneforth et al., 2015_[73]; Hörl et al., 2012_[75]).

The organisation of all-day school has since been open to all general compulsory (APS) – that is, primary schools, general secondary schools, pre-vocational schools, and special needs schools – and academic secondary schools at the lower level (AHS-U) under the responsibility of the respective school maintainers and with the involvement of the school community (i.e. teachers and parents). In the case of the lower secondary level at academic secondary schools (AHS-U), this is the federal authorities, which must inform parents before all-day schooling is organised.

In the case of general compulsory schools (APS), the maintainers are mostly municipalities or municipal associations, and for some special needs schools the province. In this case,

parents provide information about their needs when enrolling their children at school, and they have a legal right to all-day schooling if at least 15 students are registered, be it across classes, levels of education, schools, or school types. The organisation of all-day schooling requires the approval of the provincial government after consultation of the Board of Education. The decision should take into account the infrastructure requirements as well as the availability of other regional offers of after-school care, such as day care centres (*Horte*) (BMBWF, 2020_[76]).

Day care centres (*Horte*) represent another form of after-school care (*außerschulische Tagesbetreuung*), unrelated to schools. Such day care centres (which are under the responsibility of the provinces) provide an opportunity for children to play and do (independent) homework. However, there is no direct connection to school lessons (e.g. targeted individual study that is connected to the curriculum) unless there is close co-operation with a particular school. Supervision in the after-school care centres is usually carried out by qualified after-school educators (*Hortpädagoginnen*) who are trained through the 5-year educational institutions for kindergarten and after-school education (*Bildungsanstalt für Elementarpädagogik, BAfEP*) (Mitterer and Seisenbacher, 2020_[77]).

Due to the increased availability of all-day schooling, there has been some competition between after-school care in day care centres and activities offered in the form of all-day schools (Mitterer and Seisenbacher, 2020_[77]). In 2019/20, there were 951 day care centres, serving 51 665 children. Eight out of ten day care centres are open until at least 17:00, and the average day care centre is closed for 25 days a calendar year (Statistik Austria, 2021_[78]).

The expansion of all-day schooling has been a policy priority among successive governments since 2008 (Scheipl et al., 2019_[74]), putting in place different investment programmes to this end. This endeavour has also been supported by different social partners, such as the Federation of Austrian Industries (Hörl et al., 2012_[75]). Most recently, the needs-based expansion of all-day school was included in the government work programme for 2020-2024, besides other measures to support parents and provide additional learning time to children in school holidays (Bundeskanzleramt, 2020_[79]).

With an increasing number of single-parent families and parents working full-time, the demand for day care has been rising, including for early childhood education which has also traditionally been provided half-day only. Initiatives to expand all-day schooling have, moreover, been motivated by the aim to improve both quality and equity in the school system, with specific goals formulated in the related legislation for the different investment programmes (Table 3) (Bruneforth et al., 2015, pp. 62, 100_[73]; Nusche et al., 2016_[66]).

Table 3. Specific goals for the expansion of all-day schooling in Austria

Year and measure	Goals and objectives for the expansion of all-day schooling			
2017: Education Investment Act, BGBl. I No. 8/2017	1) to offer students high-quality care and to support them in their academic and social development	2) to promote equal opportunities for students in their educational opportunities	3) to provide a year-round demand-oriented offer for parents and thus contribute to a better work-life balance	
2011: Article 15a agreement, BGBl. I No. 115/2011	1) to create a demand-oriented provision for parents and thus contribute to a better work-life balance	2) to offer students high-quality care and to support them in their academic and social development	3) to promote equal opportunities for students in terms of educational trajectories	4) to improve the school infrastructure through federal support
and 2013: Article 15a agreement, BGBl. I No. 192/2013	5) to expand the offer of integrated childcare for children with special educational needs	6) to expand day care with particular quality criteria ¹	7) to create equal framework conditions for different models of day care	

Notes: The first goals and objectives formulated in an agreement between the federal government and the provinces to finance and implement all-day schooling in 2011 were complemented with additional objectives as part of a follow-up agreement in 2013. New goals were set in 2017 with the adoption of the Education Investment Act.

1. Quality criteria include promoting leisure through individual development support and the promotion of interests and talents; ensuring meaningful leisure through school cultural work, social learning, language and reading support; ensuring the spatial prerequisites for the implementation of school day care by creating areas for recreation, catering, sports and leisure, etc.

Source: Legislation regulating funding for the expansion of all-day schooling, available at <https://www.ris.bka.gv.at/eli/bgbl/I/2011/115>, <https://www.ris.bka.gv.at/eli/bgbl/I/2013/192> and <https://www.ris.bka.gv.at/eli/bgbl/I/2017/8> (accessed 2 February 2021).

Pedagogical design and staffing of activities

In Austria, the national curricula establish a number of weekly lessons for specific subjects in different levels of education and school types, although schools have different levels of autonomy to deviate from the set hours of instruction, to increase or reduce the number of lessons in individual subjects, to create optional subjects and extracurricular activities, and to offer tutoring. Table 4 provides an example for the case of primary school. Within these hours and the framework established by the curricula, as well as the general regulations on the organisation of school time (*Schulzeitgesetz*, BGBl. Nr. 77/1985),⁵ school leaders organise the school week and timetable (Eurydice, 2020_[67]; Bruneforth et al., 2015_[73]).

According to the school time regulations, for instance, lessons should be spread evenly over the school week in all schools, while the school day in federal schools should not exceed a maximum number of 8 lessons in Grades 5 to 8, and 10 lessons from Grade 9. Likewise, the school day should not begin before 8:00 in all schools, unless this is in the interest of students and agreed by the school community (e.g. due to travel times for students), and end no later than 18:00 (19:00 from Grade 9 onwards). According to the needs of parents and available spaces at school, the school leader can organise supervision for children at school before and after the regular school day through qualified staff.

⁵ In Austria, the organisation of school time (i.e. the school calendar, holidays, school days, lessons and breaks), is defined in federal legislation (*Schulzeitgesetz*, BGBl. Nr. 77/1985). The regulations apply directly to federal schools, including academic lower secondary schools (AHS-U). For provincial schools, the federal law provides basic principles to the provinces, while some regulations apply directly.

Table 4. Example for a subject timetable based on the national curriculum: weekly hours in primary school in Austria

	Number of weekly hours per grade	
	Grades 1 and 2	Grades 3 and 4
Compulsory subjects		
Religious education	2	2
Social studies and science	3	3
German/Reading/Writing	7	7
Mathematics	4	4
Music	1	1
Arts	1	1
Technical work/Textile work	1	2
Sports	3	2
Compulsory extra subjects		
Modern foreign language	x	2
Total hours per week	20-23	22-25
Remedial teaching	1	2-6
Optional exercises (extracurricular)	1	2-6

x: not applicable.

Notes: Weekly hours (*Wochenstunden*) refer to lessons of 50 minutes. Attendance of compulsory extra subjects is mandatory, but students' performance is not assessed. In addition to the schedule, there is also Road Safety Instruction (ten lessons per year) which must be taken into account in all four grades within the total number of weekly lessons available in individual subjects. Based on the curriculum, schools can make adjustments, increasing or reducing the number of weekly lessons in individual compulsory subjects (with the exception of religious education and to some extent modern foreign language). Remedial teaching in German and mathematics is offered where necessary to the extent of one period of instruction per week. In addition, students can voluntarily attend extracurricular activities, in the form of optional exercises (*unverbindliche Übung*).

Source: Eurydice (2020^[67]), Database of National Education Systems, https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/national-policies/eurydice/national-description_en (accessed 12 March 2021).

The extension of the school day through all-day schooling in Austria did not extend the number of weekly lessons or hours in specific subjects or areas set through the national curricula. Rather, the extended day provides other forms of contact time in addition to regular instruction, with the school day offering education and day care until at least 16:00, or until 18:00 if required.⁶ The extended school day should thus open up spaces for new pedagogical concepts and innovations. The additional contact time (*Betreuungszeit*) at all-day school is made up of: i) learning time (*Lernzeit*) and ii) leisure time (*Freizeit*) Figure 6. Leisure time, which includes lunch, should be dedicated to relaxation and individual development in creative, artistic, music or sports activities. Learning time, on the other hand, should serve to consolidate work done in-class and regular instruction and to provide individual support for students, but must not be used to cover new material. Learning time distinguishes between:


- subject-related learning time (*Gegenstandsbezogene Lernzeit, GLZ*) – typically three hours distributed across the week to support students in the different subjects
- individual learning time (*Individuelle Lernzeit, ILZ*) – typically four hours per week to do homework and deepen learning individually.

⁶ On Fridays, activities may be scheduled until 14:00 rather than 16:00, subject to the decision of the school community. Subject to the decision of the school maintainer, and in consultation with the principal, a second day in the week other than Friday may be scheduled until 14:00 only.

Schools are free to decide on the extent of time dedicated to learning and leisure, but they must offer some leisure and sufficient physical exercise. A specific contact time model (*Betreuungsteil plus*, previously *Tagesbetreuung Neu*) exists for the lower level of academic secondary schools (AHS-U) only. This model does not distinguish between subject-related and individual learning time, and is instead made up of seven hours of learning time across the week, plus two hours for musical/creative, sports or science/computer science activities, and leisure time. This is the most common model at academic secondary schools (BMBWF, 2020_[76]; BMBWF, 2018_[80]).

The additional contact time can either be integrated with instruction over the school day (*verschränkte/gebundene Form*), or be offered separately in the afternoon (*getrennte/offene Form*) (Figure 6). Whereas in the integrated form teaching, learning time and leisure time alternate throughout the day, the separate or split model offers two consecutive blocks, instruction in the morning and an extracurricular part in the afternoon, consisting mainly of leisure activities and homework classes.

Figure 6. Pedagogical components and use of time in all-day schooling in Austria



Notes: All-day schooling models offered in general compulsory schools (APS) and the lower level of academic secondary schools (AHS-U) under the responsibility of the school maintainers. At the lower level of the AHS, there is usually no distinction between subject-related and individual learning time, but learning time is managed together and provided by teachers. Other types of staff include educators for recreation and for learning support, for example. Breaks between lessons are usually 5-15 minutes, lunch is usually one hour long.

In integrated programmes, all students in a class must attend the full school day for the full week for organisational purposes. In separate afternoon care, groups can be made up of students of different classes and even schools, and participate only on specific days of the week. Schools may also offer both models, with some classes in integrated all-day schooling and some groups in separate afternoon care.

For the introduction of the integrated model, two thirds of parents and teachers have to be in favour of implementation. In the case of split all-day schooling, a group can be formed

with a minimum of 10 students registered for three days a week. In the case of integrated all-day schooling, the size of the group in all-day schooling is equivalent to the class size (BMBWF, 2020_[76]; BMBWF, 2018_[80]). According to ministry estimations, 90% of schools offered the separate model of afternoon care in 2017/18, and only about 5% the integrated form, with the remaining schools offering both models (Scheipl et al., 2019_[74]).

Since 2015 (in the case of general compulsory schools, APS) and 2016 (in the case of academic secondary schools, AHS-U), the curricula of the different school types define clear requirements for the organisation of learning and leisure time in the form of supervision plans (*Betreuungspläne*). Dedicated guidelines support schools in the implementation of all-day schooling. Overall, the additional elements of all-day schooling seek to promote: i) motivation and support for learning, ii) the development of creativity, iii) social learning (among students of different social groups, cultures and religions), and iv) the promotion of meaningful leisure activities (in particular exercise, retreat and relaxation) (BMBWF, 2018_[80]).

Different staff cover the additional activities in all-day schools (Table 5). Learning time is provided by regular teachers who are familiar with individual students. Educators for learning support (*Erzieherinnen und Erzieher für die Lernhilfe*) can work with students in the individual learning time part. The leisure time part can be provided by a range of staff, including educators for learning support (*Erzieherinnen und Erzieher für die Lernhilfe*) and educators for recreation (*Freizeitpädagoginnen und Freizeitpädagogen*). Specialised tertiary courses have been developed for these types of staff to ensure they are prepared for their role and bring the required competencies (e.g. to support children's personal development and social learning, manage conflicts, etc.) (BMBWF, 2020_[76]). The school maintainers, which bear the main responsibility for the organisation of the leisure time component of the extended school day, including the provision of lunch, are also responsible for the employment of the staff who cover the related activities (Mitterer and Seisenbacher, 2020_[77]).

Table 5. Types of staff providing additional contact time in all-day schooling in Austria

Type of activity	Type of staff
Subject-related learning time	Teachers
Individual learning time	Teachers (depending on contract)
	Educators (<i>Erzieherinnen und Erzieher</i>)
	Daycare educators (<i>Hortlerzieherinnen und erzieher</i>)
	Educators for learning support (<i>Erzieherinnen und Erzieher für die Lernhilfe</i>)
Leisure time, incl. lunch	Teachers (depending on contract)
	Educators (<i>Erzieherinnen und Erzieher</i>)
	Daycare educators (<i>Hortlerzieherinnen und erzieher</i>)
	Educators for recreation (<i>Freizeitpädagoginnen und Freizeitpädagogen</i>)
	Educators for learning support (<i>Erzieherinnen und Erzieher für die Lernhilfe</i>)
	Coaches for physical activities (<i>Bewegungsscoach</i>)
	Other staff qualified for employment in all-day schooling

Source: Adapted from Federal Ministry of Education, Science and Research (BMBWF), <https://www.bmbwf.gv.at/Themen/schule/schulsystem/gts/pers.html> (accessed 10 October 2020).

Implementation and targeting of reform

As discussed above, extended school days in Austria cover the different school types in primary and lower secondary education, and children from age 6 to 15. The organisation of all-day schooling is the responsibility of the school maintainers, that is the federal

authorities in the case of academic secondary schools (AHS-U), and typically the municipalities in the case of general compulsory schools (APS), although the latter require the approval of the province and consultation with the Board of Education.

Schools and their school leadership play an important role in the organisational and pedagogical preparation, planning and implementation of school day extensions. This typically involves assessing the demand together with the school maintainer and the school community, planning the number of groups, and deciding on the model of day care (integrated or separate). Participation of children in all-day school is voluntary, and a minimum number of students is required for an all-day school offer to be established. Parents indicate whether and when they require day care, and in which form. Together with the school maintainer, schools typically also need to assess the required staff, space and meals. The school leadership, sometimes together with the leadership for afternoon care, design the pedagogical offer of the additional contact time in terms of learning and leisure, and should work to ensure the collaboration between teachers and other pedagogical staff (BMBWF, 2020_[81]).

To support the expansion of all-day schooling also in general compulsory schools (APS), different financing mechanisms have been put in place, as described in the section on resource implications. As specified in these mechanisms, the federal government should set the right framework conditions (e.g. amendments to federal legislation, preparation and training of leisure educators), while the provinces should work with and oversee the efforts of the municipalities in their role as school maintainers to expand all-day schooling (e.g. assess plausibility of demand reports by municipalities). Moreover, the provinces should provide plans for expanding the offer as an instrument to steer the needs-based expansion of all-day schooling, and develop their all-day schooling offer together with the school maintainers according to quality criteria (e.g. related to quality assurance and the pedagogical concept) (BGBl. I Nr. 115/2011).

The criteria formulated in guidelines related to the financing mechanism in place at the time of writing (Education Investment Act) encompass a number of aspects, which need to be met following the receipt of funding. They include: i) adequate infrastructure; ii) adequate personnel; iii) social reductions of parental contributions; iv) consideration of pedagogical needs in enrolment in all-day school, in case not sufficient places are available; v) maintaining existing forms of after-school care outside of school; vi) demand-oriented opening times; vii) sustainable, efficient and effective investment; and viii) sustainability in financing (BMBWF, 2019_[82]).

The Education Investment Act also formulates a specific target for the coverage of all-day school: By 2033, 40% of children from age 6 to 15 should have access to all-day school, or 85% of general compulsory schools, although the objective is to reach these targets already by 2022. While funding through this mechanism is limited to all-day schools, enrolment in other after-school care facilities is included when measuring the achievement of the target, and the investment act specifies a number of quality criteria for this sector as well (e.g. use of qualified staff, opening times, group sizes) (BMBWF, 2019_[82]).

Looking at the development of all-day schooling since making this a policy priority shows that both the coverage and offer have expanded substantially. Between the school years 2007/08 and 2020/21, the number of schools with all-day schooling increased from 1 068 schools to 2 788 (both general compulsory and academic secondary schools). More than one in two schools thus offered an extended day in 2020/21, compared to about one in five schools in 2007/08 (Table 6). The expansion of all-day schooling increased its coverage from 10.7% to 26.2% of all students in the same period (Table 7) (data provided by Federal Ministry of Education, Science and Research).

Table 6. Number and share of schools with all-day schooling in Austria, 2007/08-2020/21

	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/12	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14
Number of schools with all-day schooling	1 068	1 156	1 248	1 370	1 455	1 666	1 874
Share of schools with all-day schooling (%)	21.0	22.9	24.7	26.8	28.7	33.2	37.8
	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
Number of schools with all-day schooling	2 020	2 135	2 224	2 295	2 386	2 642	2 788
Share of schools with all-day schooling (%)	40.9	43.3	45.1	46.6	48.7	53.9	56.8

Note: The number and share of schools with all-day schooling refers to academic secondary school (i.e. entire school locations, lower and upper secondary education) and general compulsory schools (APS). It includes public schools and private confessional schools (receiving subsidies from the federal government).

Source: Data provided by Federal Ministry of Education, Science and Research (BMBWF).

Table 7. Student enrolment in all-day schooling in Austria, 2007/08-2020/21

	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/12	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14
Number of students in all-day schooling	76 979	91 381	100 030	103 938	109 065	118 866	130 767
Share of students in all-day schooling (%)	10.7	12.7	14.1	15	15.9	17.5	19.4
	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
Number of students in all-day schooling	140 102	150 390	159 173	168 832	177 574	185 202	183 850
Share of students in all-day schooling (%)	20.8	22.2	23.1	24.4	25.5	26.5	26.2

Note: Enrolment data cover both general compulsory school (APS) and the lower level of academic secondary school (AHS-U) in public and private confessional schools (receiving subsidies from the federal government).

Source: Data provided by Federal Ministry of Education, Science and Research (BMBWF).

Breakdowns for different levels and types of education were only available for the school year 2017/18. These data show that the coverage rate for all-day provision was highest at the primary level, with 25% of students in this form of provision, compared to 18% at the lower secondary level (MS and AHS-U). The extent of all-day provision differs significantly across provinces. Vienna had the highest coverage rate (37% for all school types), Tyrol the lowest (11% for all school types) (Mayrhofer et al., 2019^[83]). There are also significant differences between urban and rural, more sparsely populated municipalities. Looking at the coverage rate for primary schools, only 18% of children attended an extended day in municipalities with less than 20 000 inhabitants, compared to more than 26% in municipalities with more than 20 000 inhabitants. In Vienna, 44% of primary school children already attended an extended day in 2017/18 (Mitterer and Seisenbacher, 2020^[77]).

Increasing equity has been a stated objective of longer school days in Austria. In terms of the socio-economic background of students attending all-day school, the picture has however been mixed. While all-day primary schools appear to be socially mixed with regards to parents' educational background, this does not hold true when looking at families' socio-economic status, with children from socio-economically more advantaged families being more likely to be enrolled in all-day school (very low socio-economic status: 37%, very high socio-economic status: 49%). The share of children with an immigrant background in all-day school at primary level is higher than among native students, which is however explained by attendance patterns in rural areas. In urban areas, native children are more likely to attend all-day school than their peers with a migrant background (Mayrhofer et al., 2019^[83]; Mitterer and Seisenbacher, 2020^[77]).

Resource implications and financing

While the administration of different school types has been simplified with recent governance reforms, the distribution of responsibilities for school resourcing in Austria remains complex (Nusche et al., 2016_[66]). Since 2019, human resources in federal and provincial schools are administered in joint federal-provincial Boards of Education, but budgets and staff are still either the responsibility of the federal government or the provinces, depending on the school type (Eurydice, 2020_[67]).

Efforts to expand all-day schooling require capital investments in infrastructure and a long-term increase in current spending. According to the general distribution of responsibilities, funding for these purposes has been shared between the federal government, the provinces and municipalities (Nusche et al., 2016_[66]; Bruneforth et al., 2015, pp. 62, 66_[73]).

In both general compulsory schools (APS) and academic secondary schools (AHS-U), parents also contribute with fees charged by schools and school maintainers to cover: i) afternoon care (*Betreuungsbeitrag*) and ii) meals (*Verpflegungsbeitrag*). School maintainers decide about the amount of the parental fees and any reductions based on social needs. In academic secondary schools (AHS-U), the monthly parental fee is EUR 88, an amount which is reduced for attendance of only a specific number of days. For general compulsory schools (APS), the amount of the contribution is based in many cases on the parental fee required by federal schools, and reductions based on social needs are common. The individual regulations, however, differ depending on the type of school and province (BMBWF, 2020_[76]).

Financing of all-day schooling at academic secondary schools

The federal government directly finances the federal schools. The federal government thus bears the total costs of the expansion of all-day schooling in academic secondary schools (AHS). The allocation of teaching costs is based on a funding formula which includes the number of students and class size as well as earmarked value units, including for all-day schooling. The federal government is also responsible for financing other staff working in and with federal schools, such as staff required for an extended school day.

When it comes to infrastructure investments and maintenance, long-term school development programmes (*Schulentwicklungsprogramm*, SCHEP) support the modernisation of the infrastructure of federal schools to provide students and teachers with adequate classrooms and workplaces, typically over periods of 5 to 10 years, and based on principles of results orientation, transparency and efficiency. The investments are transferred to the owners of school buildings, mostly the Federal Real Estate Company (*Bundesimmobilien-gesellschaft*) and municipalities, via increased rental payments. The spending allocated through the programme is based on planning with medium- and long-term prognoses for infrastructure needs developed with bottom-up input (BMBWF, 2020_[84]; OECD, 2018_[85]; Nusche et al., 2016_[66]).

Building on previous initiatives, the latest programme (SCHEP 2020) provides EUR 2.4 billion for the period 2020-2030 to upgrade the federal school infrastructure in line with new pedagogical requirements, ecological considerations and spatial-demographic developments. A total of about 270 investment projects is envisaged. The development of the infrastructure for teaching and learning in all-day schools (e.g. for meaningful leisure and self-study outside of regular lessons) constitutes an important pillar of this investment programme, besides other priorities, such as digital infrastructure (BMBWF, 2020_[86]).

Financing of all-day schooling at general compulsory schools

In the case of general compulsory schools, teaching staff is financed by the provinces, however using funds largely raised at the federal level and transferred through the Fiscal Adjustment Act (*Finanzausgleichsgesetz*), the country's system for sharing revenues between tiers of governance, based on a formula related to the number of students. Additional funding can be provided to provide teaching staff for specific priorities, such as support for second language learners, but also all-day school (OECD, 2017^[87]; Nusche et al., 2016^[66]).

Central regulations specify the obligation for provinces and municipalities to provide support staff to schools, but this is regulated by the provinces through implementing legislation. For all-day schooling, the employment of staff for the leisure component of the longer day (e.g. educators for recreation and educators for learning support) is thus the responsibility of the municipalities as school maintainer (OECD, 2019^[88]; Nusche et al., 2016^[66]). The school maintainers are also responsible for the construction and maintenance of general compulsory schools, in consultation with the provinces and the Boards of Education, and thus also for the adjustment of the infrastructure of general compulsory schools to provide an extended school day. The provincial governments have regional programmes to support municipalities in this task (Nusche et al., 2016, p. 125^[66]).

To support the expansion of all-day schooling, the federal government covers the payroll of additional teachers required at general compulsory schools and a part of the cost for school maintainers to adapt the school infrastructure and to employ support staff through specific financing mechanisms described in the following sections. Through these different forms of financing, the federal government has made available a total of more than EUR 1 billion for the expansion of all-day schooling, the development of the leisure component of the extended day and the necessary spatial adaptations (Scheipl et al., 2019, p. 242^[74]).

Art. 15a agreements

To finance and support the implementation of federal policy priorities, such as all-day schooling, at the level of the provinces, the federal government can negotiate specific agreements with the provinces (based on Article 15a of the Federal Constitution, referred to as *Vereinbarungen gemäß Artikel 15a B-VG*). In 2011 and 2013, such agreements were negotiated for the expansion of all-day schooling in public general compulsory schools (APS) (BGBl. I Nr. 115/2011 and BGBl. I Nr. 192/2013). The agreements established specific goals for the expansion of all-day schooling (Table 3), and established basic principles for the organisation of all-day schooling (e.g. earliest closing time of all-day care at 16:00). It also laid out responsibilities and measures for the federal government and the provinces to guarantee the expansion of all-day schooling.

Between the school years 2011/12 and 2014/15, the federal government committed itself to providing a total of EUR 200.15 million, distributed across the provinces, to ensure the leisure time component of the longer school day. The provinces were responsible for allocating the resources they received from the federal government to the school maintainers through separate agreements. They were also responsible for reporting on the use of resources, the employment of staff and the organisation of provision (model of all-day schooling, number of groups and participating students) per individual school and for controlling the use of resources by municipalities. The agreement equally envisaged an evaluation after three years by the federal government.

The largest share of funding was earmarked for staff, with a limit of EUR 8 000 per group and per year in all-day provision. A certain share of resources, however, could be spent on

infrastructure investments as well (EUR 32.4 million in 2011 and EUR 11.85 million in 2012), with a limit of a one-time payment of EUR 50 000 per group in all-day provision. Infrastructure investments were to prioritise the creation of new all-day school places and to be spent mainly on: i) the creation or adaptation of dining facilities and kitchens; ii) the creation or adaptation of group rooms for adequate care; iii) the creation or adaptation of playgrounds and similar outdoor facilities; iv) the purchase of equipment for the above-mentioned adaptations; and v) the acquisition of movable fixed assets (e.g. dishes, cutlery, games).

This initial agreement was amended and supplemented in 2013 through a new agreement (BGBl. I Nr. 192/2013), extending funding until the school year 2018/19. This new agreement also covered publicly-recognised private schools and complemented the initial set of goals with further objectives in terms of care for students with special needs, quality criteria for the extended day, and different models of day care (Table 3). The new agreement provided an additional amount of EUR 78.53 million for the year 2014 (with EUR 37.60 million already provided through the previous agreement, this amounted to a total of EUR 116.10 million), and a total of EUR 375.40 million for the years 2015/16 to 2018/19.

As in the previous agreement, a certain share of resources was earmarked for staff, with the use of the remaining resources being at the discretion of the provinces. In deciding about the use of resources for infrastructure investments, provinces were to take demographic developments into account, and the maximum amount of investment was increased to EUR 55 000 per group. The amount per group in all-day provision to be spent on staff was extended from EUR 8 000 to EUR 9 000 per group and per year. Resources that were not used by the provinces could be carried over until the end of the agreement period. The agreement also foresaw an intermediate evaluation in 2016 and a final evaluation in 2019.

However, provinces did not request all the earmarked funds, moving more slowly towards all-day schooling than hoped for by the federal education ministry (Nusche et al., 2016_[66]). When it became clear that resources could not be used up, especially since infrastructure investments required longer-term planning, and with growing resource constraints in the federal ministry, this second agreement was amended in 2014 (BGBl. I Nr. 84/2014), maintaining the same levels of earmarked funding, but moving parts of funding originally allocated for 2014 to the years 2017 and 2018. In total, the federal government provided about EUR 654.10 million between 2011 and 2018 for the expansion of all-day schooling (RH, 2018, p. 103ff_[89]).⁷

An evaluation of the Federal Court of Audit (*Rechnungshof*) identified a number of problems regarding the Art. 15a agreements (RH, 2018, p. 127_[89]). As the evaluation found, the agreements had further increased the number of transfer flows between the federal and the provincial governments in the field of education; the transfers had resulted in additional administrative costs for the provinces to distribute and monitor the use of funds, in particular to private providers; and the agreements had not addressed the issue of care during the school holidays.

According to the auditors, it had remained unclear how municipalities whose role as school maintainers had grown in importance in the wake of the expansion of all-day schooling, would ensure the continued operation of day care provision. Funding through the

⁷ Unless otherwise noted, monetary values refer to current values and values as reported in original sources. Amounts in US Dollars were derived applying Purchasing Power Parities (PPPs) available from OECD.Stat (<https://stats.oecd.org>) and the World Bank DataBank (<https://databank.worldbank.org>).

agreements was limited in time and separate from the regular financial equalisation mechanism.

Education Investment Act

In 2017, the federal government created a new source of financing for all-day schooling with the adoption of the Education Investment Act (*Bildungsinvestitionsgesetz*) (BGBl. I Nr. 8/2017). The stipulated aim of this additional funding was to further expand the range of available all-day schooling, including integrated models and out-of-school care during school holidays, with specific targets for coverage. Initially, a further EUR 750 million were to be provided between the school years 2017/18 and 2024/25 to cover infrastructure investments and spending on staff in both federal and provincial schools.

Following first changes to the timeframe in 2018, which extended the funding period until 2032/33, the Education Investment Act was substantially revised in 2019 (*Bildungsinvestitionsgesetz Neu*) (BGBl. I Nr. 87/2019) (BMBWF, 2019_[82]). The changes sought to ensure the continued financing for the existing offer as well as investments into the needs-based expansion of all-day schooling, while pursuing similar goals as those established in the previous agreements concerning educational quality and equity and support to parents (Table 3). In 2022, the new general Fiscal Adjustment Act (*Finanzausgleichsgesetz*) is envisaged to provide a sustainable solution to the financing of all-day schooling.

For general compulsory schools (APS), the new investment act provides a total of EUR 428 million between 2019/20 and 2032/33 for the creation of new places in all-day schooling. The resources are distributed from the federal level to the provinces, which in turn fund the school maintainers of both public and publicly-recognised private schools. The new mechanism finances current expenditure of the leisure part of the extended day (EUR 9 000 per group per year) and in out-of-school care during the school holidays (EUR 6 000 per group per year). Other out-of-school care institutions cannot be funded with resources from the Education Investment Act. For infrastructure investments in all-day schooling, provinces can provide a one-time payment of EUR 55 000 to the school maintainers. Provinces that have not reached their target for the expansion of all-day schooling must allocate 75% of resources provided through the investment act for this purpose. The remaining 25% can be used to finance the existing offer of all-day schooling.

The new investment act also provides the legislative framework for the provinces to use up to 80% of the earmarked funds which have not been used under the Art. 15a agreements for existing all-day schools until 2022. To fund a larger number of places, the provinces or municipalities have to provide a co-financing rate of 30%. A small share of the unused funds (up to 5%) can also be used to finance support staff, such as psychologists and social workers (up to 50% of the payroll costs) (BMBWF, 2019_[82]).

Some lessons learned

The OECD's School Resources Review study of Austria (Nusche et al., 2016_[66]) identified a number of strengths and challenges in the implementation of all-day schooling. One issue was identified with the pedagogical model. Although all-day schools are increasingly available in Austria, only a small fraction offered an integrated form of all-day schooling, which promises greater benefits for children from less advantaged socio-economic backgrounds. To allow for the introduction of a fully integrated all-day programme, two-thirds of parents and of teachers have to vote in favour of its implementation. As a consequence, while demand for all-day school is rising, most of it is implemented as optional afternoon care without an integrated curriculum, and a focus on day care. Another

issue that the review team encountered in schools offering all-day schooling was a lack of reflection on how to engage parents in all-day provision. There was some concern in schools that parental engagement decreased when their children attended all-day programmes, probably based on the assumption that all educational needs of their children would now be taken care of at school (Nusche et al., 2016, pp. 132, 138_[66]).

In terms of resources and financing, the Review suggested that the infrastructure challenge for making all-day school a success, particularly in urban areas, had not been sufficiently acknowledged. The space requirements to keep children at school for longer periods, including cooking facilities and play areas were in need of development in line with the expansion of this type of school education. All-day schooling also implies that teachers may be more present at school and need workplaces, equipment and facilities to prepare teaching, collaborate and use their out-of-class time effectively (Nusche et al., 2016, p. 144_[66]). Lastly, there seemed to be a risk for inequities between municipalities, which play an important role managing the leisure time component of all-day schooling (Nusche et al., 2016, p. 100_[66]).

The extended school day has also been subject to analysis in Austria's national education monitoring reports (Scheipl et al., 2019_[74]; Hörl et al., 2012_[75]). Most recently, Scheipl et al. (2019_[74]) reviewed the pedagogical design and enabling conditions for quality all-day schooling, and made some recommendations for its further development. Similar to previous studies, the authors highlighted a lack of national research on the implementation and effects of all-day schooling, in particular concerning quantitative empirical evidence on the effectiveness of the extended day in relation to the goals (e.g. improvement of educational opportunities for disadvantaged children). Also given the significant investments involved, they recommended creating and funding an independent research group and dedicated research projects.

Existing evidence suggests that the quality of all-day schooling and how it can be improved through staffing, organisation, pedagogy and resourcing, should receive greater attention. Given differences between primary and lower secondary education (e.g. in the time dedicated to learning and leisure), the authors suggested exploring school-type specific models of extended school days. Increasing collaboration between teachers and other types of staff should be a further priority (e.g. through dedicated time for preparation and co-ordination, common professional development).

A separate issue concerns the extent of parental contributions, including for school meals, and the barrier they may represent for disadvantaged children to attend an extended day (e.g. from single-parent households). Lastly, the authors recommended collecting more data on all-day schooling (Scheipl et al., 2019_[74]). Monitoring some aspects of all-day schooling has apparently been a challenge. For example, the intensity of participation in afternoon care provision is unclear. Since children can participate on a select number of days only, participation can vary from one to five days in a week (Mayrhofer et al., 2019_[83]).

In an earlier monitoring report, Hörl et al. (2012_[75]) made some further suggestions. For instance, concerning the adjustment of school facilities, the authors suggested developing participatory approaches to architectural planning. The greater involvement of members of the educational community in these processes would ensure the new infrastructure meets the pedagogical and organisational needs of students and staff (e.g. for learning, play and relaxation). The expansion of school social work and engagement with other partners was deemed another important area. Overall, the authors supported the expansion of all-day schooling, but suggested to pay more attention to quality, including to the working conditions for all types of staff and their integration into the school day.

3.3. Chile

Summary

Schools in Chile have operated in a fairly decentralised environment since the country's market-oriented reforms of the 1980s. While the education ministry is responsible for co-ordinating and regulating all aspects of school education, including the national curriculum, the operation of publicly funded schools is the responsibility of public and private school providers (which play an important role in the country's school system). Schools are then responsible for the implementation of their educational project and for any other responsibilities delegated by their school provider. Since 2015, a process of recentralisation has been underway for public schools with the creation of Local Education Services which have been taking over responsibilities from municipalities.

Extended school days were introduced in Chile in all levels of school education as part of an overall policy agenda to improve quality and equity in the 1990s. The expectation was to bring about important social and pedagogical benefits, such as more time for teachers and students to meet new curriculum requirements, additional support and a safe environment for students. The “full-day school” reform was a comprehensive intervention that covered the curriculum, the organisation of time, groupings, physical spaces and teaching.

With full-day school, the school system started moving away from traditional double-shift schooling. While shortening the school year, the full school day increased the length of the school day as well as total learning time. The additional time is dedicated to regular instruction in the curricular subjects as well as other learning and extracurricular activities that schools can define at their discretion. While these activities should foster students' broader development, schools have in practice often used this time to reinforce traditional subject areas.

The implementation of the full school day has been the responsibility of schools and school providers, subject to the fulfilment of specific prerequisites. There is no obligation for schools to offer a full day, but a large share of schools do so. To support implementation, the government has provided funding, both for an increase in current spending and ad-hoc capital investments, as well as technical advice and support.

Evaluations of full-day schooling suggested that the reform positively impacted school infrastructure and equipment, support for students through school meals, and time for joint work among teachers. At the same time, the organisation of schools has been difficult to change and the impact on learning has been limited, although in successful schools teachers have perceived the full school day as an opportunity for improving working conditions and professional learning. More recent reforms on teachers' professional development may also strengthen the conditions for teaching and learning in full-day school, although the effects of this remain to be seen.

3.3.1. Context

Governance of the school system and recent reforms

Since the market-oriented reforms of the 1980s, schools in Chile have operated in a fairly decentralised environment. The Constitution and the General Education Law adopted in 2009 (*Ley General de Educación*, Law 20.370) provide the regulatory framework for

education. The General Education Law defines the goals of school education, regulates the rights and duties of the members of the education community, establishes minimum requirements for the completion of each of the education levels and institutes a process for the recognition of education providers.

The Ministry of Education (*Ministerio de Educación*, MINEDUC) is responsible for coordinating and regulating all aspects regarding education, designing policies, developing programmes, defining quality standards (including the curriculum), and recognising schools. Through its regional and provincial bodies – the Education Regional Secretariats (*Secretarías Regionales Ministeriales*, SEREMI) and the Education Provincial Departments (*Departamentos Provinciales de Educación*, DEPROV) – the ministry oversees the implementation of education policy across the country and provides direct technical and pedagogical support to schools.

Within the education ministry, a dedicated unit, the Centre for Pedagogical Training, Experimentation and Research (*Centro de Perfeccionamiento, Experimentación e Investigaciones Pedagógicas*, CPEIP) is responsible for promoting the professional development of Chilean teachers and school leaders. Three further central bodies, established through the General Education Law in 2009, provide advice for policy and evaluate the delivery of education: the National Education Council (*Consejo Nacional de Educación*), the Agency for Quality Education (*Agencia de Calidad de la Educación*) and the Education Superintendence (*Superintendencia de Educación*).

Within this central framework, the operation of schools that receive public funding is the responsibility of public and publicly funded private school providers (*sostenedores*). There are also independent private providers that do not receive public funds, but these operate with considerably more autonomy even if they have to comply with a number of central regulations to be officially recognised (e.g. follow the national curriculum, educational project, adequate staffing). Public schools have been administered by municipalities or municipally controlled non-profit corporations with delegated authority (Santiago et al., 2017^[90]). Since 2015, the public school system has been undergoing a process of recentralisation with the creation of 70 Local Education Services and a national Directorate of Public Education (*Sistema Nacional de Educación Pública*) (Law 21.040). These services have been gradually taking over the responsibility for the operation of public schools. By June 2021, eleven Local Education Services had been created, serving 184 000 students (MINEDUC, n.d.^[91]). In the publicly funded private sector, schools are managed individually or as a group of schools by a non-profit organisation.

All school providers are responsible for meeting and maintaining the requirements for the official recognition of their schools, for organising and managing the staff, infrastructure, equipment and teaching materials of their schools, and for accounting for the academic performance and use of public resources of their institutions. As specified in the General Education Law, school providers have the right to establish and implement an educational project (*Proyecto Educativo Institucional*, PEI) and to establish plans and programmes for their schools with the involvement of the school community.

Individual schools are responsible for the implementation of their educational project to offer an education that complies with the overall normative framework. Schools are therefore typically responsible for decisions directly related to the implementation of the school project, such as class size (within the regulated minimum and maximum size), student grouping, support for students with learning difficulties, school leadership, and the use of school facilities. In addition, school providers may delegate further tasks and responsibilities to schools, while retaining the final overall responsibility for the operation of their schools. For example, schools may make suggestions for staffing decisions, but the school provider will take the final decision. The precise distribution of tasks and


responsibilities between school providers and schools, and therefore the degree of school autonomy for the use and management of resources, will always depend on individual school providers and their schools (Santiago et al., 2017, pp. 48ff, 162ff_[90]).

School providers and schools define their own school leadership structures. The school principal is generally in charge of the management of the school, and can be supported by a leadership team which can include other leadership roles, such as deputy principal, heads of the technical-pedagogical unit in charge of the curriculum, and general inspectors in charge of organisation issues. Publicly funded schools must organise a teachers' council (*consejo de profesores*), which provides advice on pedagogical issues, and a students' council, parents' council and school council to facilitate the participation of the school community (e.g. in the definition of the educational project) (Santiago et al., 2017, pp. 164ff, 175ff_[90]).

Chile has a single national curriculum defined by the Ministry of Education and approved by the National Education Council. The General Education Law defines General Objectives (*Objetivos Generales*) for each of the levels education, which are the general guidelines that guide the curricular instruments of the entire school system (Figure 7). Based on these General Objectives, the education ministry defines Curricular Bases (*Bases Curriculares*) specific to each education level and subject area. Schools and their providers need to respect the minimum requirements set out in the curricular bases, but can make additions thereby developing their own plans and programmes of study (Santiago et al., 2017, p. 54f_[90]).

The curricular bases are the reference for more detailed curriculum instruments for each learning field and subject: plans of study, which define the curricular areas to be covered and associated weekly time for each school level and year; programmes of study, which define the didactical organisation for each school year and provide examples for learning activities and methods; and textbooks, for teachers to deliver the curriculum. Based on the national curriculum, learning standards describe students' expected learning at key stages, and constitute the reference for student assessments (Santiago et al., 2017_[90]).

Figure 7. General objectives and curricular instruments in Chile



Source: Adapted from Centro de Estudios MINEDUC (2016_[92]), "Reporte Nacional de Chile: Revisión OCDE para mejorar la efectividad del uso de recursos en las escuelas" [Chile National Report: OECD Review to improve the Effectiveness of Resource Use in Schools] p. 51, <https://bibliotecadigital.mineduc.cl/handle/20.500.12365/4467> (accessed 2 February 2021).

A full-cohort national standardised assessment of student performance (*Sistema de Medición de Calidad de la Educación*, SIMCE), administered by the Agency for Quality Education, measures the achievement of fundamental curricular objectives and minimum compulsory contents. The assessment is used for diagnostic and improvement purposes, but results are made public and have “high stakes” for schools. Schools are also evaluated externally by the Agency for Quality Education, focusing on the quality of education, and the Education Superintendence, focusing on the use of resources and compliance with legislation (Santiago et al., 2017, p. 65f_[90]).

Structure and organisation of the school system

The school system in Chile is organised in three sequential levels:

- pre-primary education (*educación parvularia* or *preescolar*, ISCED 0, children up to age 6)
- basic education (*educación básica*, ISCED 1 and 2, typical ages 6 to 13)
- and upper secondary education (*educación media*, ISCED 3, typical ages 14 to 17).

Basic education is organised in two stages: primary education (ISCED 1, Grades 1 to 6) and lower secondary education (ISCED 2, Grades 7 to 8). Since 2003, basic and upper secondary education have been mandatory up to age 18 (i.e. twelve years of compulsory schooling). Beginning in 2027, the structure of the school system will be adjusted to provide six years in each primary and secondary education.

Upper secondary education (Grades 9 to 12) is organised in two stages, the second of which offers two differentiated strands. The first stage (Grades 9 and 10) offers general subjects and a common set of courses for all students. The second stage (Grades 11 and 12) involves the choice between scientific-humanistic studies and technical-professional/artistic studies. Two other education modalities offered are: special education, available in pre-primary and basic education; and adult education for the completion of both basic and upper secondary education (Santiago et al., 2017, pp. 55-57_[90]).

In 2020, Chile’s schools – which can offer one or several levels of education – enrolled slightly more than 2.9 million students at basic and upper secondary level. There were 8 777 schools offering basic education and 3 680 schools offering upper secondary education (not including adult education) (Centro de Estudios MINEDUC, 2021_[93]).

The attendance of public schools has steadily decreased relative to that of government-dependent private schools. While the proportion of students enrolled in municipal schools was about 50% in 2004, it stood at about 36% in 2015. Enrolment in private-subsidised schools is dominant at all levels (except for technical-professional studies in upper secondary education), even if a significant proportion of students attend municipal schools (Santiago et al., 2017_[90]). In 2020, slightly more than 1 million students, or 37% of students in compulsory education (excluding special needs and adult education) attended a public school (Centro de Estudios MINEDUC, 2021_[93]). Attendance of different school types has greatly depended on family income levels. Students from the most disadvantaged families attend public schools in the largest numbers even if they are increasingly attending subsidised private schools (Santiago et al., 2017_[90]).

Students with special education needs (with disabilities and gifted students) attend mainstream schools which implement a School Integration Programme (*Programa de Integración Escolar*, PIE), or receive their education from special needs schools (*escuelas especiales*). The School Integration Programme provides funding to mainstream schools with special needs, to be invested in dedicated staff, professional development or

educational materials (Santiago et al., 2017, p. 132_[90]). In 2020, about 180 000 students were enrolled in a special needs school, while about 2 100 students receives support through the School Integration Programme (Centro de Estudios MINEDUC, 2021_[93]).

A Programme for Intercultural Bilingual Education (*Programa de Educación Intercultural Bilingüe*, PEIB) seeks to develop and maintain indigenous languages and culture for all students, regardless of their ethnic background. The programme, created in 1996, entails different components related to curriculum adjustments, staffing and staff development, and funding (Santiago et al., 2017, p. 128_[90]).

3.3.2. Full-day school: *Jornada Escolar Completa (JEC)*

Goals, design and implementation of reform

Context and goals

During Chile's transition to democracy in the 1990s, the country embarked on a journey of education reform across successive governments to improve both the quality and equity of education. Educational change was put high on the political agenda and governments invested in building confidence and consensus around reforms and in improving labour relations and professional conditions for teachers. A continuous reform process entailed a number of elements, notably:

- a set of both targeted and universal school support programmes providing resources, materials and training to schools to improve conditions for teaching and learning (e.g. *Programa de las 900 Escuelas*, P-900; *Programas de mejoramiento de la calidad y la equidad de la educación*, MECE Básica, MECE Media and MECE Rural; *Enlaces*)
- structural changes to the school system through curricular reform beginning in 1996 and the extension of the school day starting from 1997 (described in the following)
- and steps to strengthen the teaching profession (e.g. through changes to initial teacher education, awards for teaching excellence, and study abroad programmes) (OECD, 2004_[94]).

As summarised by Bellei (2005_[95]), the educational reforms sought to create a school system that would combine a strong, but reformulated role for the state, market instruments adapted to the special characteristics of the educational services involved, and a decentralised organisational and administrative structure. For schools, the changes were gradual and individual initiatives were connected.

Within this context and the overall policy agenda to improve quality and equity, full-day schooling (*Jornada Escolar Completa*, JEC) was introduced for all levels of school education from Grade 3 until the end of secondary education, with the exception of special needs and adult education. The initial legislative framework was set with Law 19.352 in 1997, subsequently modified with Law 19.979 in 2004. Full-day schooling hoped to bring important social and pedagogical benefits, namely to:

- provide more time for teaching activities
- provide time to respond to the requirements linked to the new curriculum standards
- provide time to alternate between intensive work in classrooms and periods for breaks and complementary activities to support student concentration according to their age

- provide regular support to students, for example in the form of supported study, homework and exercises, workshops and labs
- provide the necessary infrastructure for different activities (e.g. tutoring, workshops and leisure)
- support the identification of students and their families with schools
- increase the time students in difficult environments spend at school, reducing their exposure to risky situations, and supporting working mothers
- provide the best conditions for quality work of teachers through work at school in the form of classroom teaching and other activities, such as collaboration (BCN, n.d.^[96]).

The introduction of a full school day was then based on the rationale that: i) changes to the curriculum and pedagogy would require more time for teachers and students (e.g. for project-based learning, new forms of assessment, etc.); and ii) that vulnerable students require more time for learning (OECD, 2004^[94]). The extension of the school day assumed that the additional time students spent in school would expose them to new and better educational strategies and enable them to participate in extracurricular activities, such as sports and arts, providing a more holistic learning experience and, as a result, better learning outcomes. With the increase in time that students remain in school, the physical space and school infrastructure were also restructured (Centro de Estudios MINEDUC, 2016^[92]).

Moreover, the full-day schooling initiative included a requirement for schools to provide sufficient time for teachers to engage in technical-pedagogical work with colleagues (UNESCO-IIEP and SEP, 2010^[97]; Ministerio de Educación, 2004^[98]). The extension of the school day was thus a comprehensive intervention that covered the curriculum, the organisation of time, groupings and spaces, and teaching (Elías, Walder and Portillo, 2016^[99]).

More recently, the National Service for Women and Gender Equity introduced a separate programme (*Programa 4 a 7*) to provide educational and recreational support after the end of the school day for students and thereby further support women in their labour market participation. A different programme, Open Schools (*Programa Escuelas Abiertas*), has been providing activities for students throughout the school holidays since 2006 (Box 2) (Centro de Estudios MINEDUC, 2016^[92]).

In addition, schools may provide further activities before and/or after classes, such as leisure, sports or remedial tutoring, whether they already offer a full school day or not. This appears to be more common in publicly funded private schools than in public schools (OECD, 2020^[100]).

Box 2. Additional care and educational and recreational activities for students at the end of the school day and in school holidays in Chile (*Programa 4 a 7* and *Programa Escuelas Abiertas*)

The National Service for Women and Gender Equity (*Servicio Nacional de la Mujer y la Equidad de Género*, SernamEG), a public institution attached to the related ministry, operates a programme to support women's participation in the labour market and economic autonomy (*Programa 4 a 7*). The programme, which is implemented by municipalities and Local Education Services, functions with the participation of the education ministry and the JUNAEB (*Junta Nacional de Auxilio Escolar y Becas*, JUNAEB), a public institution that provides scholarships and aid to disadvantaged students.

The programme provides comprehensive childcare for children between the ages of 6 and 13, who participate in educational workshops and pedagogical support, as well as recreational, sports and cultural activities following the end of the school day, typically between 16:00 and 19:00. At the same time, the mothers of the participating children receive transversal support to enter and stay in the labour market. In 2021, the programme covered 168 municipalities throughout the country.

A further programme, Open Schools (*Programa Escuelas Abiertas*), has been providing activities for students in pre-primary and basic education in the school holidays. Operating since 2006 under the management of the JUNAEB, the programme targets highly disadvantaged schools and seeks to maintain learning acquired during the school year and to promote healthy lifestyles. It offers activities run by certified monitors as well as meals for a period of 20 days in the summer and 10 days in the winter, 7 hours a day from Monday to Friday.

Some positive experiences of the programme build on significant community involvement. For example, in the municipality of Recoleta, the authorities make available infrastructure (e.g. recreational and educational spaces) and work together with other public authorities to create initiatives that involve youth and senior citizen organisations, migrant programmes, cultural and sports organisations, etc.

Sources: "Chile Atiende, Programa 4 a 7" [Programme 4 to 7], <https://www.chileatiende.gob.cl/fichas/12255-programa-4-a-7> and "Chile Atiende, Programa Escuelas Abiertas" [Open Schools Programme], <https://www.chileatiende.gob.cl/fichas/12295-programa-escuelas-abiertas> (accessed 15 January 2021).

Pedagogical design and staffing of activities

In Chile, central regulations established by the education ministry and based on the General Education Law (Art. 36) provide the overall framework for the length of the school year and the school calendar (e.g. a school week has 5 days, running from Monday to Friday) (Decree No. 289 of 2010). Within these regulations, the regional secretariats of the education ministry (SEREMI) determine the school calendar for officially recognised schools in their region and monitor their compliance with it. Schools and school leaders should ensure the organisation of lessons and other educational activities to fulfil the study programme and plan, which establish compulsory subjects for each level of education, and a minimum number of hours of instruction dedicated to them. Otherwise, they are free to organise their timetable according to their needs and educational project (Centro de Estudios MINEDUC, 2016, p. 181^[92]).

Through the full-day schooling reform, the school system started moving away from traditional double-shift schooling (with each shift providing six pedagogical periods of 45 minutes each to a different group of students) towards a full school day (providing a total of eight pedagogical periods of 45 minutes each) (Centro de Estudios MINEDUC, 2016^[92]). Full-day schooling thereby increased the length of the school day by an average of 1.4 clock hours for children in Grades 3 to 12 (Dominguez and Ruffini, 2018^[49]). At the same time, full-day schools provide a shorter school year, which lasts a minimum of 38 weeks as established in the central regulations, compared to 40 weeks in schools not operating on a full-day schedule (Centro de Estudios MINEDUC, 2016^[92]).

In sum, the impact of the extended school day on learning time has been the following:

- 232 clock hours are added per school year in Grades 3 to 6 of basic education
- 145 clock hours are added per school year in Grades 7 and 8 of basic education
- 261 clock hours are added per school year in Grades 9 and 10, that is, the first two years of secondary education
- 174 clock hours are added per school year in Grades 11 and 12, that is, the last two years of secondary education (Centro de Estudios MINEDUC, 2016^[92]).

Looking at the learning time provided on a weekly basis, the full school day increases total pedagogical hours in Grades 1 to 8 to 38 periods per week, and in Grades 9 to 12 to 42 periods per week (Table 8). The change in the annual total pedagogical hours is greatest in the first six years of basic education and the first two years of secondary education (27%).

Table 8. Pedagogical hours in schools with and without full-day schooling in Chile

Level of education and grade		With full school day				Without full school day		Increase in annual hours (%)
		Annual hours	Weekly hours	Compulsory weekly hours	Discretionary weekly hours	Annual hours	Weekly hours	
Basic education	Grades 1-4	1 444	38	31.5	6.5	1 140	30	27
	Grades 5-6	1 444	38	32	6	1 140	30	27
	Grades 7-8	1 444	38	32	6	1 254	33	15
Upper secondary education	Grades 9-10	1 596	42	36	6	1 254	33	27
	Grades 11-12 (scientific-humanistic)	1 596	42	36	6	1 368	36	17
	Grades 11-12 (technical-professional)	1 596	42	38	4	1 444	38	11
	Grades 11-12 (artistic)	1 596	42	40	2	x	x	x

x: not applicable.


Note: Pedagogical hours (*horas pedagógicas*) refer to periods of 45 minutes. In upper secondary education, artistic studies are only provided in full-day schooling.

Source: Adapted from Centro de Estudios MINEDUC (2016^[92]), "Reporte Nacional de Chile: Revisión OCDE para mejorar la efectividad del uso de recursos en las escuelas" [Chile National Report: OECD Review to improve the Effectiveness of Resource Use in Schools], p. 181, <https://bibliotecadigital.mineduc.cl/handle/20.500.12365/4467> (accessed 15 October 2020).

Concerning the use of this time, the full-day schooling model entails an absolute increase in the time available for curricular subjects (as stipulated by the study plan) as well as time that schools can define at their discretion (*horas de libre disposición*) (Figure 8). These discretionary hours that schools are free to use for activities other than instruction (which is not available to schools not providing a full school day) constitutes 30% of pedagogical hours. The amount of time available for breaks is calculated based on 5 minutes for each

pedagogical hour of 45 minutes, amounting to 3 hours and 10 minutes a week. Lunch makes up 3 hours and 45 minutes per week, or 45 minutes a day (OECD, 2020_[100]).

Figure 8. Pedagogical components and use of time in full-day schooling in Chile



Note: Pedagogical hours refer to periods of 45 minutes. The use of time in full-day school can be classified into three main categories: (i) total hours in the day, (ii) non-pedagogical time (breaks and school meals) and (iii) pedagogical time, which is divided into: (a) instruction in the curriculum as defined by the study plan, and (b) discretionary hours, which schools can define according to their educational project and students' interests.

Source: Adapted from Martinic et al. (2008_[101]), "Jornada Escolar completa en Chile. Evaluación de Efectos y Conflictos en la Cultura Escolar" [A Full School Day in Chile. Evaluation of Effects and Conflicts in School Culture], <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=2602524> (accessed 4 April 2021).

Table 9 illustrates the increase in regular instruction for different subjects as stipulated by the study plan and the availability of discretionary hours for Grades 1 to 4 in basic education. In these grades, for example, among the curricular subjects, more time is dedicated in the full school day to physical education and sports (1 hour per week) as well as technology (0.5 hours per week). In addition, schools have their discretionary hours (6.5 hours per week). To provide another example, in Grades 5 and 6, the study plan for the full school day allocates additional time to visual arts, music and natural sciences within the curriculum, as well as the additional hours to be allocated freely within schools (UCE MINEDUC, 2021_[102]).

Table 9. Example for the allocation of instruction time according to study plan in Chile

Grades 1 to 4 in basic education

	Annual hours			Weekly hours		
	With full school day	Without full school day	Difference	With full school day	Without full school day	Difference
Language and Communication	304	304	x	8	8	x
Mathematics	228	228	x	6	6	x
History, Geography and Social Science	114	114	x	3	3	x
Visual Arts	76	76	x	2	2	x
Music	76	76	x	2	2	x
Physical Education and Sports	152	114	48 hours	4	3	1 hour
Guidance	19	19	x	0.5	0.5	x
Technology	38	19	19 hours	1	0.5	0.5 hours
Religion	76	76	x	2	2	x
Natural Sciences	114	114	x	3	3	x
Sub-total minimum time for subjects	1 197	1 140	57 hours	31.5	30	1.5 hours
Discretionary Hours	247	0	247 hours	6.5	0	6.5 hours
Total minimum time	1 444	1 140	304 hours	38	30	8 hours

x: not applicable.

Note: Hours refer to pedagogical periods of 45 minutes.*Source:* MINEDUC (2021_[102]), "Vigencia de instrumentos curriculares Año 2021" [Validity of curricular instruments 2021], based on Decree No. 2960 of 2012 https://www.curriculumnacional.cl/614/articles-241604_recurso_pdf.pdf (accessed 14 June 2021).

The hours at the free disposal of schools provide them with flexibility concerning the national curriculum to design and develop learning opportunities in different areas that they consider meaningful for their particular context, educational project and students. These hours should be planned to benefit students' learning and holistic development, in line with the educational project, and include opportunities for students to develop and express their potential in spiritual, ethical, affective, social, intellectual, artistic and physical aspects. Activities can be linked to transversal objectives of the curriculum or take the form of extracurricular activities. Priority can also be given to allocating additional time to curricular subjects with weak performance, such as language and mathematics, and to providing additional support to students. In this context, the longer school day did not only seek to increase the time spent at school, but to also improve the use of that time so that each school develops their educational project based on the coverage of the curriculum and the hours at their free disposal (UCE MINEDUC, n.d._[103]).

Castillo and Martínez (2017_[104]) surveyed schools offering a full school day about the ways in which they define and use pedagogical hours to define at their discretion in 2017. As their survey suggests, students' participation in the process of defining extracurricular activities is limited, especially in the publicly funded private sector, and involves mainly school leaders and teachers. Public schools state considering students' interests in defining the use of their free hours, while publicly funded private schools state using the educational project as the main frame of reference. All schools seem to be using hours at their free discretion to reinforce traditional subject areas, such as mathematics and language. In the public school sector, nevertheless a larger share of schools seems to dedicate time to arts and sports education.

The study furthermore suggests that the way in which schools define and use their discretionary pedagogical hours differs across contexts, such as level of education or type of funding. Earlier studies on the use of time in schools also suggested that activities differ by other contextual factors such as geographical area and socio-economic context (Aguirre and Molina, 2014_[105]).

As part of the creation of the System for Public Education (Law 21.040) in 2017, the Local Education Services have been given the responsibility to ensure that schools under their administration allocate the time available in the longer school day to activities that contribute to the holistic education of students, in line with their study plans and programmes. This should include artistic, cultural, sports, scientific or technological activities, among others (Centro de Estudios MINEDUC, 2016_[92]).

Besides these changes in the length and organisation of the school day, full-day schooling also established the possibility for school providers to make school facilities available to the school and wider community, for example for cultural, sports and other educational and social activities (through modifications adopted with Law 19.979 in 2004) (Centro de Estudios MINEDUC, 2016_[92]). The full school day has thus given students and teachers the possibility to take advantage of school facilities outside of regular classroom time, as determined by the school leadership team and defined in the education project of each school.

Implementation and targeting of reform

While the extension of the school day originally applied to Grades 3 to 12, with the possibility to also include Grades 1 and 2 in highly disadvantaged contexts, in practice, most schools and their providers implemented the reform in all grades on offer in their school (Dominguez and Ruffini, 2018_[49]). Slightly more than a third of the country's 9 013 publicly funded schools established the full school day the year it was introduced, mostly in rural contexts where the necessary infrastructure was already in place and in other disadvantaged contexts, such as schools participating in the P-900 programme. The remaining schools were to introduce the full school day gradually, with the goal of expanding it to all publicly funded schools by the end of 2002.

Subsequent legislation (Law 19.979 adopted in 2004) that introduced some modifications to full-day schooling however extended this deadline to the end of 2006, with different timelines for public and publicly funded private schools (OECD, 2004_[94]). Progress in rolling out the full school day had been slower than anticipated, notably as a result of a lack of physical space, the high cost to extend the necessary infrastructure in urban areas and growing resource constraints in the context of slowing growth of Chile's economy in the late 1990s (García-Huidobro and Concha, 2009_[106]; OECD, 2004, p. 235_[94]). By 2004, 46% of students in basic and secondary education were enrolled in a full-day school (Table 11).

For implementation, schools and school providers have had to fulfil a number of pre-requisites and to develop a project plan for full-day schooling (*proyecto de jornada escolar completa*), to be approved by the education ministry. The project plan has had to lay out the pedagogical justification for the use of time, and the allocation of extra time to curricular subjects (essentially, language and mathematics) and to electives (sports, arts, etc.), based on the school's educational project, and the number of students to be covered in the full school day. The project plan has had to be consulted with the school community (teachers, parents and, in secondary education, students) prior to it being presented to the ministry. If the plan is approved and the school meets the infrastructure, equipment, and staff requirements (teaching, administrative and auxiliary staff), the full day is implemented in the next school year, generally for the whole school (UNESCO-IIEP and SEP, 2010_[97];

Bellei, 2005^[95]). As full-day schooling was first introduced, the organisation of school meals was identified as a main challenge (UNESCO-IIEP and SEP, 2010^[97]).

Regulations established a number of factors to inform the selection of schools into the full-day schooling programme: geographical location, characteristics of the student population (their socio-economic or educational vulnerability), quality of the educational project, amount of funding requested per student to be enrolled in full-day schooling, and share of funding contributed by students. High-performing schools (as measured by standardised assessments) have been able to request not having to offer a full school day (UNESCO-IIEP and SEP, 2010^[97]), and there is no obligation for schools to do so.

In 2019, 91% of all operating public and publicly funded private schools offered a full school day in basic and/or upper secondary education (Table 10). The share of schools offering a full school day at one or more levels of education is higher in public than in publicly funded private schools (95.6% vs. 84.4%) (authors' calculations based on data available from Centro de Estudios MINEDUC). The same year, 82% of all students in basic and secondary education attended a full-day school (Table 11).

Table 10. Number and share of schools with full-day schooling in Chile, 2013-2019

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Total number of schools	8 272	8 604	8 508	8 394	8 319	8 182	8 095
Number of full-day schools (JEC)	7 726	7 753	7 638	7 613	7 541	7 425	7 365
Share of full-day schools (JEC) (%)	88.5	90.1	89.8	90.7	90.6	90.7	91.0

Note: Data cover public and publicly funded private schools in operation offering basic and secondary education, excluding adult and special needs education. Schools in Chile can offer one or multiple levels of school education. Similarly, they can provide a full school day in one or more levels of school education. Data for earlier years are not available.

Source: Authors' calculations, based on data available from Datos Abiertos, Centro de Estudios, MINEDUC, <http://datosabiertos.mineduc.cl> (accessed 4 April 2021).

Table 11. Student enrolment in full-day schooling in Chile, 2004-2019

Year	Total enrolment	Enrolment in full-day schooling (JEC)	Share of enrolment in full-day schooling (JEC) (%)
2004	2 938 291	1 364 112	46.4
2005	2 955 772	1 579 928	53.5
2006	2 936 421	1 657 192	56.4
2007	2 886 830	1 724 073	59.7
2008	2 836 779	1 767 191	62.3
2009	2 811 679	1 838 768	65.4
2010	2 751 544	1 876 085	68.2
2011	2 698 811	1 919 055	71.1
2012	2 637 294	1 933 004	73.3
2013	2 601 700	1 959 124	75.3
2014	2 580 622	1 981 888	76.8
2015	2 569 968	1 999 691	77.8
2016	2 560 647	2 020 344	78.9
2017	2 568 925	2 036 706	79.3
2018	2 570 063	2 093 595	81.5
2019	2 592 921	2 124 394	81.9

Note: Enrolment data cover public and publicly funded private schools in basic and secondary education, excluding adult and special needs education. Data for earlier years are not available.

Source: Data provided by Unidad de Estadísticas, Centro de Estudios, MINEDUC.

Resource implications and financing

To support schools and their providers in the implementation of full-day schooling, the government committed itself to provide funding and technical advice. To cover rising costs for operating expenses, including the recruitment of additional staff, the value of the financial grant was increased. Likewise, funding was provided to cover the necessary investments for expanding and/or adapting the school infrastructure (OECD, 2004^[94]; DESUC, 2005^[107]). At the inception of the reform, it was estimated that almost 20 000 classrooms would need to be created, by adjusting existing schools or building new ones, to accommodate 760 000 students (BCN, n.d.^[96]). To finance the necessary investments in full-day schooling, an agreement allowed the increase in value added tax by 1 percentage point (Aylwin, 2016^[108]).

School staff and other current spending

School funding in Chile is centrally regulated through Decree-Law No. 2 of 1996 on the state grant for schools (*Decreto con Fuerza de Ley No 2 sobre subvención del Estado a establecimientos educacionales*). The Ministry of Education is responsible for allocating financial resources to policy priorities and for distributing them to school providers, who are then responsible for distributing these resources across the schools that they administer. The main funding mechanism for publicly financed education is a per-student grant (*Subvención de Escolaridad* or *Subvención de Base*), adjusted for the level and type of education. This basic grant is complemented by a range of other grants to account for differences in costs for education by context (e.g. the Preferential School Subsidy, *Subvención de Educación Preferencial*, SEP).

All grants consider differentiated amounts according to the length of the school day on offer (i.e. full-day schooling or not). Table 12 shows the relative amounts of the school basic grant per student and the weight of the school day in its calculation. In 2019, the per-student amount in full-day provision for the first six years of basic education was 1.333 times higher compared to a student in a school without a full school day. To provide another example, the Minimum Grant for Small Rural Schools (*Subvención Mínima Ruralidad-Piso Rural*) for schools with 17 students or less to recognise their high fixed costs, provides a minimum amount of public funding per school, which also depends on whether the school provides a full day or not (Santiago et al., 2017, pp. 83-85^[90]; Centro de Estudios MINEDUC, 2016, pp. 110,130^[92]).

At the time of presenting the law on full-day schooling (Law 19.352 of 1997) in 1996, the additional annual expenditure required for all schools to operate on a full-day schedule was estimated to amount to more than USD 230 million. Looked at from a different perspective, an additional 600 000 teaching hours were estimated to be required per year (BCN, n.d.^[96]). As judged by Bellei (2005^[95]), the increase in funding was more than proportional to the additional class hours, facilitating the recruitment of additional teachers (and other staff), and the purchase of educational materials to improve conditions for teaching and learning.

Table 12. Adjustments in the school basic grant for full-day schooling in Chile, 2019

Relative amounts per student by level and type of education

Level and type of education		Without full school day	With full school day
Pre-primary education	1st and 2nd transition levels	1.118	1.333
Basic education	Grade 1 to 6	1	1.333
	Grade 7 and 8	1.077	1.337
Special needs education	Permanent needs	3.171	3.992
	Transitory needs	2.722	3.375
Upper secondary education	Scientific-humanistic studies	1.195	1.577
	Technical-professional studies: Agricultural and maritime	1.722	2.101
	Technical-professional studies: Industrial	1.366	1.665
	Technical-professional studies: Commercial and technical	1.236	1.580

Note: This table shows the relative value of the school basic grant by level and type of education for 2019, valid from March. The reference (=1) is the amount per student for basic education, Grade 1 to 6, in schools without a full school day, which corresponds to CLP 59 360.00 or a USE factor of 2.3333. The Unit of School Grant (*Unidad de Subvención Educativa*) corresponds to CLP 25 440.361. Adult education is not considered.

Source: Authors' calculations based on Coordinación Nacional de Subvenciones, 2019, https://www.comunidadescolar.cl/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/valor-subvenciones-MARZO-2019Ley21126Reajuste3_5Ley20903.pdf (accessed 4 February 2021).

School infrastructure

In the public sector, the national government is the main source of funds for infrastructure investments (e.g. through the National Regional Development Fund, *Fondo Nacional de Desarrollo Regional*, FNDR, or the Strategic Plan for School Infrastructure, *Plan Estratégico de Infraestructura Escolar*). Borrowing is less frequent. In the publicly funded private sector, capital investments are mostly funded by debt with the banking sector or through infrastructure projects receiving government support (Santiago et al., 2017, p. 86_[90]; OECD, 2018_[85]).

In the context of the full-day schooling programme, the education ministry made significant contributions to expand the infrastructure and equipment of both public and publicly funded schools, to provide the necessary prerequisites for the extension of teaching hours (*Aporte suplementario por costo de capital adicional*). Between 1997 and 2010 alone, the education ministry allocated around CLP 2 trillion (constant values for 2015), equivalent to about USD 5.2 billion, to the implementation of the full-day school programme, mostly for infrastructure grants (authors' analysis, based on Calvo Marinkovich (2013_[109])).⁸

Public and publicly funded private school providers could submit grant proposals to a public fund created specifically for the purpose of extending the school day, managed on a regional level by the education and planning ministries (Bellei, 2005_[95]). A dedicated unit within the Ministry of Education provided support for the development of infrastructure projects, while grant proposals themselves were evaluated by the Ministry of Planning. The grant was capped at a maximum amount of funding per student for both infrastructure and

⁸ The calculation of the budget allocation is based on the budget laws of the Ministry of Education for the years 1997 to 2010 (*Ley de Presupuesto, Partida 09, Capítulo 01, Programa 02, Programa de Extensión de la Jornada Escolar*) available from the Budget Directorate of the Ministry of Finance (<http://www.dipres.gob.cl/598/w3-propertyvalue-2129.html>). The amount in US Dollars was calculated applying Purchasing Power Parities (PPPs).

materials. In the case of public schools, municipalities could also contribute resources (Aylwin, 2016_[108]).

Schools and their providers that received such additional funding to cover capital investments have been bound to ensure the school's operation for at least 30 years (as stipulated by Law 19.532). This requirement may be dismissed by the education ministry under the condition that the property is used for other educational purposes during the set period of time. Schools that have to be closed due to falling student enrolment but that had received funding for capital investments are typically used for public libraries, kindergartens, or education management (Centro de Estudios MINEDUC, 2016, p. 140_[92]).

As part of the full-day schooling programme, a Grant for Maintenance Support (*Subvención de Apoyo al Mantenimiento*) was established to assist schools in covering the costs of infrastructure maintenance, the amount of which depends on the level of education and type of education (Aylwin, 2016_[108]).

A study of the Chilean Chamber of Construction (*Cámara Chilena de la Construcción*) in 2016 estimated a deficit of 5 717 classrooms to complete the implementation of full-day schooling in all remaining schools. The required investment into the school infrastructure until 2025 was estimated at USD 10.4 billion (Mardones, 2016_[110]).

Some lessons learned

Following the introduction of full-day schooling in Chile, the education ministry commissioned a series of ad-hoc evaluations between 2000 and 2005 to assess the implementation of extended days in schools, how the time was being used, and how stakeholders were perceiving the reform. As the evaluations showed, and as summarised in Martinic et al. (2008_[101]), there had been positive changes in schools' infrastructure and equipment through public investment, support for students through school meals, and time for joint work and collaboration among teachers. Parents also valued that their children were spending more time at school.

At the same time, evaluations highlighted that the organisation and management of time in schools had not changed, and that most of the additional time available through discretionary hours (*horas de libre disposición*) was being used for reinforcing traditional subject areas rather than to promote a more holistic development of students. Also, additional activities had not been sufficiently integrated with regular instruction in a more flexible way. The implementation of the full school day was thus not without debate, and in 2006 public discussions pointed to difficulties in the pedagogical implementation of the full school day, in changing school cultures, and in reorganising time and pedagogy in a more innovative way (Martinic, Huepe and Madrid, 2008_[101]). Further issues were identified with fatigue among teachers and students (UNESCO-IIEP and SEP, 2010_[97]).

Looking back at the reform twenty years after the extension of the school day, researchers highlighted improvements in infrastructure, but limited impact on learning as a result of the programme. While the full-day schedule had created more time for teachers to engage in collaborative work, the increase in non-teaching hours for teachers had not been sufficient, be it to review and plan classes, or to create learning communities. As the researchers also suggested, teachers had few possibilities to innovate and work with different pedagogies (Universidad de Chile, 2017_[111]). However, in some schools with successful educational projects and sustainable school improvement strategies, teachers perceived the full school day as an opportunity for improving working conditions and professional learning, and to add more hours of teaching at first, but other types of activities, such as workshops, later on (Valenzuela, 2016_[112]; Bellei et al., 2014_[113]).

Since these assessments and evaluations, changes in the framework for teachers' professional development have however changed teachers' time available for activities other than teaching (Santiago et al., 2017^[90]). Compared to the earlier framework created with the extension of the school day, the new framework (System for Teacher Professional Development, Law 20.903) should provide better conditions for protecting non-teaching time and contribute to innovative and rich lessons. To support implementation, the education ministry has been carrying out dedicated measures through its unit for teacher professional development (CPEIP), namely orientations to use non-teaching time in local teacher professional development, along with web conferences; and collective performance payments that encourage school leadership teams to implement professional development activities in non-teaching time. Research has also been commissioned on the use of non-teaching time and teacher professional development (information provided by the Ministry of Education).

3.4. Colombia

Summary

Colombia was one of the first countries in Latin American to begin decentralising school education and has become one of the more decentralised systems in the region. The education ministry formulates policies and objectives, and is responsible for regulations, monitoring and technical advice, but education is provided by departments and municipalities certified to do so. Schools have substantial curricular and pedagogical autonomy, based on centrally established goals and objectives as well as standards and guidelines. There is no nationally defined curriculum, and schools only need to cover a number of mandatory and fundamental areas.

Since the 1970s, public schools (which are organised in clusters) have typically operated in double shifts in the morning and afternoon to facilitate the expansion of educational provision. While legislation introduced extended single-shift school days in the 1990s, this was not fully implemented. Since 2014, successive governments have been making renewed strides to put a “single school day” in place for greater quality and equity, also relative to students in private schools who have traditionally benefited from more time at school. Extended school days cover all levels of school education, although specific levels have been prioritised more recently.

Single-day schools provide additional time in regular instruction (in the mandatory and fundamental areas as well as optional areas). In addition, schools must provide time for other activities, such as recreation, meals and sports, artistic, social or cultural activities. The overall length of the school day is the responsibility of each school. Students cannot opt out of attending the different activities on offer if they are enrolled in a single-day school.

The Secretaries of Education of the departments and municipalities certified to provide education are responsible for planning and implementing single-day schooling, and for making the necessary adjustments in pedagogy, human resources, infrastructure, and school meals. The central government, which provides the largest share of resources for school education, provides funding for the extension of the school day to the Secretaries of Education, as well as technical assistance and support, also to schools. National goals target 2030 for the full implementation of the single school day in all public schools.

Evaluations have highlighted the positive potential of the reform, namely to improve school infrastructure, teaching and learning, and complementary services, but also the many challenges in implementation, with a lack of clarity in educational objectives, and difficulties to reorganise time and improve pedagogical practices at school.

3.4.1. Context

Governance of the school system and recent reforms

School education in Colombia is mainly regulated by the Constitution of 1991 and the General Education Law of 1994, as well as the Single Regulatory Decree of Education (Decree 1075) of 2015 and Law 715 of 2001. While Decree 1075 combines all education decrees enacted before as well as after 2015, Law 715 regulates the system of fiscal transfers across levels of governance, which includes school funding.

Colombia was one of the first countries in Latin American to begin decentralising school education and has become one of the more decentralised systems in the region. Following first steps to decentralise education to municipalities, districts and departments in the late 1980s and the early 1990s, a reform of the country's fiscal transfer system in 2001 further clarified responsibilities for each level of government. For school education, there are thus three levels of administration: the central, territorial (regional and local) and school levels. The governance framework is the same for all levels of education from pre-primary to upper secondary, and the same authorities are responsible for regulating, funding and providing education.

At the central level, the Ministry of National Education (*Ministerio de Educación Nacional*, MEN) formulates policies and objectives, regulates provision, establishes criteria and guidelines, monitors the system and provides technical advice and support, but does not directly provide education. In recent years, the ministry has taken on an increasingly important role in the design and implementation of programmes that target individual schools. In school education, the Colombian Institute for Educational Evaluation (*Instituto Colombiano para la Evaluación Educativa*, ICFES) is responsible for evaluation and assessment in education and for carrying out research on the quality of education.

Decentralisation in education has been managed by a process of certification. While all departments and districts gained the status of a certified territorial entity (*Entidad Territorial Certificada*, ETC) in 2002, all municipalities with at least 100 000 inhabitants and municipalities judged to have sufficient technical, financial and administrative capacity were certified by 2003. Other municipalities have since had the possibility to apply for certified status and to provide education. As of 2020, 96 territorial entities were certified and had their own Secretary of Education: all of the country's 32 departments and 64 out of the country's 1 122 local authorities.⁹

The Secretaries of Education of the certified territorial entities are responsible for ensuring coverage and quality, defining and implementing education policy and monitoring the quality of provision in both public and private schools in their territory. They manage the teaching staff of their schools and financial resources received through fiscal transfers, their own revenues, and oil and mining royalties that are distributed across departments and municipalities according to a central revenue sharing system. The provision of education in the non-certified municipalities is the responsibility of the departments, but departmental education authorities co-ordinate with the municipalities in fulfilling this responsibility. Non-certified municipalities support the management of the teaching staff and provide data and information to their department. They also manage a small amount of financial resources they receive through fiscal transfers and can contribute their own resources for school infrastructure, maintenance and quality.

Development plans that are established for the national and sub-national level for each four-year term of government provide the framework for policy and budget decisions and for evaluating the achievement of set goals and objectives. The development plans of departments and municipalities must be aligned with the national plan (*Plan Nacional de Desarrollo*, PND), and in education, those of the non-certified municipalities with those of the departments. The development plans are widely publicised before approval and consulted extensively with stakeholder representatives.

For the education sector, the education ministry establishes a longer vision through ten-year education plans (*Plan Nacional Decenal de Educación*, PNDE). The current ten-year plan has been established for 2016-26 following the extensive participation of civil society.

⁹ Colombia has 1 122 municipalities, 11 of which have a special administrative status as districts.

National and local education fora that take place every year around a chosen theme serve to share experiences, reflect about the state of education and present recommendations for improvement.

Different stakeholders within the education community are involved in education discourse and policy, including teacher unions, student associations, the private sector and foundations. The country's largest teacher union, the *Federación Colombiana de Trabajadores de Educación* (FECODE), has played a prominent role in improving and protecting the working conditions of teachers and shaping policy more broadly (Radinger et al., 2018, p. 48ff_[114]).

Schools have substantial curricular and pedagogical autonomy and every school develops and puts into practice an educational project (*Proyecto Educativo Institucional*, PEI) together with the school community. Schools also have some budgetary autonomy but little influence on the selection or dismissal of their teaching staff who are employed by their Secretary of Education. Responsibility for school management and administration lies mainly with the school principal and directive council (*consejo directivo*), which is composed of different members of the school community, including among others teachers, parents and students. In addition, schools should promote the participation of the entire school community, and for this purpose have an academic council, a school coexistence committee, a parent's association and a student council. In practice, however, there seems to be scope to improve participation of all members of the school communities, including disadvantaged ones (Radinger et al., 2018, pp. 154ff, 173_[114]).

The Constitution of Colombia of 1991 establishes education as a fundamental right and a public service with a social function and sets general objectives for education. These general objectives are further specified in the General Education Law of 1994 in the form of general goals for education for work and human development (previously known as non-formal education), informal education and formal education; common objectives for all levels of formal education, from pre-primary to upper secondary education; and specific objectives for different levels in formal education (Radinger et al., 2018, p. 48_[114]).

Based on these goals and objectives and the guidelines established by the education ministry, schools are largely free to define their own curriculum in line with their educational project and with their available resources – one of the most distinctive characteristics of school education in Colombia. There is no nationally defined curriculum. Within schools, responsibility for the organisation, pedagogical orientation, implementation and continuous improvement of the school curriculum lies mainly with the academic council, which includes the leadership team and teachers.


The curriculum is defined in the form of study plans (*plan de estudios*) that cover a number of mandatory and fundamental areas (80%) as well as optional areas (20%) (Figure 9). The study plan should also cover different transversal thematic areas. The fundamental and transversal areas are the same for all levels of education. The study plan then defines the specific learning objectives for different levels of education, grades and areas, the methods used, the distribution of instruction time, and assessment criteria (MEN, 2017_[115]). Teachers are also typically very autonomous to make pedagogical decisions within their classroom and should implement school curricula through the development of lesson plans (*plan de aula*).

To guarantee the development of students' core competencies, the education ministry has developed a series of standards and guidelines for different levels of education, subjects and competencies that schools must take into account when designing their own curricula, and that should guide teachers in their work in classrooms (Radinger et al., 2018_[114]).

In the last three decades, the Colombian Institute for Educational Evaluation has developed a range of instruments to measure the performance of schools in terms of learning outcomes. These standardised assessments, called *Pruebas Saber*, should be administered in Grades 3, 5 and 9 for a sample of students and assess mathematics and language in all years and science or citizenship in Grades 5 and 9. An examination of students in Grade 11 carries high stakes for individual students and determines access to tertiary education. Additional assessments seek to provide incentives for students to perform well (Radinger et al., 2018, pp. 159, 164, 187_[114]).

Colombia does not have a national body responsible for evaluating school processes, but school principals are required to conduct school self-evaluations and develop school improvement plans every year. There are also performance evaluations of teachers and school leaders, but only of those employed under the new teacher statute. Following a reform of teacher employment, there are two main employment frameworks in place for public school teachers, one adopted in 2002 and one introduced in 1979. A separate framework is in place for teachers of ethnic minorities (*etnoeducadores*) (Radinger et al., 2018, pp. 226, 233_[114]).

Figure 9. School curriculum and study plan in Colombia



Notes: Mandatory and fundamental areas include natural sciences and environmental education; social sciences, history, geography, political constitution and democracy; artistic education; ethical education in human values; physical education, recreation and sports; religious education; humanities, Spanish and foreign languages; mathematics; and technology and computer science. Transversal themes include Constitution and civics; use of free time; protection of the environment, ecology and natural resources; education for justice, peace, democracy, solidarity, fellowship, co-operation and, in general, human values; sex education; peace studies; Afro-Colombian studies. economic and financial education; healthy lifestyles; and road safety.

Source: Adapted from MEN (2017_[115]), "Guía de fortalecimiento curricular" [Guidance for strengthening the curriculum], Ministerio de Educación Nacional, Bogotá, DC.

Structure and organisation of the school system

Formal education in Colombia is defined as education that is offered by approved institutions, organised in a sequence of cycles and progressive curricular standards, and

leads to academic titles and degrees. According to the General Education Law, formal education is divided into three levels:

- pre-school education (*educación preescolar*), which is composed of pre-kindergarten (*pre-jardín*), kindergarten (*jardín*) and a transition year (*año de transición*) (ISCED 0, typical ages 3 to 5)
- basic education (*educación básica*), which consists of a first cycle of primary education (*educación básica primaria*) (ISCED 1, typical ages 6 to 10) and a second cycle of lower secondary education (*educación básica secundaria*) (ISCED 2, typical ages 11 to 14)
- upper secondary education (*educación media*) (ISCED 3, typical ages 15 to 16).

Pre-school education that is provided by certified territorial entities lasts for 3 years from age 3 to 5. There are also more care-oriented forms of early childhood education for 0 to 5 year-olds, managed by the Colombian Institute of Family Welfare (*Instituto Colombiano de Bienestar Familiar*, ICBF). Between the ages of 6 and 14, children then study 5 years of primary education and 4 years of lower secondary education. Upper secondary education lasts for 2 years, with students choosing between a general and a vocational programme. After completion of basic education, students can also decide to undertake vocational training provided by the National Learning Service (*Servicio Nacional de Aprendizaje*, SENA) – a public institution providing technical and technological programmes at tertiary level and short vocational programmes. There are also 137 higher teaching schools (*Escuelas Normales Superiores*), which offer all levels of school education, but specialise in pedagogy and also provide initial teacher education for pre-primary and primary education. Compulsory education lasts ten years, from the age of 5 to 15, comprising the transition year and all of basic education. Recently, compulsory education has been extended to the upper secondary level, to be introduced gradually until 2030 (Radinger et al., 2018, pp. 54ff, 152ff_[114]).

School education can be offered by public (*matrícula oficial*), government-dependent (*matrícula oficial contratada*) and independent private schools (*matricula no oficial*). Public education is provided directly through public schools managed by the certified Secretaries of Education. Where there is limited capacity in terms of infrastructure or teaching staff, or another limitation, Secretaries of Education can provide education through different forms of contracts and partnerships with private providers, that is, government-dependent private provision. Independent private schools can charge tuition and other fees according to ministry regulations and generally receive no public funding. Parents and students are free to select the public or private school of their choice.

Of the 9.4 million students in the Colombian school system in 2019, 81% were in the public system, the remaining 19% were enrolled in independent private schools (MEN-SIMAT, 2021_[116]).¹⁰ According to an annual survey carried out by the country's statistical agency, 3% of students in the public system attended a contracted school that year (DANE, 2020_[117]).¹¹

¹⁰ These student enrolment data include pre-primary to upper secondary education, including education for overage children (*aceleración de aprendizaje*), but excluding Grades 12 and 13 in higher teaching schools (*escuela normal superior*) and adult education (*ciclos adultos*).

¹¹ These student enrolment data include pre-primary to upper secondary education, including flexible education models (*modelos educativos flexibles*), but excluding adult education (*ciclos adultos*).

Public schools in Colombia are organised in school clusters that group different school sites under a common leadership. Through a school cluster, individual school sites may offer only some levels of education but are linked with other sites to offer students a comprehensive offer of education from pre-primary to upper secondary education. Typically, the main school site offers all levels of education, while the remaining sites offer only some levels of education (Radinger et al., 2018, pp. 54ff, 152ff_[114]). In 2019, there were 9 788 school clusters with 43 956 individual sites (MEN-SIMAT, 2021_[116]).

Another distinctive feature of school education in Colombia is the existence of a wide range of education modalities targeting the needs of different students. Flexible education models aim to address different needs, from rural and adult education to peace education (or education for reconciliation) among others, by adapting their curricula and pedagogy to the context and the students they serve. Among these, the *Escuela Nueva* is the single most widespread model, providing basic education to rural children following a multi-grade teaching methodology. The education ministry moreover provides guidelines and promotes policies and programmes for different vulnerable groups, including victims of the country's armed conflict and displaced populations, youth in the penal system and rural students, among others.

Since the 1970s, a specific policy has also been developed for the education of the country's different ethnic minorities, including Afro-Colombian, indigenous and Rrom communities, with the purpose of respecting and maintaining ethnic language, culture and values. Ethnic education (*etnoeducación*), which is regulated through Decree 804 of 1995, grants ethnic minorities full autonomy to organise their own schools and curricula through Community Education Projects (*Proyectos Educativos Comunitarios*, PEC) and the right to bilingual education. Teachers, employed under the framework of the decree, should be selected preferably among community members. More recently, a process has been underway to provide ethnic groups with greater autonomy through the creation of their own intercultural education systems.

Finally, the government has established legislation for the rights of disabled people, and in that context adopted a policy to promote the inclusion of children with special educational needs in mainstream education. As part of this policy, every school must develop an Individual Plan of Reasonable Adjustments and make the necessary curricular, infrastructure and other adjustments to guarantee learning, participation, retention and promotion for all student (Radinger et al., 2018, pp. 58, 161_[114]).

3.4.2. Single-day school: *Jornada Única*

Goals, design and implementation of reform

Context and goals

Since the 1970s, public schools in Colombia have typically operated in double shifts of an estimated 5 to 6 hours a day (*doble jornada*), one in the morning and one in the afternoon, to facilitate the expansion of educational provision and coverage. Following recommendations of the Mission for Education, Science and Development (*Misión de Educación, Ciencia y Desarrollo*, also called *Misión de Sabios*), the country moved to the introduction of a single, extended school day in the early 1990s. As stipulated in the General Education Law (Art. 85) in 1994, “the public education service should be offered in educational institutions in one single day shift (*una sola jornada diurna*)”. The law nevertheless provided for the possibility for schools to offer an additional shift in the evening where necessary, preferably for adult education. Schools were to define their plans to transition to a single school day (*jornada única*) to be submitted for approval to their

Secretary of Education (Decree 1860 of 1994), and some certified territorial entities, such as the capital Bogotá, developed plans for the roll-out of single-day schooling (Bonilla, 2014_[118]).

In the end, however, single-day schooling was never fully implemented. An economic crisis in the late 1990s reduced the country's fiscal space for public investments (Radinger et al., 2018_[114]). Scarce resources thus limited the capacity to hire sufficient staff and to expand the physical infrastructure. Demographic developments and an increase in student enrolment created further challenges to provide the necessary infrastructure for single-day schooling. While the National Development Plan for 1998-2002 (adopted through Law 508 of 1999) still foresaw the gradual transition to a longer school day, related regulations (Decree 1850 of 2002) set a less ambitious vision and allowed for the continued provision of multiple shifts where necessary (Hincapie, 2016_[32]; Bonilla, 2014_[118]).

While schools continued to operate in multiple shifts, separate initiatives were launched to provide additional time at school in the form of complementary school days (*Jornada Escolar Complementaria*) or extended school days (*Jornada Escolar Extendida*) (Sánchez, 2018_[119]; Arango Vallejo, 2013_[120]). These forms of extended learning time were developed to complement the school day and in some cases to provide single-day schooling. The complementary school day normally provides extracurricular activities in the afternoon, while students in an extended day participate in activities related to instruction and the study plan, particularly in areas such as mathematics, science and language. The extended day is set to be replaced by the single school day, while complementary days may continue to offer extracurricular activities (Radinger et al., 2018, p. 161_[114]; Sánchez, 2018_[119]). In recent years, work within the ministry was being undertaken to articulate the single-day school programme with the complementary school days (e.g. collecting data on schools that implement both programmes, focusing the single school day on pedagogical projects) (MEN, 2018_[121]) (see Box 3 for further details on complementary school days).

Box 3. Complementary school days in Colombia (*Jornada Escolar Complementaria*)

Complementary school days were introduced in the late 1990s and early 2000s with the National Development Plan for 1998-2002 (Law 508 of 1999), subsequently regulated through a series of laws and decrees (e.g. specifying objectives, funding, targeting and implementation). Resources were initially provided through a fund for social housing (*Fondo de Vivienda de Interés Social*, FOVIS) as established in Law 633 of 2000 and Decree 348 of 2000. In 2002, a dedicated fund was put in place for the comprehensive care of children and the organisation of complementary school days (*Fondo para la Atención Integral de la Niñez y Jornada Escolar Complementaria*, Foniñez, see Law 789 of 2002 and Decree 1729 of 2008). Decree 1729 also regulated the organisation of the complementary school day, while external circulars by the education ministry and the Superintendence for Family Subsidies in 2009 and 2011 provided further guidance. A dedicated guide was published in 2014 (see (MEN, 2014_[122])).

The organisation of the complementary school days is the responsibility of the funds for family benefits (*Cajas de Compensación Familiar*), in collaboration with the Secretaries of Education. The funds for family benefits can also establish partnerships with other public or private organisations, such as the Colombian Institute for Family Welfare (ICBF), non-governmental organisations and universities.

The objective of the complementary school day is to contribute to the holistic, physical, cognitive, social and emotional development of children and young people. More specifically, the programme seeks to:

- improve the quality of learning, providing a space for learning support
- provide learning environments that offer opportunities for knowledge and use of technology
- reduce the risks of children and young people, keeping students from unproductive and harmful activities, promoting spaces that stimulate the good use of free time
- encourage cultural practices that are oriented towards the respect for human rights, the appreciation of differences and the exercise of democracy.

The complementary school day can be provided in different modalities: i) environmental, ii) sports, iii) arts and culture, iv) science and technology, v) reading and writing (*Plan Nacional de Lectura*), and vi) bilingualism. Regardless of focus, the activities should develop citizenship, have a playful pedagogical approach, and be aligned with the school's educational project. The activities can be organised within the school, but also outside of school, for a duration of between 5 and 9 hours per week, and should be led by teams of staff that work closely with the teachers in a school. This team of staff can also include teachers, paid for by the family benefit funds. In agreement between the different actors (family benefit funds, Secretaries of Education and schools), the complementary school day can also include activities to strengthen the mandatory and fundamental subject areas.

Participation in the complementary school day is open to all students in any grade of primary and secondary education, but programmes should prioritise the most vulnerable and at risk children and young people, with a particular focus on children with special needs or children displaced in the country's armed conflict. The country's means-testing indicator for targeting social programmes (SISBEN) is used to prioritise participation. Participation in the extracurricular programme must be free of charge. In 2017, 632 schools provided a complementary school day to a total of 67 035 students in 33 territorial entities certified to provide education (MEN, 2018, p. 66_[121]; MEN, 2018, p. 74_[123]).

More recently, successive governments have been making renewed strides to put a single school day in place as set out in the General Education Law. The country's National Development Plan (*Plan Nacional de Desarrollo*, PND) for 2014-18 established a dedicated policy in this respect (Law 1753 of 2015, Art. 57), regulated subsequently through Decree 501 in 2016, and described in-depth in the following sections. Following negotiations and discussions with the main teacher union (FECODE), some revisions were made to the organisation of single-day schooling together with revisions to regulations for teachers' working conditions through Decree 2105 in 2017 (Radinger et al., 2018_[114]; MEN, 2018_[121]). Guidelines for implementation for schools and territorial entities were published in 2018 by the education ministry (*Lineamientos para la implementación de la Jornada Única*) (MEN, 2018_[124]).

These renewed efforts to move to a single school day (*Jornada Única*) have been based on both equity and quality grounds. As formulated in the National Development Plan for 2014-18, a longer school day should address inequities between students in public education and those in independent private schools who benefit from more learning time and time at school. The longer school day should also promote a safe environment for vulnerable children and reduce their exposure to out-of-school risks such as crime, drugs and pregnancy. Moreover, a longer school day should help improve educational quality and

students' academic performance (in particular their basic competencies in mathematics, science and language), by transforming curricula and pedagogical practices (DNP, 2015, p. 89_[125]; MEN, 2018, p. 113_[123]).

The National Development Plan for 2018-2022 stressed the further progressive implementation of quality single-day schooling “to provide equality of opportunities for children and young people in terms of their time to learn, share, and enjoy” (DNP, 2019, p. 331_[126]). Besides strengthening students' basic competencies, single-day schooling should in particular provide students with the opportunity to foster their socio-emotional skills, integrating the arts, culture, sport, science, technology and creativity, creating a value-added and enriching their life projects (DNP, 2019_[126]).

The regulations for the implementation of the single-day school formulated more specific objectives, first with Decree 501 in 2016 and then modified with Decree 2105 in 2017. Accordingly, the single school day seeks to:

- Increase the time dedicated to academic activities in school to contribute to the achievement of the general and specific goals and objectives of education according to the educational cycle or level.
- Strengthen the education in the mandatory and fundamental areas established in the General Education Law among students in any grade of basic or upper secondary education, so they can effectively access knowledge, science, technology, and other cultural goods and values.
- Improve educational quality in schools offering pre-school, basic and upper secondary education.
- Encourage the greater use of time in schools dedicated to pedagogical activities that promote education in the respect for human rights, peace and democracy, and the development of sports, artistic and cultural activities, healthy recreation and the protection of the environment.

Pedagogical design and staffing of activities

In Colombia, the school calendar, and specifically the beginning and the end of the school year, is defined each year by each Secretary of Education, respecting regional contexts and local traditions, with prior approval of the education ministry. The school year should provide 40 weeks of instruction and 12 weeks of holidays. The organisation of the school day and timetable are up to the school principal, in line with the school's study plan and central regulations for minimum instruction time. This includes the duration of lessons, which can have 60 minutes, but also be shorter, as well as the extent of time for breaks, which may therefore differ across schools (Radinger et al., 2018_[114]; Sánchez, 2018_[119]).

The minimum number of hours (60 minutes) of compulsory instruction have been established for each level of education per school week and year (see Table 13). As discussed above, at least 80% of this time must be used for teaching the mandatory and fundamental subject areas set out in the General Education Law, which should be reflected in the school's study plan and educational project (PEI) (Decree 1850 of 2002) (Radinger et al., 2018_[114]; Sánchez, 2018_[119]).

With the introduction of single-day school, the time for instruction was increased, while also providing additional time for relaxation and meals. Initially, regulations moreover set a minimum amount of time students should spend at school in a single school day (Decree 501 of 2016). This was however subsequently dropped, while also reducing the increase in instruction time by one clock hour. The overall length of the single school day is thus not

defined, and is essentially the responsibility of each school. The single school day however must entail time for instruction (in the mandatory and fundamental areas as well as optional areas in the form of subjects or pedagogical projects) as defined for each level of education.

Compared to the school day in a school with multiple shifts, there is at least one more hour of academic activities per day, with the increase in instruction time ranging from 17% in secondary education to 25% in pre-school education (Table 13). For a 15-year-old, this represents two more years of instruction time, compared to a student without a single school day (MEN, 2018, p. 113_[123]). In addition to these academic hours, schools must provide time for other activities, such as recreation, meals and sports, artistic, social or cultural activities (Figure 10). Students cannot opt out of attending the single school day and must participate in the different activities on offer.

Table 13. Instruction time in schools with and without single-day schooling in Colombia

Level of education	School with single-day schooling			School without single-day schooling		Increase in hours (%)
	Daily hours	Weekly hours	Annual hours	Weekly hours	Annual hours	
Pre-school	5	25	1 000	20	800	25
Primary education	6	30	1 200	25	1 000	20
Lower secondary education	7	35	1 400	30	1 200	17
Upper secondary education	7	35	1 400	30	1 200	17


Notes: Academic hours (*horas académicas*) refer to clock hours. For schools without a single school day, only weekly and annual academic hours are defined. For schools with a single school day, also the duration of academic activities in the day are defined. In schools with a single school day, academic hours differ for vocational programme (*educación media técnica*) or programmes that are articulated with tertiary education (*programa de articulación con la educación superior o educación para el trabajo y el desarrollo humano*). These types of upper secondary education must provide 30 hours per week in the mandatory and fundamental areas, and up to 8 hours in their specialisation, that is, a total of 38 hours.

Source: Decree 1075 of 2015, <http://www.suin-juriscol.gov.co/viewDocument.asp?ruta=Decretos/30019930> (accessed 10 October 2020).

Schools in Colombia have considerable autonomy for curricular and pedagogical matters as discussed in the section on governance, and are free to organise their school days according to their plan of studies (which is approved by the school board, the *consejo directivo*) and educational project. For the implementation of a single school day, schools need to revise their plan of studies and educational project, and are encouraged to make use of the possibilities for pedagogical and curricular innovation resulting from an extended schedule. This includes the integration of arts, culture, sports, science and technology.

Revisions to the school curriculum and plan of studies need to be aligned however with the different learning standards and guidelines in place that provide guidance on the knowledge and skills students should acquire and for developing curricular proposals and pedagogical methods. This includes, among others, basic competence standards (*Estándares Básicos de Competencias*, EBC), curriculum guidelines (*Lineamientos Curriculares*) and basic learning rights (*Derechos Básicos de Aprendizaje*, DBA) (Radinger et al., 2018_[114]). As clarified in the ministry guidelines for implementation, the single school day should focus on students' learning and development. The different activities should be integrated into the curriculum with pedagogical strategies and form part of the plan of studies (MEN, 2018_[124]). Based on the educational project and the study plan of schools, the Secretaries of Education analyse the teaching staff requirements and submit their related technical studies for approval to the education ministry.

Figure 10. Pedagogical components and use of time in single-day schooling in Colombia



Note: In basic and upper secondary education, time for academic activities should be dedicated to the development of mandatory and fundamental areas and optional areas or subjects. In pre-school education, this time should be dedicated to children's development in biological, cognitive, psychomotor, socio-affective and spiritual aspects through pedagogical and recreational experiences. The schedule is defined according to the curriculum defined by the school board and in line with the school's educational project, within the autonomy of the school. The extent and duration of breaks is also defined by schools at the beginning of each school year.

The National Development Plan for 2018-2022 stressed the role of educational quality in the further development of the single-day schooling programme and offer (*jornada única de calidad*). To this end, different models should be defined that can be scaled up across the country while taking different local realities into account. These models should encompass school leadership, teacher development and pedagogical support, the use of available capacities, inter-institutional articulation, strengthening of educational projects and innovative learning environments, school meals, a strengthening of classroom didactics and improvements in the contents of school texts (DNP, 2019, pp. 331-332_[126]).

The development plan also set out the role of other actors, such as the ministry of culture which, together with the ministry of education, should promote the development of artistic, cultural and socio-emotional competencies, such as critical thinking, openness to change and self-awareness from an early age within the framework of single-day schooling (DNP, 2019, pp. 839-840_[126]). The Colombian Institute of Family Welfare (ICBF) should develop its offer for children and young people to develop their talents and interests within safe environments in line with single-day schooling (DNP, 2019, p. 280_[126]).

Implementation and targeting of reform

Single-day schooling in Colombia covers all levels of school education, that is children from age 5 in the transition year to youth aged 16 in the last year of upper secondary education. More recently, nevertheless, specific levels and years have been prioritised in rolling out the single school day, in particular pre-school and the first grades of primary education as well as upper secondary education (DNP, 2019_[126]).

In the first two years of the single-day schooling programme (that is, 2015 and 2016), the education ministry opened a number of public calls (*Súbete al bus de la Jornada Única*) for Secretaries of Education and their schools to submit proposals for participation in the programme, receive resources and move to a single school day. Since 2017, certified territorial entities have been developing their own strategies for expanding coverage within their capacity and available resources (MEN, 2018, p. 112_[121]).

As established in Decree 501 in 2016, the certified territorial entities are responsible for planning the implementation of single-day schooling, in co-ordination with the national government and considering financial, economic and demographic factors; carrying out the related technical and financial studies and cost projections; setting short, medium, and long-term targets; and monitoring and evaluating implementation. The education ministry should follow up and monitor implementation by the certified territorial entities. Schools are responsible for designing the pedagogical part of single-day schooling and making the related adjustments, in co-ordination with their Secretary of Education.

Regulations allow for a gradual implementation of single-day schooling, which can be established for specific cycles or levels of education and school sites within a school cluster for the pedagogical project of the school (Decree 2105 of 2017).

For the transition to a single school day, schools have to fulfil four pre-requisites:

- adequate available infrastructure
- a school meal plan for students that includes lunch to promote a healthy lifestyle and to reduce absenteeism and dropout
- sufficient human resources for lengthening the school day
- operative public services.

The implementation of single-day schooling should then consider adjustments in four dimensions: i) pedagogy, ii) human resources, iii) infrastructure, and iv) school meals.

- As part of the **pedagogical component**, schools should revise and adjust their educational project, curriculum and plan of studies, taking into account a number of elements, such as student performance in standardised assessments, and curricular and pedagogical guidelines set by the education ministry. Changes to the study plan should involve all knowledge areas and include the use of ICT to improve students' digital skills. Schools should furthermore revise their approach to evaluation (e.g. formative evaluation, and student promotion criteria), their school climate manual (*manual de convivencia*), and their school improvement plan (*Plan de Mejoramiento Institucional*).
- In terms of **human resources**, the Secretaries of Education should analyse the teaching staff required for the reported student enrolment, and evaluate the need for additional staff positions and profiles according to schools' educational projects and study plans. They should also assign the necessary administrative staff to schools. The organisation of the working day of teachers has traditionally been one of the most controversial aspects of the transition to a single school day (Bonilla, 2014_[118]). As established by the regulations adopted in 2017 (Decree 2105), the teaching load defined by level of education remains the same. The working day of teachers should be organised in a continuous manner, but it does not need to be the same for all teachers in a school.
- Concerning the **school infrastructure**, Secretaries of Education should prioritise the available capacity and reorganise the educational provision, such as moving students from an afternoon shift into the morning. A dedicated school infrastructure programme and infrastructure fund (more on these in the next sections on financing) have been established to finance investments in school buildings (e.g. libraries, canteens, recreation areas, administrative facilities, meeting rooms, etc.).
- Regulations for the national **school meal programme** (*Programme de Alimentación Escolar*, PAE) also include specific provisions for single-day

schooling (e.g. priority in resource allocations for schools with a single school day, the creation of the necessary infrastructure for food storage, preparation and distribution, etc.).

To facilitate the transition to a single school day, the education ministry has invested in building the capacity of Secretaries of Education and schools through technical assistance and pedagogical support (MEN, 2018, pp. 111-112_[121]; MEN, 2019, p. 51_[127]). Further work has been under way in this direction to guarantee a relevant and quality single school day, with a particular focus on the meaningful use of time to support students in their integral development and consolidation of their life projects, through enriching learning experiences that integrate the arts, culture, sports, science and technology. Recent actions undertaken by the education ministry include an evaluation of the state of implementation of single day school at the level of schools, territories and the country as a whole in the different dimensions and the development of related improvement plans (MEN, 2020_[128]; MEN, 2020_[129]).

To support teachers and schools in their pedagogical projects and strategies, methodological and didactic tools have been designed, while educational materials have been developed to strengthen students' socio-emotional skills. Teachers have been offered online training to update their skills, and a dedicated diploma on Pedagogical Strategies for a Quality School Day is in development (MEN, 2020_[128]; MEN, 2020_[129]).

Schools with a single-day schedule have also received more direct support and advice. In 2020, comprehensive support was provided to 295 schools with a single school day, while a further 40 schools received support with a focus on learning and pedagogy in rural contexts. An additional 102 rural schools received support in the integration of sports and recreation in their curriculum, in co-ordination with the ministry of sports. Support was also provided to almost all Secretaries of Education to provide a single school day through at-home study due to the COVID-19 pandemic (MEN, 2020_[128]; MEN, 2020_[129]).

The National Development Plan for 2014-2018 set 2030 as the goal for when all schools should operate on a single-day schedule (schools in urban areas should already reach this goal by 2025). The plan also set intermediate targets for the share of students attending a single school day, seeking to reach 20% of students in 2017, and 30% of students in 2018 (DNP, 2015_[125]).

Progress was however much slower than anticipated, in particular due to challenges in the available infrastructure and the available resources to employ the required staff, and expand the provision of nutrition at school through the country's School Meal Programme (*Programa de Alimentación Escolar*, PAE). The share of students enrolled in single-day schooling remained relatively stable during the period 2014-16. In 2017, slightly less than one in five public or government-dependent private schools offered a single school day to more than 730 000 students, or about 10% of the students enrolled in school education (Radinger et al., 2018_[114]; MEN, 2018_[121]).

The National Development Plan for 2018-2022 set a new goal for the government to double the number of students in single-day schooling, bringing the share of enrolment to 24% (1.8 million students) by 2022, with intermediate goals set for specific years (Table 14). The development plan stressed a gradual and progressive implementation with a focus on the most vulnerable contexts, prioritising pre-school, the first grades of primary school and upper secondary education (DNP, 2019_[126]). In 2020, enrolment in single-day school had reached more than 1.1 million students, or 16% of students (Table 14 and Table 15). Slightly less than one in three public schools (30.7%), and 14.6% of school sites, offered a full school day that year (Table 16) (data provided by Ministry of National Education).

Table 14. Student enrolment in single-day schooling in Colombia, 2015-2020

National Development Plan	Year	Coverage goal (%)	Total enrolment	Enrolment in single-day school	Share of enrolment in single-day school (%)
2014-2018	2015	4	7 333 953	316 917	4.3
	2016	9	7 324 024	512 169	7.0
	2017	20	7 296 553	730 411	10.0
	2018	30	7 294 310	992 888	13.6
2018-2022	2019	15	7 335 447	1 116 793	15.2
	2020	18	7 378 718	1 180 012	16.0
	2021	21
	2022	24

..: not available.

Note: Reflecting the scope of regulations, student enrolment includes public and government-dependent private provision (*matricula oficial, matricula oficial contratada*), from the transition year to Grade 11.

Source: Data provided by National Ministry of Education (MEN).

Table 15. Student enrolment in single-day schooling in Colombia, 2015-2020, by level of education

Year	Transition year			Primary education		
	Total enrolment	Single-day school enrolment	Share of enrolment in single-day school (%)	Total enrolment	Single-day school enrolment	Share of enrolment in single-day school (%)
2015	560 487	17 738	3.2	3 438 128	113 034	3.3
2016	556 824	31 159	5.6	3 405 647	182 699	5.4
2017	560 693	47 599	8.5	3 362 785	257 489	7.7
2018	563 198	61 670	10.9	3 319 979	327 551	9.9
2019	561 311	75 829	13.5	3 313 535	372 185	11.2
2020	560 845	83 826	14.9	3 295 615	400 338	12.1
Year	Lower secondary education			Upper secondary education		
	Total enrolment	Single-day school enrolment	Share of enrolment in single-day school (%)	Total enrolment	Single-day school enrolment	Share of enrolment in single-day school (%)
2015	2 512 192	134 537	5.4	823 146	51 608	6.3
2016	2 521 611	193 887	7.7	839 942	104 424	12.4
2017	2 526 994	256 731	10.2	846 081	168 592	20.0
2018	2 564 094	322 184	12.6	847 039	281 483	33.2
2019	2 605 652	366 047	14.0	854 949	302 732	35.4
2020	2 642 337	379 281	14.4	879 921	316 567	36.0

Note: Student enrolment includes public and government-dependent private provision (*matricula oficial, matricula oficial contratada*), from the transition year to Grade 11. This reflects the scope of the regulations targeted by the single-day school programme.

Source: Data provided by National Ministry of Education (MEN).

Table 16. Number and share of schools with single-day schooling in Colombia, 2015-2020

Year	Number of school clusters	Number of school clusters with single-day school	Share of school clusters with single-day school (%)	Number of school sites	Number of school sites with single-day school	Share of school sites with single-day school (%)
2015	9 897	490	5.0	43 088	900	2.1
2016	9 882	1 107	11.2	43 417	2 280	5.3
2017	9 871	1 705	17.3	43 979	3 475	7.9
2018	9 813	2 618	26.7	44 006	5 359	12.2
2019	9 788	2 779	28.4	43 956	5 973	13.6
2020	9 350	2 872	30.7	43 853	6 403	14.6

Note: School clusters refer to *instituciones educativas*; school sites refer to *sedes educativas*, in the public sector (*sector oficial*).

Source: Data provided by National Ministry of Education (MEN).

Resource implications and financing

The implementation of single-day schooling requires substantial resources, especially in infrastructure and equipment, but also for operational expenses and additional staff - teachers and non-teachers. Further resources are required, such as for the adequate provision of school meals and the professional development of teachers and school leaders (Radinger et al., 2018_[114]). The National Development Plan for 2018-2022 estimated further investments of COP 3.8 trillion (about USD 2.8 billion) (reference year: 2017) to reduce the remaining deficit of 25 000 classrooms required for single-day schooling (DNP, 2019, p. 685_[126]). For comparison, the total investment budget allocated for all projects in pre-school and school education for 2020 amounted to COP 1.7 trillion (about USD 1.3 billion) (MEN, 2020, p. 184_[129]).

School staff and other current spending

The financing of public school education is highly centralised, with the national budget providing almost 90% of the total resources spent on education. The main funding mechanism is the General System of Transfers (*Sistema General de Participaciones*, SGP), a system for sharing revenues between the central and sub-national governments to help them carry out some of their functions. The distribution of resources is specific to each sector. While the methodology for the distribution of resources is regulated by law, it gives the central government considerable flexibility to regularly modify the form in which it distributes resources among the territorial entities responsible for providing education (Radinger et al., 2018_[114]).

The allocation of resources for education is based on two criteria: i) the provision of education, to ensure the delivery of a basic basket of services to all students in public education, including adult education; and ii) efforts to improve the quality of education. The component for the provision of education is the most important one, distributing resources in relation to the effective enrolment of students, to be spent mainly on staff payroll. For each certified territorial entity, the average per capita cost, based on the cost of maintaining the current payroll of teachers and school leaders, is added to the maximum approved administrative expenditure, based on the previous year's enrolment. Based on the average per capita cost for each certified territorial entity, cost ratios are estimated for each level of education based on a technical relation for the ratio of teachers and students/classroom by level of education at a national level.

To fund the higher operating costs required for the implementation of the single school day, the allocation for the provision of the educational service provides an additional 20% per student in this type of provision to certified territorial entities (Radinger et al., 2018, pp. 87-

94_[114]). Nevertheless, the actual increase in effective operating costs was unclear and much debated among stakeholders, especially for the greater allocation of teaching hours, and other staff to cover activities beyond instruction (Radinger et al., 2018_[114]).

School infrastructure

In order to implement the infrastructure requirements for single-day schooling, the education ministry developed a National Infrastructure Plan (*Plan Nacional de Infraestructura Educativa*, PNIE) in co-ordination with the territorial entities. The strategic importance of this initiative for the introduction of single-day schooling was confirmed by the CONPES (*Consejo Nacional de Política Económica y Social*), the country's advisory body on economic and social policy in Document 3831 in 2015.

The plan has three main objectives: i) to ensure that the infrastructure conditions to implement the single school day are in line with the best minimum standards, ii) to generate a new institutional framework to manage infrastructure projects that optimises the use of financial resources, and iii) to improve the information and data systems related to infrastructure issues.

For the first objective, a national study was carried out which identified the need to build more than 50 000 new classrooms throughout the country to meet that target of universal coverage of single-day schooling by 2030. New quality standards were also set for infrastructure projects, named *Colegio 10* (e.g. in terms of required facilities, which should include a library, laboratories, canteen and kitchen, sports and recreation areas, etc.) (Radinger et al., 2018_[114]). The total required infrastructure investment for universal coverage of single-day schooling was estimated at COP 7.3 trillion (about USD 6 billion) (reference year: 2014). To meet the objective of increasing coverage in single-day school to 30% in 2018 as set out in the National Development Plan for 2014-18, the government sought to provide 31 000 new classrooms, be it by building new schools or by expanding, reconstructing or renovating existing ones. The required investment for this milestone was estimated at COP 4.5 trillion (about USD 3.7 billion) (reference year: 2014) (MEN, 2018, p. 80_[123]).

To address the programme's second objective, securing the resources to finance the infrastructure and equipment required to provide children with safe and adequate spaces for learning, an Educational Infrastructure Fund (*Fondo de Financiamiento de la Infraestructura Educativa*, FFIE) was created through Law 1753 in the National Development Plan for 2014-2018 (Art. 59) in 2018. The operation of the fund was subsequently regulated through Decree 1525 of 2015. In 2019, legislation for the National Development Plan 2018-2022 (Law 1955, Art. 184) introduced some modifications. This fund has been designed to perform three tasks: i) consolidate resources from different sources and channel them towards educational infrastructure investments, ii) manage the resources efficiently, and iii) prioritise and select projects located in areas with the greatest potential impact.

The FFIE is a special fund of the education ministry designed to manage the available resources, develop financing instruments, channel funds from different sources, co-ordinate public-private actors at the national and sub-national level, and approve public-private projects subject to funding availability. The fund receives regular public resources from the education ministry to finance educational infrastructure; contributions from the General Royalties System (*Sistema General de Regalías*, SGR), with the ministry of education as executor of these resources; contributions of the certified territorial entities; and any surpluses from the education allocation of the General System of Transfers (*Sistema General de Participaciones*, SGP).

In the event that the infrastructure fund has additional resources, internal or external credit may be requested, with a guarantee from the state; in these cases, financing is established through a public-private partnership. The different sources of public financing operate as an instrument called autonomous equity (*patrimonio autónomo*), which is governed by private norms and is comprised of all the resources committed by the various institutions contributing to this initiative. Developing part of infrastructure requirements for single-day schooling under public-private partnership scheme reduces public sector direct investment. Initially, it was estimated that 13% of the new classrooms and additional resources would be financed under this modality.

Under the framework of the single-day schooling programme, the FFIE announces public bids for the Secretaries of Education and schools to put forward their investment projects. The certified territorial entities should co-finance 30% of the cost of investments, but for the most disadvantaged departments, that contribution was reduced to 15% and for rural areas to 10%. In special circumstances, such as emergencies or natural disasters, the FFIE can finance 100% of investment (Radinger et al., 2018, pp. 106-108_[114]; Sánchez, 2018_[119]). Any project funded by the FFIE must include reasonable adjustments for access for students with special educational needs.

A diagnostic of the state of existing infrastructure works revealed severe shortcomings in a large number of infrastructure projects underway under the National Infrastructure Plan and financed through the FFIE, notably delays in the execution of projects, cost overruns, and disparities in the quality of the infrastructure delivered. Delays have been related to a number of issues, such as the concentration of projects in a small number of suppliers, difficulties in planning and co-financing by municipalities and departments, and the financing mechanism itself, and had a negative effects on the education of children concerned by the infrastructure projects (Semana, 2019_[130]). To overcome the existing delays and advance in further infrastructure projects, the education ministry has been undertaking adjustments in the administration of the fund (e.g. creating an account for contingencies to cover cost overruns related to delays, promoting the participation of local contractors, improving transparency in project execution, and strengthening co-ordination with oversight bodies). Incomplete infrastructure projects have been reassigned and reactivated (MEN, 2020_[128]; MEN, 2020_[129]).

The education ministry can also support initiatives according to the priorities of the government in office and its respective National Development Plan through its investment budget and related programmes. Given that such programmes and the amount of resources involved depend on the priorities of each central government, they are not a regular source of funding for territorial authorities (Radinger et al., 2018, pp. 95-96_[114]). To support the implementation of single-day schooling, the regulatory framework provided the possibility for the ministry of education to transfer resources from the national budget to the certified territorial entities for single-day schooling through a dedicated programme (*Programa para la Implementación de la Jornada Única y el Mejoramiento de la Calidad de la Educación Básica y Media*).

Some lessons learned

The OECD School Resources Review of Colombia highlighted a number of positive aspects of the reform (Radinger et al., 2018_[114]). While the reform involves a significant investment to provide the required facilities and staff to provide space and time for instruction and other activities, it was deemed an opportunity to improve the conditions of public school infrastructure in the country, as well as an opportunity to improve teaching and learning in schools. It was also seen as a chance to improve complementary services that are indispensable for the implementation of the single school day, such as school meals.

At the same time, the programme constitutes an opportunity to test an inter-institutional co-ordination model that can serve in the future to plan and implement various multi-year school improvement strategies. Single-day schooling is furthermore likely an improvement over the organisation of learning in multiple shifts, which can result in reduced teaching hours, a more stressful learning environment and more limited opportunities for remedial or enrichment classes.

Considering differences between rural and urban areas, the infrastructure dimension of the programme was judged as potentially having a greater impact on rural schools where basic conditions such as sanitation, access to gas and electricity, and the availability of libraries or laboratories tend to be much worse than in urban ones. The rapid roll-out of single-day schooling is also more feasible in rural schools in terms of infrastructure since they are more likely to have the space available to accommodate students than urban schools. Urban schools are often already at the limit of their current capacity, also given the organisation of the school day into double-shifts. At the same time, rural contexts pose their own challenges for implementing a single school day (e.g. students having difficulties getting to school, students having to work outside of school hours).

However, the Review also identified many challenges regarding the implementation of single-day schooling, both in terms of the pedagogical strategies and the financing of the initiative. A first challenge was related to the country's overall difficulties in improving long-term planning and implementation of key national policies. This had to do with the sustainability of the programme since it is a policy that must be ratified by successive governments in the context of a tight fiscal situation while drawing on lessons learned during previous implementation periods.

A second important challenge concerned infrastructure requirements (estimating the classroom deficit, for example), which was initially developed based on existing educational provision and not on those needed to solve remaining problems in educational coverage, especially in secondary education. For example, the number of Grade 11 classrooms was equivalent to only 68.7% of the Grade 9 classrooms or just 39.7% of Grade 5 classrooms, even though children should remain in single-day schooling during their entire schooling. The extension of compulsory education means schools will require additional classrooms through to Grade 11. At the same time, demographic shifts suggest a decline in the school-age population (of about 10.5% by 2030), complicating planning of infrastructure needs. Also, the regular financing of maintenance and replacement costs was not adequately considered in the existing financing system.

A third challenge was identified in the adequate financing of the programme's complementary services, such as school meals. The Secretaries of Education were responsible for providing lunch only. Since the programme requires students to be at school for a longer time, students, especially the most disadvantaged, will however require more than one meal to ensure proper nutrition and ensure the potential contribution of the programme. At the time of the Review, the School Meal Programme (PAE) remained severely underfunded in most certified territorial entities (Radinger et al., 2018_[114]). Nevertheless, at the time of writing this paper, steps were underway to strengthen the school meal programme and address concerns in its administration (e.g. through the creation of an administrative unit on school meals), and between 2017 and 2019, coverage of school meals had been extended, in particular in single-day and rural schools (MEN, 2020_[128]).

Finally, not only must schools have sufficient resources, but they must also focus on pedagogical processes, classroom environments and local capacities so that the programme has a positive impact on educational quality. The implementation of single-day schooling was seen to quickly require an increase in the number of teachers, and thus payroll expenses as well as future social security and pension costs, to cover additional teaching hours. At

the time of the Review, some of the additional time provided in the single school day was provided by teachers doing extra hours. A reform of this size may then also reduce the fiscal space for investments in teaching quality. Also, while pedagogical considerations have been established as conditions for schools to establish a single school day, they may imply a slower implementation than initially envisaged in the government's targets and objectives (Radinger et al., 2018, pp. 115-116_[114]; Sánchez, 2018_[119]).

Concerning the pedagogical dimension and benefits of the single school day, the Review also pointed to difficulties in teachers' use of their time in classrooms and schools. As teachers reported during the Review visit, the longer school day interfered with teachers' group activities such as learning circles and decreased time to exchange experiences and work alongside their peers. Teachers, who are believed to sometimes hold another job in addition to their teaching position, seemed to be opposed to longer school days.

At the time of the Review, it also did not seem to be clear at the school level how to use the extra time – a question that seems essential given the absence of a national curriculum and considerable curricular autonomy for schools. By international standards, instruction time in Colombia was already very high compared to other countries, yet largely stemming from a long school year. While some school principals mentioned that additional hours should be used to strengthen fundamental skills (in mathematics and language), teachers and also some students mentioned that longer school days should not provide more of the same but the chance to practice sports and participate in cultural activities, looking for a more comprehensive education (Radinger et al., 2018, pp. 190-191_[114]).

The Review thus recommended providing adequate resources and ensuring financial sustainability for the single-day schooling programme, prioritising disadvantaged and rural areas for further implementation. For this purpose, it was deemed essential to determine the real costs for implementation, beyond the identification of investment and equipment costs, which was the most advanced component of the initiative. Overall, the Review recommended being cautious in the process of implementing single-day schooling beyond the initial public commitments (Radinger et al., 2018, pp. 205-206_[114]).

These findings are similar to those of García et al. (2018_[131]) which highlighted that single-day schooling represents an opportunity to fulfil a long-standing promise to provide students in public school with a similarly long school day as those in private schools. According to their analysis, single day school also represents an opportunity for students to deepen their learning in core competencies (e.g. in mathematics, languages and science), to develop civic and socio-emotional competencies and to reduce engagement in risky behaviours. However, the policy is considered a costly and difficult one, given challenges in the availability of infrastructure, the organisation of students' and teachers' time at school, and the design of activities.

The authors highlighted that additional activities need to reflect different types of learning opportunities, which respond to the needs of the students of a particular school and requires involvement of the responsible Secretaries of Education. Depending on the context, activities could for instance provide tutoring in mathematics and Spanish, or increase time that students spend in areas such as sports, arts or culture. The availability of teachers represents another challenge, given an already high teaching load for teachers as part of their employment and contract conditions.¹² In this context, the lengthening of the school

¹² Teachers with a permanent contract have a working time schedule of 40 hours a week, which requires them to be at school for 30 hours a week and to dedicate between 22 and 25 hours to contact time with students (García, Maldonado and Rodríguez, 2018_[131]; Radinger et al., 2018_[114]).

day should not require teachers to provide additional teaching time, but rather engage them in other ways during the school day (García, Maldonado and Rodríguez, 2018^[131]).

A first impact evaluation of the short-term effects of single-day schooling on student learning and retention, using a difference in difference design, suggested positive effects on educational quality, particularly in language. Between 2012 and 2016, the share of students at the minimum level in the standardised assessment for Grade 5 showed a reduction of 2.5 percentage points, with an increase in the share of students performing at an advanced level by 1.8 percentage points. In Grade 9, the share of students with insufficient results was reduced by 1 percentage point. The impact was greater for students with a disadvantaged background. For the area of mathematics, a negative effect was however found in Grade 3, with a reduction in the share of students at the satisfactory level by 1.4 percentage points. No effects were found for attrition and repetition rates (Vega Carvajal, 2018^[132]). A second evaluation commissioned by the National Department for Planning (DNP) replicating this study with more recent data suggests similar mixed effects, identifying positive effects on standardised assessments in Grade 5 for language and Grade 9 for Mathematics, but no effect on Grade 3 in language (Econometría-SEI, 2019^[133]).

The evaluation also entailed a qualitative component, analysing the process of implementation of single-day schooling in relation to the objectives of the initiative, and identifying strengths or good practices, weaknesses, deficits or bottlenecks for implementation. Students seemed motivated to stay longer at their school and the programme seemed to mitigate risks of exposure to harm in their free time. Parents valued teachers' work with students and the provision of school meals reduced financial costs. At the same time, it was found that schools with a single school day concentrate too much on basic areas which generates fatigue among students, and reduces time for teaching in other areas, such as arts and sports. There were also issues in articulation between the ministry and Secretaries of Education (e.g. to manage infrastructure investments and to staff schools with sufficient teachers with the right profile). Among others, the study recommended conveying a clear message about the meanings and objectives of the single school day, strengthening support to schools in the implementation of a single school day, and promoting a balance between teaching and recreation (Econometría-SEI, 2019^[133]).

3.5. Denmark

Summary

In Denmark, the central government is responsible for the overall framework and objectives of school education, while the operation of schools is the full responsibility of the municipalities (for primary and lower secondary, the so-called *Folkeskole*) and schools themselves (for upper secondary). More recently, the national government has sought to take on a more prominent role in driving the quality of the school system by supporting a culture of performance management, evaluation and assessment, and local capacity building.

In 2013, the central government introduced a reform to improve quality and equity in public primary and lower secondary education, and more specifically to challenge all students to reach their potential, reduce the influence of students' background on their performance, and build trust and improve student well-being. As one of the core elements of this *Folkeskole* reform, "a longer and more varied school day" was introduced for this stage of school education.

With the extension of learning time as part of the *Folkeskole* reform, the government increased the minimum number of lessons in different curricular subjects, in particular Danish and mathematics, but also other subjects, such as English, nature and technology, and music. In addition, the longer school day introduced the concept of supported learning to provide room for pedagogical innovation for schools and support students in their learning, and established physical exercise and homework assistance as core elements of the school day. Further changes were introduced to improve teaching and learning, for instance through the greater involvement of the local community and the integration of other types of staff in schools.

Within the overall context of governance for the *Folkeskole*, the implementation of the longer and more varied school day is the responsibility of the municipalities together with schools, and they have great freedom to define the content and form of the extended days. The education ministry has been providing guidance on the new requirements and advice on how the different elements can be introduced into teaching and pedagogical practice. To follow up on the implementation of the reform, the education ministry also initiated a comprehensive evaluation programme, and has been mapping the length of the school day on an annual basis.

Assessments of the reform have judged that the extension of the school day provides opportunities for schools and students, but that the effects depend on the quality of teaching and learning taking place, and how teachers and school leaders adjust to the new organisation of the school day. Evaluations also suggest that more time is required to fully assess the effects of the reform, with school leadership being an important pre-condition for success.

3.5.1. Context

Governance of the school system and recent reforms

In Denmark, the central government is responsible for the overall framework and objectives of day care, primary and lower secondary education, as well as upper secondary education. Within these general frameworks and national legislation, the financial and organisational

operation of day care and public primary and lower secondary education, the *Folkeskole*, is the full responsibility of the municipalities. Upper secondary schools have the status of self-governing institutions with different histories and academic profiles. As self-governing institutions, they finance the implementation of one or more education programmes by the means of grants from the central government provided mainly based on the number of students (so-called “taximeter system”). The school leader of an upper secondary school has the overall responsibility for the running of the school and its activity and answers to a board, the members of which are appointed by teachers and students and reflect the school’s specific profile. All upper secondary schools must have a quality assurance system in place, and are themselves supervised by the Ministry of Children and Education (OECD, 2017^[87]; Nusche et al., 2016^[134]; Houlberg et al., 2016^[135]).

To elaborate more specifically on public primary and lower secondary education, this part of the school system is regulated through the Folkeskole Act. The legislation related to the Act sets out the overall goals of primary and lower secondary education, the responsibilities of the different layers of governance, the subjects to be taught and the competence goals and areas of skills and knowledge, the so-called “Common Objectives” (*Fælles Mål*). The Ministry of Children and Education has the overall responsibility for setting the legal, regulatory and financial framework; steering the *Folkeskole*; monitoring the overall quality of education; and ensuring that municipalities and schools carry out the government’s education policies.

Within the framework set by the Folkeskole Act and the education ministry, municipalities determine how their schools are organised, set local goals and objectives, determine the financial framework for their schools, and specify the exact parameters for education (e.g. curricular plans, number of classes taught, additional classes, teacher-student ratios, etc.). Municipalities are responsible for the external evaluation of public schools and for following up on results. They can also launch their own special initiatives and programmes (e.g. organising local learning consultants) (Nusche et al., 2016^[134]).

Schools are responsible for providing education in line with the national aims for the *Folkeskole* and the requirements of their municipality, and for planning and organising their education programme. At individual schools, school principals hold the administrative and educational responsibility. They develop proposals for the activities in their school and for the budget within the financial framework laid down by the municipality. They are responsible for managing their staff and teachers, making decisions about their teachers’ working time, and distributing tasks and responsibilities. They also make all concrete decisions about their students and ensure that teaching is challenging, meets students’ needs and fosters student learning.

Schools and teachers have relatively large autonomy on the content of teaching within the national framework that sets requirements for learning objectives and assessments. While the Common Objectives (*Fælles Mål*), provide a set of binding learning progressions, achievement targets and curricular guidelines, and describe how objectives can be reached, there is generally no tight national curriculum defining the specific content of the teaching.

The school community is involved in the organisation and operation of schools through school boards made up of parents, students and teachers. School boards approve the school budget and teaching materials, and determine principles for running the school (e.g. on the organisation of teaching, the length of the school day, the offer of optional subjects, collaboration between the school and the home, information for parents about their children’s progress). School boards are consulted by the municipality on issues relating to their school. Optional pedagogical councils made up of all school staff with pedagogical functions can provide an advisory function for the school leadership, while student councils

provide a platform for students to voice their views on schools (Nusche et al., 2016_[134]; Eurydice, 2020_[67]).

While the national level has traditionally played a less important part in the governance of the *Folkeskole*, it has sought to take on a more prominent role in driving the quality of the education system by supporting a culture of performance management, evaluation and assessment, and local capacity building. Examples for tools and processes put into place to facilitate soft steering include national performance goals and measures for student achievement and well-being, national learning progressions and curricular guidelines in the form of Common Objectives, compulsory examinations after Grade 9, and national assessments and student plans.

Moreover, the government has established a learning consultant corps to support municipalities and schools, developed IT infrastructure to encourage the use of data, and established new institutions, such as the Danish Evaluation Institute (*Danmarks Evalueringsinstitut*, EVA). These tools, processes and structures constitute the framework within which municipalities, schools, principals and teachers operate. For example, Common Objectives, national assessments and student plans all influence the ways in which teachers should plan their teaching (Nusche et al., 2016, pp. 41-42, 105f_[134]).

Structure and organisation of the school system

The Danish school system is organised in three stages: non-compulsory day care for children from age 0 to 5 (ISCED 0), compulsory primary and lower secondary education for children from age 6 to 16 (ISCED 1-2), and upper secondary education for young people aged 16 to 19 (ISCED 3).

All children aged 6 begin their schooling with one year of compulsory pre-school (grade 0). Children then continue with nine years of primary and lower secondary education, which constitutes compulsory education and is completed with a compulsory school leaving examination. In Grades 8 to 10, students have the option of changing to continuation schools (*Efterskole*), which are private boarding schools offering lower secondary education. Parents are free to decide if their children complete compulsory education at a public *Folkeskole* that offers both primary and lower secondary education in an integrated structure, a private school or through home schooling (Nusche et al., 2016_[134]). In 2020, about 650 000 students were enrolled in primary and lower secondary education, from Grade 0 to 9. About 30 000 students attended a private continuation/boarding school (Grade 8 to 10) (Statistics Denmark, 2021_[136]).

The majority of children attend a *Folkeskole*, but the share of students going to private schools (*Friskoler* and *private grundskoler*) has been increasing (Nusche et al., 2016_[134]). In 2020, about 119 000 students or 18.3% of students in Grades 0 to 9 attended a private school (Statistics Denmark, 2021_[136]). Danish private schools, which receive public funding and can charge tuition fees, decide the objectives for the education they provide, but have to offer an education that is equivalent to the *Folkeskole*. They are also highly diverse, and both students with a weak and strong socio-economic background attend private schools, although studies find that students in private schools, on average, have a more advantaged socio-economic background than students in the *Folkeskole* (Nusche et al., 2016_[134]).

With completion of Grade 9, students have the option of attending a voluntary 10th Grade if they wish, be it at a public or private school or a private continuation/boarding school. Students can do so if they do not feel prepared for upper secondary education, need more time to choose their further educational pathway, or for personal and social development, for example. Data suggest that it is quite common for students to take a voluntary additional

year (Nusche et al., 2016_[134]). In 2020, about 37 000 students attended a voluntary 10th Grade, 59.1% of whom did so at a private continuation/boarding school (*Efterskole*), and 22.5% at a public *Folkeskole* (Statistics Denmark, 2021_[136]).

Upper secondary education (or youth education) builds upon the qualifications that students have acquired in the *Folkeskole* and there is an expectation that all youth complete upper secondary education. Upper secondary education is divided into general and vocational programmes. While general programmes qualify students primarily for access to tertiary education, vocational programmes, which are based on periods in school alternating with periods of practical training in a company, qualify students primarily for a career in a specific trade or industry (Nusche et al., 2016, p. 72ff_[134]). In 2020, about 145 400 students attended general upper secondary education, while about 113 500 students attended a vocational programme (Statistics Denmark, 2021_[136]).

According to the *Folkeskole* Act, students have the right to receive teaching according to their needs, and schools have to provide differentiated teaching that challenges all students. One of the goals of public schools in Denmark is to minimise the impact of students' socio-economic impact. Denmark has also committed itself to the greater inclusion of children with special needs in the mainstream *Folkeskole*, although numerical goals for inclusion that had been set previously have been given up, and an evaluation of inclusion and special needs education has been launched. The decision for special needs provision is taken by the school management and the municipality, involves an assessment by the pedagogical, psychological consultation unit (*pædagogisk psykologisk rådgivning*), and includes parents, students and teachers under general rules set by the *Folkeskole* Act. Based on the assessment, students are provided with educational support in regular classes, special classes or special needs schools (Eurydice, 2020_[67]; Nusche et al., 2016, p. 76_[134]).

3.5.2. A longer and more varied school day: Den længere og mere varierede skoledag

Goals, design and implementation of reform

Context and goals

In June 2013, the Danish government introduced a reform of the *Folkeskole* based on a broad political agreement to improve public primary and lower secondary education (UVM, 2013_[137]). The reform has been implemented since the 2014/15 school year.

As basis of this reform, the government set three national goals related to quality and equity:

- the *Folkeskole* must challenge all students to reach their full potential
- the *Folkeskole* must reduce the influence of social background on academic results
- trust in the *Folkeskole* and student well-being must be enhanced through respect for professional knowledge and practice in the *Folkeskole*.

These three goals were conceived to set a clear direction and a high level of ambition for the development of the public primary and lower secondary education, and to provide a clear framework for a systematic and continuous evaluation of the reform. The three national goals were operationalised through four clear, simple and measurable targets that form the basis for dialogue and follow-up regarding the development of students' academic performance and well-being at all levels.

To fulfil the three national goals, the 2014 *Folkeskole* reform has focused broadly on three main areas of improvement. One of these was the implementation of a longer and more varied school day with more and improved teaching and learning, discussed in the next sections. The other two areas of improvement concerned better professional development of teachers, pedagogical staff and school principals, and few and clear objectives and simplification of rules and regulations (Nusche et al., 2016_[134]).

Pedagogical design and staffing of activities

In Denmark, legislation specifies a minimum number of lessons for different grades (in blocks for Grades 1 to 3, Grades 4 to 6, Grades 7 to 9), as well as an upper limit of total teaching time for all grades (sections 14 b and 16 of the *Folkeskole* Act). The length of these lessons is measured in clock hours and the total time for lessons includes breaks. While legislation also specifies the beginning of the school year and the beginning of the summer holidays (section 14a of the *Folkeskole* Act), primary and lower secondary schools are free to organise their school year as long as they provide the minimum number of lessons. Traditionally, most schools operate on the basis of 200 school days within a period of 40 weeks. Schools themselves are also free to organise their weekly timetable, which differs from school to school. Teaching usually starts between 8:00-8:15 in the morning, and should end no later than 16:00 to give students time for leisure after school, and family and friends (Eurydice, 2020_[67]; UVM, 2020_[138]; Houlberg et al., 2016_[135]).

With the extension of learning time as part of the 2014 *Folkeskole* reform, the government increased the minimum number of lessons to the following:

- 1 200 lessons per year for the mandatory pre-school year (Grade 0) to Grade 3 (later reduced to 1 110 lessons per year as described in the next paragraphs)
- 1 320 lessons per year for Grades 4 to 6
- 1 400 lessons per year for Grades 7 to 9.

Over 40 weeks in the school year, this equals an average school week of:

- 30 hours for Grade 0 to 3 (later reduced to 27.8 hours per week)
- 33 hours for Grade 4 to 6
- 35 hours for Grade 7 to 9 (Houlberg et al., 2016_[135]; UVM, 2020_[138]).


While the extent of the increase differs for each grade, this increase translated into an approximate addition of 280 lessons per year, on average, or 7 hours per week for all students in compulsory education, from the mandatory pre-school year to the end of lower secondary education (World Bank, 2019_[139]). Based on these minimum number of lessons, students will typically be in school for 6 to 7 hours a day, with the day ending usually around 14:00 for the youngest students, and 15:00 for the oldest students, although some days may be shorter, and others longer, depending on the decision of the school (UVM, 2020_[138]).

In 2019, the learning time regulations introduced through the reform were adjusted for the pre-school year and the first three grades of primary education. Since the school year 2019/20, children in Grades 0 to 3 have been expected to attend schools for 2.15 hours less than previously, that is, for 27.8 hours per week instead of 30 hours per week. For the school year, this reduces the number of lessons from 1 200 lessons per year to 1 110 lessons. If needed, municipalities can shorten the school day further for children in Grades 0 to 3. This reduction in teaching time should free up staff who can then support classrooms through team teaching. The school boards, which hold schools accountable, should monitor

and approve the conversion of these resources in schools for team teaching. For other grades, schools can apply to shorten the school day, but this is also subject to approval by the municipality (Eurydice, 2020_[67]; UVM, 2020_[140]).

The reform however not only changed the length of the school day for students, but also the way it is organised. Essentially, the longer and more varied school day provides more time for the teaching of subject-divided lessons, in particular Danish and mathematics, but also other subjects, such as English, nature and technology, and music; introduces the concept of and dedicated time for “supported learning”; and integrates daily sports, exercise and movement as well as homework assistance into the school day (Figure 11). Further changes were introduced as part of the extended day to ensure students reach high standards through their learning, for instance through a clarification and simplification of the Common Objectives; more freedom to offer electives and to introduce elite sports and talent music classes; the greater involvement of local sports clubs, cultural centres and businesses (“an open school”); the competency development of school boards to increase parent and student involvement; and measures for a better classroom climate (Nusche et al., 2016_[134]; World Bank, 2019_[139]).

Figure 11. Pedagogical components and use of time in the longer and more varied school day in Denmark



Note: Physical exercise and homework assistance can be integrated in subject-divided lessons, that is regular instruction, or supported learning. Physical exercise can also be provided with the local community, such as sports clubs and associations. There are no regulations on the extent of breaks, which are a local decision. Normally most schools plan to use about one hour a day for breaks, or 200 hours a year. The reform of the longer and more varied school day also entailed further elements and changes to the way schools organise teaching and learning, e.g. through the greater involvement of local sports clubs, cultural centres and businesses. After-school leisure time facilities (*Skolefritidsordning og Fritidshjem, SFO*) are determined by municipalities.

The introduction of a longer and more varied school day sought to increase the time allocated to learning, both through subject-divided lessons and additional time for supported learning during the remainder of the school day (Houlberg et al., 2016_[135]). These changes were designed to give municipalities and schools the possibility to organise teaching in innovative and better ways, for example through teaching within but also across subjects (World Bank, 2019_[139]). Concerning time for learning in subject-divided lessons, the Folkeskole Act stipulates how many hours the students must have in selected subjects per year, namely Danish and mathematics (for all grades) and history (for Grades 3 to 9). For the remaining subjects, a number of lessons is recommended for each grade. The total

minimum number of hours of regular lessons that schools need to provide constitutes the sum of the minimum number of lessons and the recommended number of lessons for the different subjects (Table 17) (Houlberg et al., 2016_[135]; UVM, 2020_[141]).

Table 17. Distribution of annual learning time across different subject areas according to the curriculum in the *Folkeskole* in Denmark, 2020/21

	Number of hours per year									
	Grade 0	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9
Humanities	x	420	390	360	360	450	480	480	540	540
Natural Sciences	x	180	210	210	240	210	210	330	300	300
Practical/Musical subjects	x	150	180	240	180	270	240	120	60	60
Electives	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	60	60	60
Annual hours of instruction (minimum)	600	750	780	810	870	930	930	990	960	960
Supported learning and break time	510	360	330	300	450	390	390	410	440	440
Total annual learning time (minimum)	1 110	1 110	1 110	1 110	1 320	1 320	1 320	1 400	1 400	1 400

x: not applicable.

Note: Hours refer to clock hours. Humanities include Danish, English, German or French, History, Christianity, and Social Studies. Natural Sciences include Mathematics, Nature/Technology, Geography, Biology and Physics/Chemistry. Practical and Musical subjects include sports, music, visual arts, crafts and design. The amount of instruction time for different subjects is recommended, except for Danish (330 hours in Grades 1 and 2, 240 hours in Grade 3, and 210 hours in Grades 4 to 9), Mathematics (150 hours in each grade), and History (30 hours in Grade 3 and 60 hours in Grades 4 to 9). In these three subject, instruction time is compulsory. Electives are compulsory for Grades 7 and 8 in Practical/Musical Studies. In addition, there are three mandatory topics (road education, health and sex education, and education and jobs) without an assigned number of hours that must be taught as part of the other subjects in all grades. There are no regulations on the extent of breaks, which are a local decision. Supported learning provides time for students to deepen their learning, and to develop their social and emotional skills. Activities typically take three forms: additional time connected to regular instruction, separate activities during the school week that go beyond the traditional subjects, entire school days dedicated to specific electives. The total annual learning time should not exceed 1 400 hours, except for students with more than one elective.

Source: UVM (2020_[141]), "Timetal (minimumstimet og vejledende timetal) for fagene i folkeskolen. Skoleåret 2020/2021" [Hours (minimum and indicative) for primary and lower secondary school subjects. School year 2020/2021], <https://www.uvm.dk/-/media/filer/uvm/udd/folke/pdf20/jan/200117-timetaloversigt-20-21-ua.pdf> (accessed 3 March 2021).

Supported learning, which was not part of the school day prior to the reform, should provide time for students to deepen their learning, and to develop their social and emotional skills. Activities typically take three forms: additional time connected to subject-divided lessons, separate activities during the school week that go beyond the traditional subjects, entire school days dedicated to specific elective courses. The time available for supported learning is the time left after subject-specific teaching and breaks (World Bank, 2019_[139]; UVM, 2020_[138]).

The extended day includes two further elements – physical exercise and homework assistance:

- As part of the school day, students should participate for an average of about 45 minutes per day in sports activities and exercise to support students in their

motivation, learning and development. These activities can be integrated in regular classes or supported learning (e.g. morning runs, ball games or using movement pedagogically to work with content), or be provided in the form of more extended and continuous activities in collaboration with the local community (Houlberg et al., 2016_[135]; World Bank, 2019_[139]).

- From the school year 2015/16, it also became compulsory for municipalities and schools to offer homework assistance as part of the longer school day, with the goal of reducing the impact of socio-economic status on students' learning. Homework assistance can be integrated throughout the school day, be it as part of regular instruction in subjects or supported learning, and should offer activities that suit students with different needs. Students may nevertheless still have homework to do at home (World Bank, 2019_[139]; UVM, 2020_[142]).

As explained above, the longer and more varied school day entailed further expectations in the way schools organise their teaching and learning. In the belief that a simple extension of learning time would not help achieve set goals, the reform set expectations for teachers in terms of the organisation of their working time and of greater collaboration among teachers and staff at school. The reform also entailed changes to staffing with the greater use of pedagogues in schools, although subject-divided teaching has to be provided by teachers. Pedagogues are professionals trained to support all stages of human development from birth to old age and focused on children's and young people's comprehensive development, which includes their intellectual, social, emotional, ethical, and aesthetic development. Depending on the context in which they work, they might be compared to recreational instructors, play workers or social workers (World Bank, 2019_[139]; Nusche et al., 2016_[134]).

According to the Folkeskole Act, the municipalities can decide whether schools should establish leisure time facilities for students after the end of the school day (*Skolefritidsordning*), and how these should operate. The school leader has the overall educational and administrative responsibility for the form and content of school-based leisure time (Eurydice, 2020_[67]). There are also leisure time facilities outside of school, which fall under the responsibility of the municipalities' day care services (*Fritidshjem*).

Implementation and targeting of reform

The reform of the *Folkeskole* has been implemented from the school year 2014/15 onwards following the necessary changes in legislation to the Folkeskole Act. The changes in the length and organisation of the school day applied from that year onwards to all public primary and lower secondary schools, from Grade 0 to 9. Some changes however only applied from a later point in time, notably the requirement for municipalities and schools to offer homework assistance, while other regulations have been adjusted over time (length of learning time required in Grades 0 to 3) (World Bank, 2019_[139]).

Within the overall context of governance for the *Folkeskole* as described at the beginning of the case study, and the pedagogical framework in terms of learning time that schools should provide, the implementation of the extended school day in Denmark is the responsibility of the municipalities together with schools, and they have great freedom to define the content and form of the longer days. The Ministry of Children and Education supports municipalities and schools with guidance on the new requirements, advice on how the different elements can be introduced into teaching and pedagogical practice, and the dissemination of tools, knowledge and experiences (World Bank, 2019_[139]; Statsrevisorerne, 2018_[143]).

To follow up on and support the implementation of the reform, the education ministry also initiated a comprehensive evaluation and research programme, and the ministry has been monitoring and mapping the length of the school day on an annual basis. According to the surveys, a decrease in the proportion of schools with extended days could be observed in 2019, compared to previous years, related to the possibility to shorten teaching time for supported learning and use the freed resources for other purposes, such as team teaching that year. While the data collection for the school year 2020/21 was hampered by the COVID-19 pandemic, results of the survey representing 70% of all public primary and lower secondary schools show that 65% of schools used the possibility to shorten the school day in Grades 1 to 3, and 79% of schools in Grades 4 to 9. Most schools were using the additional resources for team teaching (STUKUVM, 2020_[144]).

The surveys also provide information on the implementation of the different elements of the longer and more varied day, such as supported learning and homework assistance. For instance, the latest available survey reveals that many schools scheduled two hours for homework assistance in 2020 (44-48% of school, depending on the grade level), often integrated into subject-divided teaching (52-59% of schools), and taking place in the early afternoon in 63-71% of schools. With regards to supported learning, the survey provides insights on the type of staff providing this form of teaching, for example. Accordingly, supported learning is provided jointly by teachers and pedagogues at every second school, and primarily by pedagogues in about 20% of schools (STUKUVM, 2020_[144]).

Resource implications and financing

According to the Folkeskole Act, municipalities are responsible for all expenditures in compulsory education, except if stated otherwise by law. Municipalities decide themselves which system of financing they want to use for the schools under their responsibility, but the Ministry of Children and Education has laid down certain minimum requirements (Eurydice, 2020_[67]). A variety of models and mechanisms are used for this allocation in different municipalities. Some municipalities simply allocate a given amount per student, while most municipalities take the socio-economic background of students or neighbourhoods into account in some way. Schools have a high degree of autonomy in using school funding, in consultation with their school board. Individual municipalities might set some more regulations and instructions than the central government, but, above all, school principals are restricted by the national regulations for class size, regulation of the amount of teaching hours in the school year and in the different subjects, and individual students' right to receive teaching in accordance with their needs (Nusche et al., 2016_[134]).

The municipalities themselves have income from local taxes and receive grants from the central government. While municipalities receive some earmarked grants to promote certain policy priorities, the most important grant is a lump sum for any type of expenditure (current and capital spending), including sectors other than education. This central grant is negotiated annually between the central government and Local Government Denmark (KL), the interest group and member authority of the Danish municipalities. Negotiations include both the level of the grant from the central government and changes in the local income tax rate. The agreement sets the goals for the coming fiscal year regarding both municipal economic performance and the development of the different municipal services. It lays down the overall framework for the economy for the coming year and the level of overall service expenditure and capital investments. The allocation of the unconditional lump-sum to individual municipalities follows a budget allocation model of the Ministry of Social Affairs and the Interior, which takes certain characteristics of the individual municipalities into account (Nusche et al., 2016_[134]; Statsrevisorerne, 2018_[143]).

Since 2013, the implementation of the 2014 Folkeskole reform has been an important part of the negotiations between the central government and KL, with the central government steering in relation to the national goals set with the reform. To finance the implementation of the reform, of which the longer and more varied school day is an essential part, the central government allocated a total of DKK 1.8 billion (2014-17), introduced a grant for the competency development of teacher and school leaders (total of DKK 1 billion from 2013-20), and permanently raised the annual block grant by DKK 407 million (Nusche et al., 2016, p. 81_[134]). As Denmark's national audit office summarised, the reform was estimated to increase total public expenditure on primary and lower secondary education by approximately DKK 6 billion between 2013 and 2020, and by about DKK 430 million per year after that. For comparison, the total expenditure of municipalities on the Folkeskole in 2016/17 was about DKK 41 billion (Statsrevisorerne, 2018_[143]).¹³

School staff

The impression of the OECD School Resources Review of 2016 was that the focus of reform was on improving school quality within the available resources, and that the Danish school system was able to implement an ambitious reform with clear goals for improved student learning, motivation and well-being without a major increase in overall spending (Nusche et al., 2016_[134]).

The lengthening of the school day in Denmark was accomplished without hiring additional teachers at the time. As mentioned in the previous section, children and young people have traditionally been able to attend different leisure or youth clubs, either organised at school or outside of schools, after the end of the school day and during some school holidays (*Skolefritidsordning og Fritidshjem*, SFO). For the implementation of a longer school day, it has been possible to shift resources from these after-school programmes to schools, enabling schools to employ more pedagogues, as students' time in after-school programmes decreased following the introduction of longer school days (Nusche et al., 2016_[134]).

While not related to the reform itself, a previous change to teachers' working time arrangements also provided resources for the change in the school day. In April 2013, the Danish parliament passed an Act specifying the framework for the utilisation of teachers' working hours (Act no. 409). Although working conditions in Denmark are traditionally agreed upon between employers and employees without the interference of legal regulation, this Act was passed following the inability of the Danish Union of Teachers (*Danmarks Lærerforening*) and Local Government Denmark (KL) representing the municipalities as employers to reach a collective agreement (Nusche et al., 2016_[134]). At the time of writing, a new collective agreement on teachers' working hours had been reached.

Act no. 409 revised the previous agreement on teachers' working time that had given all teachers a certain amount of preparation time for each class irrespective of their subject or experience. The Act intended to facilitate a better use of staff in schools by encouraging teachers to use their preparation time in a more effective way, and to enable school leaders to move resources to where they are needed. For instance, under this framework, school principals could give newly qualified teachers fewer and more experienced teachers more teaching hours. Under Act no. 409, teachers' working time had remained unchanged, but, within regular working hours, teachers were expected to teach, on average, about two clock hours more per week than prior to the new arrangement (18.3 hours a week compared to 16.3 hours a week) (Nusche et al., 2016_[134]).

¹³ These expenditures were calculated in 2014 on the basis of estimates at the time for price and wage developments.

Following the implementation of Act no. 409, the majority of municipalities issued guidelines on the implementation of the law for schools (e.g. regarding mandatory hours of presence and possibilities to work from home). More than half of the municipalities had introduced attendance requirements that required teachers to be present at school for a certain duration each day irrespective of their number of teaching hours. Various municipalities introduced an upper limit for the number of teaching hours a teacher is supposed to perform. In general, it appeared that municipalities increased the number of classes taught per teacher, and those municipalities with already high rates of teaching hours per teacher continued to have comparatively high rates of teaching hours per teacher (Nusche et al., 2016_[134]).

As part of the state budget for 2021 introduced with the Finance Bill for 2020, the government agreed on the allocation of an additional DKK 400 million per year as part of the central grants, earmarked for hiring additional teachers to support quality improvement in schools, and distributed across municipalities depending on student enrolment. It is up to schools to decide how to use these additional staff, be it for team teaching, smaller classes or time for teachers, for example. This additional funding is planned to increase to DKK 807 million per year from 2023 (UVM, 2020_[145]).

Some lessons learned

The 2016 OECD School Resources Review of Denmark judged that the extension of the school day as part of the 2014 *Folkeskole* reform provided opportunities for schools and students. Teachers' presence at school for longer time was deemed to potentially help students learn and facilitate greater collaboration between teachers and other staff, for instance. Overall, however, the review study highlighted that the effects of the change on student learning would depend on the quality of teaching and learning taking place during these extra hours, and how teachers and school leaders would adjust to the new organisation of the school day as well as working time arrangements introduced through Act no. 409. Depending on how schools adapt to the new arrangement, the Review highlighted risks for the quality and equity of learning (Nusche et al., 2016_[134]).

Concerning the change in working time arrangements, in particular, teachers, school principals and representatives of the teacher union and school leader association voiced concerns about a lack of clarity regarding the process of changing the organisation of working arrangements within schools. Some teachers were found to experience a reduction in their time for preparation and that this posed a challenge for their school. At the time of writing, however, a new working time agreement had been concluded by the teacher union and the municipalities as employers, while additional funding from 2021 onwards to hire additional teachers through the Finance Bill may give teachers more time for preparation.

As part of the reform, the government furthermore intended to reduce the amount of homework and instead use some of the extra hours at school to cover material that used to be done at home. In this context, the Review highlighted that schools needed to find the right balance on the content of the extra teaching hours in schools, using time to further learning among students targeted by the reform, without having a negative effect on equity (e.g. by complementing rather than substituting in-class learning) (Nusche et al., 2016_[134]).

A mixed-method study evaluating the effects of the longer and more varied school day between 2014 and 2018 that forms part of the education ministry's follow-up evaluations to the reform concluded that more time is required for the full implementation of all reform elements (Myrup Jensen et al., 2020_[146]). Municipalities, schools and teachers have great freedom to define the content and form of the extended day. According to the study, less than half of the schools had come a long way with the implementation of (parts of) the

reform, although the implementation of supported learning and homework assistance had increased compared to 2016.

Teachers and pedagogues had become more positive about the reform elements over the years, but they reported lacking preparation time so they can support students learning in a meaningful way. Teachers surveyed for the study for example emphasised the advantages of the flexibility to use hours for supported learning for different purposes. At the same time, it appeared to be a challenge to prepare teaching so it supports subject-specific learning. Overall, school leadership seems an important element for implementation (e.g. by setting priorities and having a clear plan and strategy) (Myrup Jensen et al., 2020_[146]).

Collaboration between teachers and pedagogues, one of the goals of the reform, had been strengthened. According to the qualitative interviews, this was due to an increased understanding for each other's work. In the schools where the collaboration worked well, teachers and pedagogues also experienced greater job satisfaction and recognised each other's competencies. In terms of student learning, the report found no clear indications that the reform had a positive impact. The reform also appeared not yet to have improved achievement of at risk students (Myrup Jensen et al., 2020_[146]).

3.6. Portugal

Summary

The governance of Portugal's school system is fairly centralised, with the education ministry defining, co-ordinating, implementing and evaluating policy decisions for school education. Some responsibilities have been gradually devolved to municipalities as part of wider steps towards decentralisation, while also promoting the autonomy of public schools, although mostly with respect to educational responsibilities. Curricula are defined at the national level, although schools have some freedom on delivery to contextualise learning.

In 2005, the education ministry introduced a series of reforms and measures to improve teaching and learning in the first four years of school education, which included the lengthening of the school day through "full-time school" and curriculum enrichment activities. This change sought to provide new opportunities for students to develop different competencies and to adapt school timetables to the needs of working families, thereby also reducing inequities. In recent years, the government has started to develop plans for extending full-time school to later stages of the school system, and a small pilot programme was established in Grades 5 and 6 in 2020.

The introduction of full-time school did not change the amount of regular instruction as stipulated in the curriculum, but requires schools to remain open until at least 17:30, to offer educational activities for a minimum of eight hours per day, and to provide an extracurricular programme in addition to instruction time in the curriculum, mainly run by monitors. While schools must provide these additional hours for curriculum enrichment, their attendance is voluntary for students.

The management of the enrichment activities and the related resources and staff is the responsibility of "promoting entities", typically the municipalities. Schools (as well as parent associations and private organisations) can also act in this function so that all children in public school can attend an extended day. At the central level, the introduction of full-time schools has been supported through a continuous monitoring process. The school infrastructure was one of the most complex issues in the implementation of full-time school, and a reorganisation of the school network was hence an important element, providing larger and well-equipped schools, and supporting the move away from double-shift schooling.

Evaluations of the introduction of full-time school suggest that the programme had an impact on the openness of schools to the community, school culture and participation, experience with teamwork, and the organisation of time and space to meet shared goals. Challenges were identified, among others, in the articulation of regular instruction and enrichment activities, the integration of new types of staff into school culture, and their working conditions and training.

3.6.1. Context

Governance of the school system and recent reforms

The governance of the school system in Portugal is fairly centralised. The Ministry of Education (*Ministério da Educação*) establishes major policies regarding educational programmes, the curriculum, national examinations, teacher recruitment and deployment, the distribution of funds to public school, and the regulations for the public funding of

private providers. While the education ministry defines, co-ordinates, implements and evaluates policy decisions for school education, a number of central agencies across which ministry services are distributed support policy implementation. Another ministry, the Ministry of Labour, Solidarity and Social Security (*Ministério do Trabalho, Solidariedade e Segurança Social*), which is also responsible for regulating and funding parts of early childhood education and adult education, collaborates in establishing the rules governing vocational programmes in secondary education.

Specific advisory bodies, notably the National Education Council (*Conselho Nacional de Educação*) and the School Council (*Conselho Escolar*), inform education policy making and promote the participation of all education stakeholders, including schools. Other stakeholders, such as municipalities, teacher and parent associations, are also typically consulted. Teacher unions have had an important role in the development of the profession and need to be consulted by law in matters related to teachers' working conditions (Liebowitz et al., 2018, p. 56ff_[147]).

Despite the relatively high degree of centralisation, some responsibilities for public school funding and management have been gradually devolved to the local level as part of wider decentralisation efforts following the instauration of democracy in 1974.¹⁴ Indeed, school education was one of the first sectors to start a process of decentralisation that has also included other public sectors, such as health care and transportation. New responsibilities for municipalities have focused on areas such as the management of school infrastructure facilities and equipment, the management of non-teaching staff and the provision of ancillary services, such as school meals, leaving educational policy and the management of teachers to the education ministry (Liebowitz et al., 2018_[147]).

Over the last decades, responsibilities have been transferred through different types of contracts and agreements between the education ministry and individual municipalities, giving municipalities the possibility to decide to take on increasing responsibilities or not. While ongoing steps to decentralise funding and management have focused in particular on the first cycle of basic education (elsewhere called primary school) and pre-school, more recently, they have been extended to all of compulsory education (Liebowitz et al., 2018_[147]; Ministério da Educação, 2018_[148]). Since 2019, municipalities hold competencies over buildings and non-teaching staff from pre-primary to upper secondary education.¹⁵

Portugal has also been undertaking efforts to promote the autonomy of public schools, although mostly with respect to educational responsibilities. In 2008, the responsibilities of the public school governing bodies was reinforced and a more professional framework for school management was established (Decree-Law No. 75 of 2008). Today, the formal governing body of each public school is the General Council (*Conselho Geral*), composed of different school representatives. The council is responsible for selecting the school principal, approving the educational improvement plan for the school, and conducting internal evaluations (Eurydice, 2020_[67]; Liebowitz et al., 2018_[147]).

The school principal is responsible for the pedagogical, cultural, administrative and financial management of the school, and for choosing their leadership team. In the administration of the school, the leadership team is assisted by staff represented in a

¹⁴ Portugal has 308 municipalities (*concelhos*), which are sub-divided into 3 091 civil parishes (*freguesias*). Municipalities can also further delegate responsibilities to civil parishes in the distribution of funding, resources and services to schools. However, parishes only play a more important role in the provision of education in the country's capital, Lisbon. There are no regional governments besides the Autonomous Regions of the Azores and Madeira.

¹⁵ Important legislation includes Decree Law No. 144 of 2008 and Decree Law No. 21 of 2019.

pedagogical council (*Conselho Pedagógico*) and an administrative council (*Conselho Administrativo*). Parent associations represent and promote the interests of parents for their children's education (Eurydice, 2020_[67]; Liebowitz et al., 2018_[147]).

While school autonomy was originally framed in terms of local participation and democracy, the vision has increasingly emphasised the link between pedagogical and curricular autonomy and school success. Since 2001, public schools have had the right to tailor parts of the curriculum to their specific needs, according to regulations (Decree-Law No. 6 of 2001). The autonomy of public schools does generally not extend to the management of financial resources and the staffing of schools, although public schools can apply for more autonomy in these areas in the form of autonomy contracts with the education ministry, subject to positive external school evaluations and renewal after a four-year period. Nevertheless, the coverage of these contracts is limited and they have not significantly changed school organisation or classroom practice (Liebowitz et al., 2018, pp. 135f, 219f_[147]; Ministério da Educação, 2018_[148]).

The Constitution of the Portuguese Republic (1976) dictates the legal right for all citizens to access education and sets out the basic principals for education and related duties of the state (Articles 43 and 72-75). The Base Law of the Education System, which provides the main reference for education policy (Law No. 46, approved in 1986 with minor amendments since then) reinstates the principles enshrined in the constitution and translates them into the goals and organisation of the school system (Liebowitz et al., 2018, p. 49_[147]). The curricula for basic and secondary education (more on the organisation of the school system in the next section) are defined at a national level by the education ministry. While public schools have had some freedom on how to deliver the national curriculum, curricular autonomy more broadly has been limited, also given the availability of resources. The broad coverage and prescriptive nature of the national curricula have tended to constrain pedagogical autonomy and innovation, especially in grades subject to national examinations (Liebowitz et al., 2018, p. 222_[147]; Santiago et al., 2012, p. 31_[149]).

National examinations take place at the end of basic education in Grade 9 in Portuguese and mathematics as well as the end of general secondary education (Grades 11 and 12) as a requirement for graduation from secondary school. National assessments (*provas de aferição*) are carried out in basic education, in the middle of each education cycle (Grades 2, 5 and 8). While earlier testing regimes focused on measuring the particular performance of students and schools, these assessments are mainly used for monitoring the system overall. Teachers receive information on the achievement of specific students; families and students qualitative reports describing students' skills (Eurydice, 2020_[67]; Liebowitz et al., 2018, p. 53_[147]).

School accountability has traditionally had a strong regulatory dimension focusing on compliance with legislation, but over the last twenty years, a school evaluation system focusing on school improvement has been established. Schools are required to evaluate themselves and are evaluated externally by the school inspection on a five-year cycle, with the third evaluation cycle starting in 2018/19. Teachers and school principals are also subject to individual evaluations, although they have typically not been implemented in recent years (Eurydice, 2020_[67]; Liebowitz et al., 2018, p. 136f_[147]).

Following broad stakeholder consultations on the skills and knowledge students should acquire and a pilot project of curricular autonomy and flexibility with a select group of schools, a reform of the national curricula was adopted in 2018 (Decree-Law No. 55 of 2018). The new curriculum frameworks are being gradually implemented since the school

year 2018/19 in each of the stages of the Portuguese school system, a process that should be completed by 2021/22 (Eurydice, 2020_[67]; Liebowitz et al., 2018, pp. 49, 209_[147]).¹⁶

A student profile (*Perfil dos Alunos à Saída da Escolaridade Obrigatória*) provides the national reference framework for the competencies, vision, principles and values that all students must develop throughout compulsory schooling to be active citizens and lifelong learners in the 21st century. Essential Learning Objectives (*Aprendizagens Essenciais*) provide guidance for teaching and assessment on the subject knowledge, capacities and attitudes students should acquire in each subject or subject area, usually according to the grade or cycle of education. Citizenship and student development are a transversal component of the curriculum at all levels of education. Similar to previous frameworks, the new curricula for basic education also include time for study support (*Apoio ao Estudo*) and a curricular complement (*Oferta Complementar*) to be developed by schools (Eurydice, 2020_[67]; Liebowitz et al., 2018_[147]).

To contextualise learning, schools can tailor up to 25% of their instruction time to their students' needs and interests, and articulate curricular priorities and encourage interdisciplinary work by combining existing subjects and disciplines. This permits, for instance, the combination of a history and Portuguese class into a humanities class that would cover similar content in an integrated fashion, or the organisation of the school calendar in innovative ways. For example, schools may offer some subjects more intensively, but only for part of the year, or they may divide the school year into two semesters, rather than the traditional trimester format. As part of the new curriculum framework, upper secondary students have, moreover, more options to choose their pathway by exchanging and/or substituting subjects according to a range of available options (Eurydice, 2020_[67]; Liebowitz et al., 2018_[147]; Ministério da Educação, 2018_[148]).

Government-dependent private schools must meet the national standards in the pedagogical and academic level of their curricula, while independent private schools can follow the national curriculum or offer an alternative approved by the school inspection services. All private schools can determine what will be taught in at least 20% of the instruction time and choose textbooks and other learning materials without prior government approval (Liebowitz et al., 2018, p. 135_[147]).

Structure of the school system

The Portuguese school system is organised in three sequential levels: pre-primary education, basic education and secondary education. Pre-school education is offered for children between the ages of 3 and 5, in either public pre-schools or government-dependent private centres. Since 2015, 2 years of non-compulsory, pre-primary education are offered free of charge to all children aged 4. Compulsory education typically starts at the age of 6, when children enrol in basic schools. Basic education (*ensino básico*) is organised in three study cycles, with varying lengths:

- The first cycle – elsewhere called primary education – comprises the first four years of basic education under the responsibility of a single teacher (ISCED 1, Grades 1 to 4, typical ages 6 to 9).

¹⁶ The new curriculum framework applied in Grades 1, 5, 7, and 10 in 2018/19, that is, the first years of the first, second and third cycle in basic education and the first year of secondary education respectively. It will be applied in subsequent years in the following school years.

- The second cycle lasts for two years and is organised in interdisciplinary classes under the responsibility of one teacher per subject (ISCED 1, Grades 5 and 6, typical ages 10 to 11).
- The third cycle of basic education, comparable to lower secondary education in other countries and lasting 3 years, furthers the specialisation of the curriculum with one teacher responsible for each subject area or group of related subjects (ISCED 2, Grades 7 to 9, typical ages 12 to 14).

At the end of the third cycle, students (typically aged 15) transition to (upper) secondary education (*ensino secundário*) (ISCED 3). Compulsory education was extended from 2009/10 and formal education has since been compulsory for students until 18 years old or until they complete upper secondary education (Liebowitz et al., 2018_[147]). In 2019/20, there were about 1.27 million students in basic and secondary education, with about 901 000 students in the basic education cycles and 373 000 students in secondary education. About an additional 239 000 children attended pre-school (DGEEC-DSEE, 2021_[150]).¹⁷

Secondary education is organised in both general and vocational education pathways. In the general track, students select between four strands of scientific-humanities courses and a set of technological courses (which are gradually being phased out). Slightly more than half the students enrol in scientific-humanities courses, selecting one of four curricular areas: science and technologies, social and economic sciences, languages and humanities, or visual arts. While the scientific-humanities strand is geared towards further study at the tertiary level, other pathways offer vocationally-oriented courses. Professional programmes (*cursos profissionais*), apprenticeship programmes (*cursos de aprendizagem*), specialised artistic courses (*cursos artísticos especializados*), education and training courses (*cursos de educação e formação*) and the recently discontinued vocational programmes (*cursos vocacionais*) are mainly geared towards integration in the labour market.

A non-negligible portion of students attends basic education under specific programmes other than the regular curricular pathway, suited to their profiles. These include basic level specialised artistic courses, education and training courses, alternative curricular pathways and pre-vocational courses, adapted to struggling students' specific cultures and interests. Basic and secondary education in Portugal also provides a wide array of courses for adult qualification and potential early school leavers (Eurydice, 2020_[67]; Liebowitz et al., 2018, p. 50ff_[147]).

Both public and private providers guarantee the school offer in Portugal. The public school network is principally organised in clusters that integrate schools from different education levels in one organisation under the same leadership. School clusters typically group between five to nine individual school sites or units, but clusters range from as small as two sites to as many as 30 sites. A small share of students attend non-clustered schools, almost all of which provide secondary education only. The organisation of the public school offer in clusters reflects a major consolidation process initiated in 2005, which sought to reduce the number of isolated schools, prevent social exclusion and scale-up pedagogical capacity and efficiency in larger school networks. Establishing school clusters also intended to facilitate transitions across educational levels and improve communication between central authorities and schools since there are now only just over 800 public schools in Portugal

¹⁷ These data on general characteristics of the Portuguese school system refer to continental Portugal only, excluding the Autonomous Regions of the Azores and Madeira, both of which oversee their own education system independently of the education ministry.

(Liebowitz et al., 2018, pp. 53ff, 130ff_[147]). In 2019/20, 3 386 public school units offered the first cycle of basic education, 859 public school units offered the second cycle and 1 073 public school units offered the third cycle. Secondary education was provided in 546 public school units (DGEEC-DSEE, 2021_[150]).

The public school network enrolls most students, but the proportion of those attending public schools varies with the level of education students (53% in pre-primary school, 87% in basic education and 78% in secondary education in 2019/20) (DGEEC-DSEE, 2021_[150]). Enrolment in public schools follows a set of legally defined criteria. Beyond the public education offer, there is a relatively large network of private schools. Private provision is mostly self-financed through attendance fees charged to students' families, but there are also private providers that operate with government funding and on a variety of contracted funding models, particularly at the pre-primary level which has faced pressures to expand capacity (Liebowitz et al., 2018_[147]). In 2019/20, there were 1 212 private schools contracted by the government to provide pre-school education for about 70 000 children (DGEEC-DSEE, 2021_[150]). Government-dependent private provision is intended to fill gaps in the public supply of schooling in over-subscribed or remote locations, specialised artistic areas or special education (Liebowitz et al., 2018, pp. 55, 98, 133, 149_[147]).

Equity and inclusion are guiding principles of education policy in Portugal. In order to help achieve these goals, central authorities provide additional support usually by means of targeted programmes (e.g. Priority Educational Intervention Areas, *Territórios Educativos de Intervenção Prioritária*, TEIP). The law on inclusive education also sets the principles for the inclusion of special needs students in regular schools, aiming to promote equity. The education of students identified with special needs is almost exclusively provided in mainstream schools, with special education schools fulfilling almost entirely a role of resource centres for inclusion. Students may only attend a different institution when learning limitations are sufficiently severe and under approval from the education ministry (Liebowitz et al., 2018, pp. 49, 142_[147]).

3.6.2. Full-time school: *Escola a Tempo Inteiro*

Goals, design and implementation of reform

Context and goals

In 2005, the education ministry started introducing a series of reforms to improve teaching and learning in the first cycle, that is the first four years, of basic education. The measures principally included:

- the reorganisation and consolidation of the school network as described in the previous section
- the lengthening of the school day through full-time school (*Escola a Tempo Inteiro*) and access to curriculum enrichment activities (*Actividades de Enriquecimento Curricular*, AEC)
- the funding of school meals and transportation
- the creation of professional development programmes for teachers of mathematics, Portuguese and experimental science
- the definition of curriculum orientations, establishing minimum hours dedicated to the teaching of the core subject areas of the curriculum (Matthews et al., 2009_[151]).

The introduction of an extended school day and the related curriculum enrichment activities has been implemented with the adoption of Government Order No. 12.591 in 2006, building on the positive experience of another initiative that extended English lessons to students in Grades 3 and 4 (*Programa de Generalização do Ensino de Inglês*, Government Order No. 14753 of 2005). The full-time school programme was introduced specifically with two main objectives in mind:

- to provide new opportunities for students to develop diverse competencies through a range of optional activities and student support, thereby also reducing socio-cultural inequalities
- to adapt school timetables to the needs of working and low-income families, thereby also promoting social justice and reducing the burden on families to provide after-school care (World Bank, 2019^[139]; Matthews et al., 2009^[151]).

Since its inception, the regulatory framework for full-time school and the curriculum enrichment activities has been revised on different occasions.¹⁸ Today the programme is considered part of a broader strategy that articulates the functioning of the school with social support to families and provides care and playful pedagogical activities for children. Additional components of this strategy include care for children in pre-school education before and after the related educational activities (*Atividades de Animação e de Apoio à Família na Educação Pré-Escolar*, AAAF) and care for children in the first four years of basic education before and after the regular school day (*Componente de Apoio à Família*, CAF) (DGE, 2020^[152]).

While all of these strategies focus specifically on pre-school and the first years of basic education, later stages of school education can also offer students additional time at school. Students in subsequent cycles of basic education may attend tutorial classes and extracurricular activities either in public schools or community centres free of charge, or in private institutions for a fee. Similarly, students in secondary education often attend optional tutoring or extracurricular activities at public school or a private institution. Also, a national programme for sport in schools (*Desporto Escolar*) provides sport activities in almost all public schools to students from the second cycle of basic education onwards. As part of this programme – the country’s largest multi-year educational project – students remain at school after the standard school day free of charge and may participate in 36 different sports with over 7 000 teams across all municipalities.

While the length of the school day therefore differs for individual students depending on the level of education, schools’ programmes and families’ interests and needs, an increasing number of students have lunch at school and complement regular instruction time with additional activities outside of the regular curriculum (Ministério da Educação, 2018^[148]; Liebowitz et al., 2018^[147]).

More recently, the Portuguese government has started to develop plans for extending full-time school to the second and third cycle of basic education, that is Grades 5 to 9 for

¹⁸ The latest regulations defining the rules to be observed in the operation of public schools for pre-school education and the 1st cycle of basic education, as well as the provision of activities of animation and family support (*Atividades de Animação e de Apoio à Família na Educação Pré-Escolar*, AAAF), the family support component (*Componente de Apoio à Família no 1.º ciclo do Ensino Básico*, CAF) and curriculum enrichment activities (*Atividades de Enriquecimento Curricular*, AEC) were published in 2015 with Ordinance No. 644-A of 2015. Together with the curriculum frameworks (Decree-Law No. 55 of 2018) and the annual regulations for the organisation of the school year (*Despacho de organização do ano letivo*), they provide the main regulatory framework for the organisation of full-time school.

youth aged 10 to 14 (Liebowitz et al., 2018_[147]; Ministério da Educação, 2018_[148]). This was included as an objective in the programme of government adopted for 2019 to 2023, related to the objective of reducing inequalities in education. Specifically, the government seeks to “implement curriculum enrichment and diversification programmes in public schools that are based on teaching art, different foreign languages and other subjects, such as programming, gradually contributing to a principle of full-time education throughout basic education” (Governo da República Portuguesa, 2019_[153]). In 2020, a small-scale pilot was established to trial full-time school in Grades 5 and 6, in view of a larger roll-out in schools from 2022 onwards (Dias Cordeiro, 2020_[154]).

Pedagogical design and staffing of activities

In Portugal, the education ministry is responsible for defining the school calendar, with the school year typically starting in mid-September and ending in mid-June, providing a minimum of 180 days of instruction. The ministry also defines the mandatory instruction time for the different levels of education as laid out in Decree-Law No. 55 of 2018 (Table 18). In basic education, the amount of instruction time is defined for the different subjects and disciplines in terms of minimum weekly hours (clock hours or minutes), based on the national curriculum, by cycle and grade. Table 19 provides an example of the distribution of hours across disciplines for the first cycle. In secondary education, the specification of instruction time differs substantially between the different pathways. However, generally, instruction time for scientific-humanistic courses is defined in minimum weekly hours as well, while for professional courses simply a total number of hours of instruction time is defined for the three years of study (Ministério da Educação, 2018_[148]).

Table 18. Instruction time requirements in different levels of education in Portugal

Education level		Grade	Weekly workload (minutes)	Weekly workload (hours)	Workload per cycle (hours)
Basic education	1st cycle	Grades 1 and 2	1 500	25	x
		Grades 3 and 4	1 500	25	x
	2nd cycle	Grade 5	1 350	22.5	x
		Grade 6	1 350	22.5	x
	3rd cycle	Grade 7	1 500	25	x
		Grade 8	1 500	25	x
Grade 9		1 500	25	x	
Secondary education	Scientific-humanistic	Grade 10	1 530 to 1 620	25.5 to 27	x
		Grade 11	1 530 to 1 620	25.5 to 27	x
		Grade 12	1 035	17.25	x
	Professional	Grade 10	x	x	3 100 to 3 440
		Grade 11	x	x	
		Grade 12	x	x	

x: not applicable.

Note: This table describes the instruction time linked to the new curriculum framework being gradually applied since 2018/19. Hours refer to clock hours.

Source: Decree-Law No. 55/2018 of 6 July, https://www.dge.mec.pt/sites/default/files/Curriculo/AFC/dl_55_2018_afc.pdf (accessed 12 December 2020).

Within these minimum hours of regular instruction and their curricular autonomy and flexibility, schools are free to organise their schedule and lessons as they see fit. As described above, schools can define up to 25% of their instruction time (that is, of the total workload per grade in a school year in basic education and general secondary education,

and of the total workload in professional courses in secondary education). Moreover, schools have specific staff resources through teachers' non-teaching time and a dedicated allowance of staff time (*crédito horário*) that they can use for instructional activities besides the regular curriculum. While these hours are mainly dedicated to individual or small-group tutoring, they can also be used for other purposes, such as more innovative practices. This can be splitting a class in two groups with two different teachers for more experimental work, for example (Liebowitz et al., 2018, pp. 219-220_[147]; Ministério da Educação, 2018_[148]).

Table 19. Allocation of instruction time according to the curriculum in the first cycle of basic education in Portugal

Curriculum components		Weekly instruction hours	
		Grades 1 and 2	Grades 3 and 4
Portuguese	Citizenship and Development ICT (Transversal areas of curriculum)	7	7
Mathematics		7	7
Environment		3	3
Arts education (Visual arts, Drama/Theatre, Dance, Music)		5	5
Physical education			
Study support (<i>Apoio ao Estudo</i>)		3	1
Complementary offer			
English		x	2
Total			25
Moral education and Religion		1	1

x: not applicable.

Note: The indicated weekly instruction hours (clock hours) constitute a reference for each component of the curriculum. Each school manages, within the scope of its autonomy, the times in the curriculum matrix, so that the total of the teaching time incorporates the time inherent in the interval between activities with the exception of lunch. Study Support (*Apoio ao Estudo*) is a form of supported learning, based on the integration of various curriculum components, focusing on research and the treatment and selection of information. The complementary offer is created by the school and has its own identity and curriculum documents.


Source: Decree-Law No. 55/2018 of 6 July, https://www.dge.mec.pt/sites/default/files/Curriculo/AFC/dl_55_2018_afc.pdf (accessed 12 December 2020).

The introduction of full-time school did in fact not change the amount of regular instruction hours per week as stipulated in the curriculum. Instead, the full-time schedule requires schools to remain open until at least 17:30, to offer educational activities for a minimum of eight hours per day, and to provide an extracurricular programme in addition to instruction time in the curriculum (*Atividades de Enriquecimento Curricular*, AEC) (Figure 12). Children attending full-time school thus start at 9:00 and finish at 17:30, although they may start earlier and end later as well. The reform maintained the equivalent of 5 hours of instruction per day, and added on average around 1 hour per day for enrichment activities, as well as time available for lunch.¹⁹

¹⁹ The latest regulations specify a range for which additional enrichment activities should be offered in the different grades: in 1st and 2nd Grade between 5 and 7.5 hours per week, and in 3rd and 4th Grade between 3 and 5.5 hours. Enrichment activities should only be offered for more than 5 and 3 hours, respectively, where the weekly instruction time is lower than that defined in the curriculum (Ordinance No. 644-A of 2015).

While schools must provide these additional hours for curriculum enrichment, their attendance is voluntary for students. However, once enrolled, students commit themselves to attending for the full school year. If necessary, children may be cared for through the family support activities (CAF) described above, providing further pedagogical activities before and after instruction in the curriculum and participation in enrichment activities, typically for a fee (World Bank, 2019_[139]; Ministério da Educação, 2018_[148]).

Figure 12. Pedagogical components and use of time in full-time schooling in Portugal



Note: Family support (*Componente de Apoio à Família*, CAF) provides additional care for children in the first four years of basic education before and after the regular school day.

In the planning of activities, the resources available in the community should be considered, and the needs of special needs children be taken into account. The number of children in a group should be based on the type of activity and the space as well as the general class size regulations. As a rule, enrichment activities should take place in the afternoon following instruction in the curriculum (Ordinance No. 644-A of 2015). Some schools have developed alternative schedules, integrating extracurricular activities into regular instruction, although this can be difficult where not all students attend the full day (World Bank, 2019_[139]).

At the inception of the programme, the intended range of enrichment activities sought to: i) provide mandatory teaching in English; ii) to provide mandatory time for study support (*Apoio ao Estudo*), during which children could do their homework, for example; iii) and to provide other activities in specific areas, such as sports and art. While some activities, such as English and study support were entirely new, others were already part of the curriculum, with the expectation that more innovative methods would be used. To help assure the basic quality of the activities, the education ministry published curriculum guidelines, for instance in sports or music (World Bank, 2019_[139]; Matthews et al., 2009_[151]).

In practice, however, the nature of enrichment activities organised in schools has varied, depending on local choices, but also available resources in terms of staff, materials and infrastructure. In some cases, this has been motivated by the freedom to devise additional activities and children have experienced the activities as interesting and challenging. Activities have been distinct from those foreseen in the regular curriculum, taking the form of games, story telling, collective construction, singing, dancing, and theatre, for example. In other cases, activities have rather extended the content of the curriculum, resulting in excessive instruction time for children. This may also have been related to limited opportunities for learning about how to structure and implement activities (World Bank, 2019_[139]; Matthews et al., 2009_[151]).

More recent regulations stress that enrichment activities should “have an eminently playful, formative and cultural character”. The type of activities provided should focus, among others, on sports, arts, science and technology, school connections with the community, solidarity and volunteering, and the European dimension in education. The offer should be adapted to the particular context of the school, providing a balance between the interests of students, the profile and training of staff who provide them and the material and other resources available (Ordinance No. 644-A of 2015). This has also been stressed in communication of the education ministry to schools and municipalities as “promoting entities” of the activities (Ofic-Cir/DGE/2016/3210 and letter from the DGE about AEC on 28 June 2017).

The statistical department of the education ministry carries out an annual survey of the provision of curriculum enrichment activities. According to data available for 2020/21, and as in previous years, the three most popular activities among students are related to sports (62% of students in full-time school), arts (58% of students) and English (16% of students) (DGEEC, 2021_[155]).

In terms of staffing, enrichment activities are mainly run by monitors, who are contracted and employed directly by a “promoting entity”, typically the school or municipality (more on this in the next section). Where the promoting entity is the municipality, the school should be involved in the recruitment process. Monitors must have the necessary qualifications as determined by the school principal (Ordinance No. 644-A of 2015). The use of monitors for running activities sought to promote a variety of pedagogical approaches and to ensure that full-time school was financially viable. In the first cycle of basic education, a single teacher is responsible for a class, unlike in the remaining stages of school education. Full-time school thus also provided an opportunity to bring different types of experiences to children. Monitors are often young with a professional qualification in education, who may be waiting to gain a permanent teaching contract through the country’s annual national hiring competition.²⁰ At the same time, temporary teachers employed on a contract basis who ensure greater flexibility in school staffing have taken on the role of monitors where less teachers were required for regular lessons (World Bank, 2019_[139]; Matthews et al., 2009_[151]).

Where permanent teachers do not carry a full teaching load of regular lessons, they may also run enrichment activities (Ordinance No. 644-A of 2015). This use of schools’ teaching staff seeks to optimise the use of resources already available in schools. The allocation of permanent teachers to enrichment activities was for instance an option to

²⁰ Portugal employs teachers on a two-track system, with permanent teachers who, barring misconduct, have permanent rights to a position within a school, and temporary contract teachers who are employed on an annual basis, most re-entering the national hiring competition each year.

reduce costs in the context of increasing budgetary constraints following the financial crisis in 2008, and to maintain the full-time school offer (World Bank, 2019_[139]).

In 2019/20, the curriculum enrichment activities in public school were run by 2 636 teachers employed at school, each spending on average 2.4 hours per week on these activities, and 17 532 monitors, each working an average of 2.6 hours of work per week (DGEEC, 2021_[155]).

Implementation and targeting of reform

While a pilot project has been underway to extend the school day in later stages of school education, and all schools may offer tutoring to students as well as extracurricular activities, the introduction of full-time school has targeted the first cycle of basic education, that is children aged 6 to 9 in Grades 1 to 4, since the beginning of the initiative in 2006. For the organisation of the curriculum enrichment activities that constitute the core of the full-time school schedule, the education ministry has established a general framework, providing guidance on the responsibilities for the definition of schedules, the types of activities, and the profile of staff running them (Ordinance No. 644-A of 2015) (World Bank, 2019_[139]).

The management of the enrichment activities and the related resources and staff is the responsibility of “promoting entities”, typically the municipalities. In this function, municipalities establish a collaboration agreement with the school (e.g. defining activities and their staffing and duration), with schools being responsible for planning and evaluating the extracurricular offer in line with their educational project, following the guidance of the pedagogical council and in consultation with the municipality. In case municipalities prefer not to take on the responsibility of a promoting entity, schools usually act in this function so that children in all public schools can attend an extended day. Also other bodies, notably parents’ associations and private organisations can function as promoting entity, depending on the local context (World Bank, 2019_[139]; Matthews et al., 2009_[151]). In 2019/20, as in previous years, the large majority of promoting entities were however municipalities (39%) or schools (36%) together representing two thirds of all providers (DGEEC, 2021_[155]).

Regardless of the promoting entity co-ordinating the curriculum enrichment programme, parents’ associations and/or private organisations are also often involved in providing the additional activities that complement regular instruction. This can help to support participation in the extended day, and facilitate its management and organisation (e.g. through greater flexibility in the hiring of monitors and the management of small expenses required for the activities compared to rules set by public administration).

At the central level, the introduction of full-time school and curriculum enrichment has been supported through a continuous monitoring process. First, this took the form of a Programme Monitoring Committee (*Comissão de acompanhamento do programa*), incorporating the general director for curriculum innovation and development and regional education directors. Since 2015, a Co-ordinating Commission (*Comissão Coordenadora*), composed of representatives from different departments of the education ministry, has taken on this responsibility. Monitoring processes have typically entailed the consultation of stakeholders and experts, visits to a sample of schools and the collection of data to analyse current provision, and resulted in annual evaluation reports and recommendations for improvement (DGE, 2020_[152]).

Concerning the roll-out of full-time school provision, almost all public schools offer the extended day for children in the first cycle of basic education, and demand from families has been very high. In 2020/21, 81% of students in the first four years of basic education attended full-time school and the related extracurricular activities, a decrease compared to

previous years, possibly explained by the COVID-19 pandemic (Table 21) (DGEEC, 2021_[155]).

In the first cycle of basic education, 10% of schools still offer double-shift provision, where some groups of students have classes only in the morning, while others attend only in the afternoon. This type of provision is especially in the densely populated suburbs of Lisbon (Liebowitz et al., 2018_[147]). From the school year 2020/21, however, all schools should offer a full-time schedule in the first cycle as stipulated by the education ministry, with different shifts offered only in exceptional and justified circumstances, in particular where the school infrastructure is not sufficient for the number of classes, and in agreement with the school community, including parents (Viana, 2020_[156]).

Table 20. Number and share of schools with full-time schooling in Portugal, 2015/16-2020/21

	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
Total number of schools	3 549	3 455	3 484	3 429	3 355	3 354
Number of full-time schools	3 540	3 446	3 479	3 411	3 347	3 340
Share of full-time schools (%)	99.7	99.7	99.9	99.5	99.8	99.6

Note: Data refer to public school education. Data from earlier years were not available.

Source: DGEEC (n.d._[157]), "Atividades de Enriquecimento Curricular" [Curricular Enrichment Activities], <https://www.dgeec.mec.pt/np4/99> (accessed 14 June 2021).

Table 21. Student enrolment in full-time schooling in Portugal, 2015/16-2020/21

	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
Total students enrolled in 1st cycle of basic education	331 764	327 262	324 085	319 409	313 716	315 498
Number of students enrolled in full-time schools	291 726	282 579	278 360	272 765	269 658	254 216
Share of students enrolled in full-time schools (%)	87.9	86.3	85.9	85.4	86.0	80.6

Note: Data refer to public school education. Data from earlier years were not available.

Source: DGEEC (n.d._[157]), "Atividades de Enriquecimento Curricular"[Curricular Enrichment Activities], <https://www.dgeec.mec.pt/np4/99> (accessed 14 June 2021).

Resource implications and financing

In Portugal, the central government executes most strategic decisions according to the annual state budget and education is no exception. The central government is the main source of funding for all levels of school education, and while increasing responsibilities have been delegated to lower levels of governance, most financing decisions are made by the education ministry (Liebowitz et al., 2018, p. 41ff_[147]).

School staff and other current spending

Funding for the current educational expenditure of public schools in Portugal is implemented through a number of allocation mechanisms that distribute and transfer funds to municipalities or schools. The bulk of funding is directly transferred from the education ministry to schools to cover the payroll of teaching staff. Schools receive earmarked grants to pay teachers' salaries at all educational levels. The amount of the central grants to schools for the teacher payroll is based on a process that determines the numbers of teaching staff in any given year, while taking the profiles of staff assigned centrally to schools and the staff salary schedules into account. Schools also receive grants to cover operating costs

(e.g. related to utilities), from the central government and from municipalities, according to specific arrangements and the cycle and level of education. Alongside these regular budgets, schools may apply for additional resources from targeted programmes, typically for equity and in the form of additional staff allocations and related professional development (OECD, 2019^[88]; Liebowitz et al., 2018, pp. 91, 92^[147]; OECD, 2017^[87]).

As described in the section on the governance of the school system above, municipalities have gradually taken on greater responsibilities for the management and funding of public schools, although this has differed across levels and cycles of the school system and across municipalities. More recently, the possibility for municipalities to take on responsibilities for funding and management has been extended to cover all stages of the school system. Responsibilities for the employment of non-teaching staff, for example, have been split between the education ministry and municipalities according to specific stages of education. Since 2019, municipalities have had the option of taking on the responsibility for contracting and paying non-teaching staff in all cycles of basic education and secondary education, according to centrally defined staffing plans on an annual basis. Similarly, the provision of school meals has been managed by municipalities in basic education and pre-school, sometimes by contracting other partners, but this can cover all levels of education if municipalities decide to take on new responsibilities.

To fulfil their responsibilities, municipalities use resources raised through both local taxes and funds transferred from the central government through the Municipal Social Fund (*Fundo Social Municipal*), a fiscal transfer mechanism that distributes resources across municipalities on an annual basis according to a formula and administrative discretion based on spending justification by local authorities. Municipalities have discretion over the use of these centrally allocated funds, as long as they are assigned to broad areas of funding. In 2021, the amount of the funds transferred through the Municipal Social Fund amounted to EUR 163 million (DGAL, 2021^[158]). In addition, municipalities may receive grants as part of specific programmes or through individual contracts and agreements with the ministry. Following further steps to decentralise funding and management in education, an additional fiscal transfer mechanism has been put into place to fund the new responsibilities (*Fundo de Financiamento da Descentralização*).

The provision of extracurricular activities as part of the extended school day has been an important area for which municipalities have taken on key responsibilities, besides the responsibility for mapping and managing the local school network. To implement the activities required for full-time school, municipalities have received funding through the Municipal Social Fund, which includes current expenses and expenses for educational staff for curriculum enrichment activities as one possible area of spending.

The framework for the curriculum enrichment activities moreover includes specific funding to municipalities (and other promoting entities, except schools), on an annual basis to cover the related operating expenses, in particular staff. The amount of the grant is based on the number of students enrolled per activity and the number of hours offered during the school year within an overall ceiling of EUR 150 per student in Grades 1 and 2, and EUR 90 per student in Grades 3 and 4. When the school where the activities are being implemented has staff resources available for running an activity, that is permanent teachers who have fulfilled their minimum teaching time for regular instruction, the corresponding resources are deducted from the financial subsidy. There are no costs for parents and families for their children's participation in the activities (Ordinance No. 644-A of 2015). In the first years of the programme, there appeared to be significant differences in the efficiency with which municipalities used the financial resources made available by the ministry (Matthews et al., 2009^[151]), but more recent information on this was not available.

School infrastructure

As with the funding of current expenditures, the responsibility for managing and distributing capital funding is shared between the central and local levels. While the education ministry has been responsible for investing in secondary schools and the third cycle of basic education, municipalities generally have been responsible for the management and maintenance of school buildings at the pre-primary level and the first two cycles of basic education (Liebowitz et al., 2018_[147]). As part of recent initiatives to further promote decentralisation, the powers of local authorities have also been extended for the investment, equipment, conservation and maintenance of school buildings in all of basic and secondary education, with the exception of some particular schools, although municipalities are free to take on these additional responsibilities or not. This includes the equipment of schools following technical specifications set by the education ministry (e.g. kitchen and dining facilities, sports, lab, musical and technological equipment).

Investments by the central and local authorities take either the form of ad-hoc decisions or infrastructure investment programmes, both based on assessments of needs and standard costs, which take into account the type of teaching and the nature of the intervention. For some schools at the secondary level, infrastructure construction and maintenance is financed by an investment programme co-ordinated by *Parque Escolar*, a state-owned company created to improve school facilities in secondary education (OECD, 2018_[85]; Liebowitz et al., 2018_[147]).

The school infrastructure was one of the most complex issues in the implementation of full-time school and curricular enrichment activities, with more than half of schools operating the first cycle of basic education on a double-shift basis and a lack of facilities to accommodate a longer school day. Most schools had been built for classes of five hours and lacked appropriate infrastructure for other types of activities such as music, sports and arts, or for play, relaxation and sleep. In the initial phase of full-time school, this could limit the range of activities for children who would occupy the same room all day, every day. At the same time, local solutions could be found in such cases (e.g. using municipal facilities), although transportation and supervision of children could be difficult (World Bank, 2019_[139]; Matthews et al., 2009_[151]).

At around the same time of introducing full-time school, the education ministry made a renewed effort to reorganise the existing school network, which had become too large for a declining number of students, in consultation with municipalities and schools. Within a decade, almost half of the country's public schools were closed, most of them primary schools in rural areas, and almost all public schools were re-organised into school clusters as described in the section on the structure of the school system. This process of restructuring the school network was an important element in the implementation of a longer school day, providing larger and well-equipped schools (e.g. sports, science and library facilities), and supported the move away from double-shift schools. At the same time, the introduction of full-time school provided support to parents whose children would attend and travel to school beyond their community, and an incentive for change as part of school network reform (OECD, 2018, p. 146_[85]; Matthews et al., 2009_[151]).

The education ministry provided financial support to municipalities which could apply for co-financing to improve and adapt the school facilities and cover costs for school transport where necessary. The European Structural Fund provided additional resources for the building programmes. Approximately 800 schools benefited from this financing until 2013 and another 300 have received support for infrastructure since then. In total, the central government invested about EUR 1.1 billion, complemented by about EUR 900 million from European funds, plus the costs carried by municipalities (World Bank, 2019_[139]).

The planning and management of the school network and infrastructure, however, remains challenging given the complex demand for school places, which varies between rural and urban locations. On the one hand, there is a high demand for school places, which is also influenced by the plans to further extend full-time school and further raise participation among children, as well as goals to expand access to early childhood education, upper secondary and adult education. On the other hand, a massive decline in the school-age population leads to a much lower demand for school places (Liebowitz et al., 2018, p. 158_[147]).

Some lessons learned

An external evaluation of the introduction of full-time school in 2013, which involved surveys with teachers, principals, municipalities, students, and families, among others, suggested that the programme has had an impact on the openness of schools to the community, school culture and participation, experience with teamwork, and the organisation of time and space to meet shared goals. At the same time, the enrichment activities have not always been well articulated with regular instruction and the educational project of the school, and enrichment activities have sometimes risked displacing and substituting for more creative components of the regular curriculum, notably sports and arts. With regards to students, the programme had a positive impact on autonomy and social competencies, transitions to the second cycle of basic education, higher levels of motivation, and satisfaction with school. Families reported high satisfaction with different dimensions of the programme, such as the quality of staff and the additional time available for students (Fialho et al., 2013_[159]).

An earlier evaluation from 2009 sought to identify innovative and good practices in the implementation of curriculum enrichment activities based on interviews with the various actors involved (students, teachers, monitors, school leaders), an observation of the activities and local documentation (Abrantes, Campos and Alves Ribeiro, 2009_[160]). In general, the results of the study suggested that full-time school had an impact on different dimensions of school life, and required adaptations in the administrative, organisational, curricular and pedagogical framework of schools.

The study identified the importance of defining the principles for organising curriculum enrichment activities within the school community, strengthening the involvement of parents and other local institutions, providing training to monitors to improve professional practices, improving the working conditions of staff, clarifying the relation of activities to the national curriculum, and facilitating the inclusion of special needs students. The study also suggested to better integrate monitors into the school's organisational culture, fostering local ownership over the national curriculum, creating quality spaces, and strengthening the relationship between teachers and monitors (Abrantes, Campos and Alves Ribeiro, 2009_[160]).

As the experience with full-time school suggests, the employment of monitors for the extracurricular activities has not always been without challenges. Fixed-term contracts, lasting from a month to a year, often on a part-time basis and lower pay have been linked to high turnover, influencing the quality and continuity of activities. The integration of monitors into schools has also been a challenge, resulting in frustration among staff. Monitors should be guided and supervised by teachers, but teachers tend not to get involved in monitors' work and may not be at school during those times since activities typically take place after instruction rather than in between classes (World Bank, 2019_[139]; Matthews et al., 2009_[151]).

3.7. Uruguay

Summary

The school system in Uruguay is highly centralised, with the main responsibility for education policy resting with the National Public Education Administration and its central governing council, which in turn co-ordinates the work of four individual education directorates that inform the development and implementation of policy for specific parts of the school system. Public schools have limited autonomy to manage their resources, but also to modify their curriculum, although this differs across levels of school education.

Uruguay's "full-time schools" represent one of the first more systematic approaches of extending learning time at school in Latin America. Following the first creation of full-time primary schools on an experimental basis in the late 1980s, the pedagogical and organisational model was further developed and institutionalised in the late 1990s. The primary goal was to promote the cognitive and socio-emotional development of students, in particular the most vulnerable ones, through a richer and more holistic education. Following difficulties in scaling up full-time schools, an alternative model was introduced in the form of "extended-time schools", which require less resources for implementation. Following the experience at the primary level, and to provide continuity for students in their educational trajectories, full-time and extended-time schools have also begun operating in general secondary education since 2011 and 2016, respectively.

The different learning time extensions provided through full-time and extended-time school models increase the school day to a different extent where they are implemented. The additional time does not increase regular instruction in the curriculum, but provides for different types of enrichment activities, as well as time for meals and recreation. They also entail additional elements to change schools, such as bilingual education, teacher development, and time for teachers to collaborate in the case of full-time primary schools. All full-time and extended-time school models employ specific types of staff, such as workshop leaders and social workers.

In line with the country's centralised governance, the responsibility for planning the educational offer and network, including the transformation of schools into full-time or extended-time models or the construction of new schools for this purpose, lies with the education directorates, with the approval of the central governing council. The needs of full-time and extended-time schools in staffing are reflected in central resource allocations to schools, while infrastructure adjustments have been funded through investment programmes and international loans.

There is still a broad consensus in Uruguay that it is desirable to further increase learning time, especially in primary education. The National Education Plan 2010-2030 emphasises the positive impact of full-time schools and there is a fairly broad consensus on the nature of extracurricular activities (languages, technology, leisure, and individual support). At the same time, the implementation of full-time or extended-time schools also faces some resistance. While different forms of school day extensions have been created, no comprehensive evaluations have thus far identified the effectiveness of each in educational outcomes.

3.7.1. Context

Governance of the school system and recent reforms

The governance of the school system in Uruguay is highly centralised. The main responsibility for formulating and implementing policies in school education lies with the autonomous National Public Education Administration (*Administración Nacional de Educación Pública*, ANEP). The ANEP, which is headed by a central governing council (*Consejo Directivo Central*, CODICEN), has full responsibility for developing and implementing policy for school education in the country (Santiago et al., 2016_[161]).

The CODICEN co-ordinates the work of four education directorates, each of which takes the majority of administrative and curricular decisions and plays an important role in the development and implementation of policies for specific parts of the system: i) pre-primary and primary education (*Dirección General de Educación Inicial y Primaria*, DGEIP), ii) secondary education (*Dirección General de Educación Secundaria*, DGES), iii) technical and professional education (*Dirección General de Educación Técnico Profesional*, DGETP), iv) teacher training (*Consejo de Formación en Educación*, CFE).²¹ While a few initiatives have been developed to delegate more autonomy to the regional level, the different directorates maintain the final say in most administrative and pedagogical matters for their sub-system.

The CODICEN defines the general guidelines for all levels and types of education, including the supervision of private schools. It is also responsible for drafting the educational budget and approving both the curricula and the statutes of teachers and non-teaching staff developed within the sub-systems. In addition, the CODICEN decides on the establishment of new schools (as well as their location) and has authority over the school calendar. The CODICEN co-ordinates the work of the education directorates and is hierarchically above them but, at the same time, the directorates are considered autonomous in their areas of responsibility. The individual education directorates develop curricula, manage teaching and non-teaching staff, establish monitoring processes for public institutions, manage financial resources and submit budget forecasts to the CODICEN.

There are two additional authorities, which play a role for specific aspects in the administration of the school system and early childhood: the Ministry of Education and Culture (*Ministerio de Educación y Cultura*, MEC), which regulates part of private early childhood and pre-primary education, and plays a minor role in policy co-ordination; and the Child and Adolescent Institute of Uruguay (*Instituto del Niño y Adolescente del Uruguay*, INAU), which plays a role in the regulation and administration of early childhood education and pre-primary education. Moreover, the National Institute for Educational Evaluation (*Instituto Nacional de Evaluación Educativa*, INEE) is responsible for evaluating the quality of the entire school system, from pre-primary to upper secondary education (Santiago et al., 2016, pp. 44f, 72f_[161]).

While private schools have considerable autonomy for the management of their resources, public schools have limited autonomy to manage their budgets and staff. Staff allocations are determined centrally for each school along with the selection and deployment of teachers, and the education directorates provide educational materials and other services directly to schools, thus managing the major components of operating expenses. Schools

²¹ The organisation of education directorates within the National Public Education Administration (ANEP) follows legislative changes introduced in 2020 with the *Ley de Urgente Consideración* (Law No. 19.889), concentrating authority further within the central governing council (CODICEN). Previously, responsibilities were deconcentrated to education councils: CEIP, CES, CETP and CFE.

only manage a very small budget (“petty cash”) for small operating expenses (e.g. cleaning supplies and minor repairs) provided by the directorates (Santiago et al., 2016, p. 131_[161]).

The pedagogical, organisational and community work of public schools is typically led by a school principal together with their school leadership team. Parents, students and the community can participate in school affairs, such as the collaboration with external partners and the organisation of social and cultural activities, through participation councils (*Consejos de Participación*), although not all schools count with such a structure yet. Parents can moreover organise themselves and contribute through parent associations, which typically focus on raising additional funds for schools. Parental engagement is typically relatively low in secondary education, also compared to primary school (Santiago et al., 2016, p. 171_[161]).

The General Education Law (*Ley General de Educación*, Law No. 18.437 of 2008) states the general purpose of the education system and defines the general goals of each level of education. The respective education directorates define national curricula for each level and type of education, in consultation with teachers, education experts and the school inspection services, and following guidelines established by the CODICEN. Public schools have rather little autonomy to modify their curriculum and they are required to implement educational programmes as specified by the respective directorate.

In general secondary education, schools have some more flexibility through an open curricular space (*Espacio Curricular Abierto*) at the lower secondary level, and through optional classes in some upper secondary programmes. At the same time, the content of most study programmes and related documents is not clearly defined, and expected learning progressions and outcomes are not always provided. This gives schools and teachers substantial room for interpretation and to decide upon more specific goals, content and methods (Santiago et al., 2016, pp. 78, 188_[161]). Since 2016, a process has been underway to develop a new national curriculum framework (*Marco Curricular de Referencia Nacional*, MCRN) (Act No. 30, Resolution No. 4) (ANEP, n.d._[162]).

Private schools typically follow the national curriculum, but they can choose the courses that they offer and often complement the curriculum with extracurricular activities. They also have considerable leeway in determining the course content, student assessment and textbooks used (Santiago et al., 2016, p. 73_[161]).

Since 2016, the National Institute for Educational Evaluation (INEEd) has been implementing new national student assessment (*Aristas*) every two years for each level of education in public and private schools. These assessments evaluate students’ learning in reading and mathematics in Grades 3 and 6, that is the middle and end of primary education, and Grade 9, that is the end of lower secondary education (INEEd, n.d._[163]). In addition, an online platform run by the ANEP provides online formative student assessments for core subjects to teachers in primary and lower secondary education (*Sistema de Evaluación de Aprendizaje*) (Santiago et al., 2016, p. 58_[161]). There is no comprehensive framework for school evaluation, and each education directorate is responsible for organising the school inspection for its sub-system. At all levels and types of school education, however, the inspections focus on the appraisal of individual staff rather than the evaluation of the school as a whole (Santiago et al., 2016, p. 166_[161]).

Structure and organisation of the school system

The school system in Uruguay is organised in four consecutive stages, managed by the different directorates of the National Public Education Administration (ANEP):

- early childhood and pre-primary education (*primera infancia* and *educación inicial*) (ISCED 0, children aged 0-36 months and 3 to 5 respectively), under responsibility of the DGEIP and INAU (for early childhood education)
- primary education (*educación primaria*) (ISCED 1, Grades 1 to 6, children typically aged 6 to 11), under responsibility of the DGEIP
- lower secondary education (*educación media básica*) (ISCED 2, Grades 7 to 9, typically aged 12 to 14), under responsibility of the DGES and DGETP
- upper secondary education (*educación media superior*) (ISCED 3, Grades 10 to 12, typically aged 15 to 17), under responsibility of the DGES and DGETP.

School attendance is compulsory from the age of four (i.e. the second year of pre-primary education) to the end of upper secondary education. Primary education lasts six years and is provided through different modalities of instruction. Common urban schools provide the regular offer, attending to about 243 000 students from Grade 1 to 6 in 1 971 institutions (ANEP and CEIP, 2020_[164]). Full-time and extended-time schools provide additional hours of enrichment activities in the school day. These types of provision are discussed in this case study from the next section onwards. Practice schools are similar to common schools, but receive teacher education students for their practice. *Aprender* schools are located in a disadvantaged socio-economic contexts and receive additional resources. Rural schools (which may also offer pre-primary and general lower secondary education) provide education in sparsely populated rural areas (Santiago et al., 2016_[161]).

When entering lower secondary education, students choose between two main types of programmes, general education and technical/professional education and training. Similar to primary education, different modalities exist for the case of general lower secondary education, namely full-time and extended-time school, also discussed in detail in this case study. Basic professional training provides a pathway for students at least 15-years-old who have not completed lower secondary education, to acquire a professional certificate in a chosen field and to move on to upper secondary education.

In upper secondary education, students then choose between three different tracks: general education, technical education, or professional training. In both lower and upper secondary education, the large majority of students complete a general programme. While general programmes are offered at secondary schools, technical and professional education and training is offered by technical and agrarian schools (Santiago et al., 2016_[161]). In 2019, about 226 000 students were enrolled in general secondary school, provided by 304 institutions (ANEP and CES, 2020_[165]). About 102 000 students attended a technical or professional programme in secondary education (CETP, 2019_[166]).

With the exception of the capital Montevideo and some surrounding departments, public education is the norm in Uruguay and school choice exists mainly among public schools. With some exceptions in early childhood and pre-primary education, private schools are generally not publicly funded and require payment of tuition fees, although they are exempt from paying taxes (Santiago et al., 2016_[161]).

At primary level, children and their families can choose to go to a special needs school (organised by type of special need) or to attend both a special needs and a regular school, that is, they can split their time between the two schools, attend both schools, or only spend some time period in a special needs school. Provision for special needs education also

includes classrooms in regular schools with groups for inclusion, support and medical teachers in regular schools, and home assistance, if needed. There are no specific provisions for students with special needs in secondary education, although some programmes for special needs students are provided within the mainstream school system (Santiago et al., 2016, pp. 61-63_[161]).

3.7.2. Full-time and Extended-time school: *Escuelas y Liceos de Tiempo Completo y Extendido*

Goals, design and implementation of reform

Context and goals

Since the 1990s, the extension of learning time at school has been a priority among many countries in Latin America and the Caribbean to improve the quality of education and to reduce gaps in performance. Uruguay's Full-Time Schools Programme (*Programa Escuelas de Tiempo Completo, ETC*) represents one of the first systematic approaches of its kind within the region (ANEP, 2017_[167]).

The programme, which focuses on primary education, began in the late 1980s with the creation of the first seven full-time schools on an experimental basis. Following the creation of further full-time schools through the transformation of schools in contexts with spare capacity (e.g. open air schools or rural schools), the pedagogical and organisational model of the programme was further developed and institutionalised in the late 1990s. In 1998, the central governing body of the public education administration, the CODICEN, defined the guidelines and criteria that govern the pedagogical model of full-time schools until today with the adoption of Resolution No. 21 of Act 90 (*Resolución N° 21 del Acta 90*) (ANEP, 2017_[167]).

Two factors brought about the introduction of the full-time schooling programme in Uruguay. First, results from the 1996 National Learning Assessment revealed dramatic differences in student achievement by socio-economic background. Second, the country began experiencing significant demographic changes, with a rapid population decline and a corresponding decrease in primary student enrolment, creating a favourable resource context (Alfaro, Evans and Holland, 2015_[20]). The primary goal of full-time schooling was equity as it sought to promote the cognitive and socio-emotional development of students, in particular the most vulnerable ones, through a richer and more holistic education. As stated in the Resolution No. 21 of Act 90, the implementation of full-time school “seeks to contribute to social equity, benefitting first and foremost the most vulnerable children with an enriched and more complete education”. It was expected that improvements in learning should, in the short term, help improve transitions and reduce repetition and, in the long term, labour market outcomes and incomes (World Bank, 2019_[139]; ANEP, 2017_[167]).

The creation of the full-time school programme was part of a larger education reform process introduced in 1995, known as *Reforma Rama*. This reform process sought to raise student achievement in national assessments; reduce grade repetition and dropout, mainly affecting disadvantaged students; update teacher education; and improve school management. It entailed a number of measures besides the extension of the school day in some schools, such as changes to school meals and the creation of new teacher education institutions across the country (UNESCO-IIEP and SEP, 2010_[97]). At around the same time of these reforms, a Summer School Programme (*Programa Educativo de Verano*) was introduced for primary education, extending the school year for 28 days in the summer, following projects proposed by some schools (Box 4).

Box 4. Summer School Programme in Uruguay (*Programa Educativo de Verano*)

In 1996, a Summer School Programme (*Programa Educativo de Verano*) was introduced for primary education, extending the school year for 28 days in the summer, managed by the responsible education directorate (DGEIP), and following projects proposed by some schools. Typical activities include both extracurricular activities and support to improve language and mathematics (Santiago et al., 2016, p. 83_[161]). Its objectives are the extension of pedagogical time and the strengthening of schools, without losing the school holiday environment. Schools request their participation in the programme every year and present the educational project that will be developed by teachers of the school. All schools offer school meals (*Programa de Alimentación Escolar*, PAE). In addition, some carry out a component called “First Cycle Experience”, in which a teacher works with 15 children from first and second grade to develop their language skills. These students, depending on their progress, could complete the year if they did not do so in December, in the opinion of the teaching team. The programme serves all primary schools that request it, so its coverage is conditioned by the dissemination of the programme (INEEd, 2016, p. 65_[168]). In 2020, about 13 000 children from 130 schools participated in the programme.

By 2010, 168 full-time schools had been built (or created by converting and adapting existing schools) after 15 years of implementation of the policy, and a new government adopted the extension of learning time as the central element of its reform programmes, making full-time schooling a national policy. As the General Education Law (Law No. 18.437 of 2008) made clear in terms of regulations, the extension of pedagogical time and curricular activities should be ensured for students in primary and lower secondary school as part of compulsory education, and plans should be developed to this end.

However, since scale-up had been slow as discussed further below in the section on implementation, an alternative model was introduced to extend the school day in primary education. This new model, known as extended-time schools (*Escuelas de Tiempo Extendido*, or ETE) and regulated through Circular No. 108 of 2013, has been rolled out since such that selected schools do not require additional infrastructure (Alfaro, Evans and Holland, 2015_[20]). Extended-time schools thus provide an alternative to full-time school, and similarly seek to expand learning time as a way to support access and permanence in education, improve achievement and develop other types of competencies for all students. Through the additional time at school, the model furthermore seeks to meet the needs of families and support them in child care (ANEP, n.d._[169]; CEIP, n.d._[170]).

Following the experience at the primary level, and to provide continuity for students moving to secondary education, a full-time school model also began operating in general lower secondary education in 2011, serving initially an enrolment of 150 students (San Luis secondary school in the department of Canelones). As in primary education, an extended-time model has been put into place, targeting however both general lower and upper secondary education. The idea and objectives behind both models is to “create educational spaces with school formats that de-structure institutional times and spaces offering young people the possibility to acquire other learning, develop their creativity, engage in recreational and sports activities, experience different expressions of culture, and participate in actions of solidarity, among others.” The extension of learning time should particularly benefit vulnerable students, by providing greater support and cultural experiences at school (CES, n.d._[171]). In general secondary education, there is moreover a dedicated tutoring project (*Proyecto Tutorías*) implemented since 2008 that grants

individualised support, resources and instruction time to disadvantaged students selected by schools (INEEd, 2016, pp. 66, 141_[168]).

Pedagogical design and staffing of activities

The central governing council (CODICEN) of the National Public Education Administration (ANEP) holds responsibility for setting the school calendar, for deciding when classes begin and when they end, and for defining the number of instruction days or weeks for the different levels of education and programmes in a school year. In primary school, there should be 180 days of instruction per year; in practice, students may attend less or more days than those that are specified. In secondary education, there should be a minimum of 32 weeks of instruction per year (Santiago et al., 2016_[161]; UNESCO IBE, 2010_[172]), although the actual number is typically higher. Based on information provided by INEEd, the school year 2019 had 36 weeks in lower secondary education, and 33 weeks in upper secondary education, for example.

Except for pre-primary and primary education, the national curricula (*planes* and *programas educativos*) specify the number of weekly lessons for different subjects and learning areas (see Table 22 for the detailed example of general lower secondary education):

- In general lower secondary education, there are 39 lessons of 45 minutes per week in total, that is 29.25 weekly clock hours of instruction.
- In general upper secondary education, there are 34 to 36 lessons of 45 minutes in total, depending on the grade, equivalent to between 25.5 and 26.5 weekly clock hours of instruction.
- Also in technical/professional programmes of lower and upper secondary education, the curricula specify the number of lessons for the different subjects that make up the different specialisations (INEEd, 2016_[168]).

In pre-primary and primary education, only a total number of four clock hours of instruction per day, including half an hour break time, is specified (i.e. 20 hours per week). While previous curricula specified the time dedicated to specific subject areas as well, the latest curriculum released in 2009 (*Programa de Educación Inicial y Primaria*) no longer prescribes the organisation or assignment of hours to different disciplines (Feldman and Palamidessi, 2015_[173]).

Table 22. Instruction time requirements in the study programme for general lower secondary education in Uruguay

Subject	Weekly lessons (45 minutes)		
	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9
Spanish	4	4	2
Mathematics	4	4	4
Literature	x	x	4
English	4	4	4
History	3	3	3
Geography	3	3	2
Biology	3	3	3
Physics	3	3	3
Chemistry	x	x	3
ICT workshop	4	4	x
Visual and plastic education and drawing	2	2	2
Sound education	2	2	2
Open Curricular Space	2	2	x
Space for inclusive pedagogical strategies	2	2	1
Physical education and recreation	3	3	3
Social and civic education	x	x	3
Total	39	39	39

x: not applicable.

Note: The curriculum defined in 2006 (*Plan de la Reformulación 2006 ciclo básico*) is aimed at youth graduating from primary education. The curriculum covers three years, with a workload of 39 lessons per week, and the curriculum is organised by subjects. The Open Curricular Space, is implemented through projects appropriate to the context of each school community. Additional study programmes and related curricula are in place for specific groups of students, e.g. overage students: Plan 1996, Plan 2009, Plan 2012, Plan 2013.

Source: DGES (n.d._[174]), "Propuesta Educativa. Programas de asignaturas"[Educational Offer. Programmes of subjects], <https://www.ces.edu.uy/index.php/propuesta-educativa/20234> (accessed 10 April 2020).

The different learning time extensions provided through full-time and extended-time school models increase the school day to a different extent where they are implemented (Table 23). In primary education, common urban schools, practice schools and *Aprender* schools, teach only the regular curriculum (i.e. a school day of 4 hours, including breaks), either in the morning or in the afternoon depending on the shift they offer, while rural schools provide five hours of instruction per day. By contrast, full-time schools add 3.5 hours of curricular enrichment to regular instruction (i.e. a school day of 7.5 hours), and extended-time schools do so for an additional 3 hours per day (i.e. a school day of 7 hours) (INEEd, 2016_[168]).

In general secondary education, the regular school day typically last 6 hours at lower secondary level, and about 5 hours at upper secondary level, providing instruction in the curricular subjects (INEEd, 2016_[175]). In full-time schools at this level of education, students spend eight hours a day at school, participating in additional enrichment activities. In extended-time models, secondary students participate in at least two additional hours of enrichment per week. In both cases, this includes breaks and meals (CES, n.d._[171]).

Table 23. Learning time for students in different levels and types of education in Uruguay

Primary school				
School type	Hours per school day	Minimum number of school days	Hours per school year	Difference in learning time from common urban school (%)
Common urban school	4	180	720	x
<i>Aprender</i> school	4	180	720	x
Practice school	4	180	720	x
Full-time school	7.5	180	1 350	88
Extended-time school	7	180	1 260	75
Rural school	5	180	900	25

Lower secondary education (general)				
School type	Hours per school week	Minimum number of school weeks	Hours per school year	Difference in learning time from school with regular curriculum (%)
School with regular curriculum	30	32	960	x
Full-time school	40	32	1 280	33.3
Extended-time school	32	32	1 024	6.7

Upper secondary education (general)				
School type	Hours per school week	Minimum number of school weeks	Hours per school year	Difference in learning time from school with regular curriculum (%)
School with regular curriculum	25	32	800	x
Extended-time school	27	32	864	8

x: not applicable.

Note: Hours refer to clock hours. In general secondary education, hours per school week are calculated based on the duration of typical school days (6 hours in lower secondary, and approximately 5 hours in upper secondary); hours per school year are calculated based on minimum number of school weeks and days, although the number of actual weeks and days in a school year may differ. Full-time and extended-time models at all levels of education provide the regular time of instruction in the curriculum, plus additional forms of activities, including lunch and breaks. The regular curriculum in general secondary education refers to *Plan reformulación 2006*. The table does not present all types of programmes in general lower secondary education.

Source: Adapted from Table A.5 in INEEd (2021_[176]). "Identificación de los elementos que inciden en la asignación de recursos en los liceos públicos" [Identification of the elements that affect the allocation of resources in public general secondary schools], <https://www.ineed.edu.uy/nuestro-trabajo/publicaciones-del-ineed.html> (accessed 4 June 2021).


Initially, full-time schools in primary education simply provided more learning time within the school day, as well as lunch and a snack, but left the curriculum and infrastructure unchanged. Following a consultative process involving educational authorities, the school inspection, teachers and experts, however a revised model was introduced in 1998 that featured a new pedagogical approach (*propuesta pedagógica*). This final model included bilingual education, teacher development, and time for teachers to discuss, plan, and evaluate their work with their peers. It also included a substantial infrastructure component, and the provision of educational materials for schools (Alfaro, Evans and Holland, 2015_[20]). In sum, the final model has been structured around four pillars: i) the extension of the school day, ii) a specific pedagogical approach, iii) teacher development, and iv) investments in school infrastructure (ANEP, 2017_[167]).

Concerning the use of the additional time, full-time primary schools should promote the goals of the curriculum and support students' learning through projects, organised games, and student assemblies (Figure 13). The daily schedule should be organised so that 75% of time is dedicated to activities (in lessons or projects) and 25% to meals and relaxation. Schools are free to organise their schedule as they wish in line with their pedagogical project, but full-time schools typically start at 8:30 and end at 16:00. Where necessary,

schools can prolong the day by an additional hour to accommodate the needs of working parents, and provide care (incl. the possibility to shower), nutrition and academic support to children in that time. This has however been difficult in practice, given staffing issues (World Bank, 2019^[139]).

The morning should be dedicated to regular instruction in the curriculum. Generally, teachers should work with their class in two separate lessons of 90 minutes, separated by a break of 15 minutes. In the afternoon, schools should provide the curricular and pedagogical enrichment, distinct to regular lessons, in which all students in the school participate. Additional activities take the form of play (*hora de juego*), at least three times per week for 45 minutes; projects (*talleres*), for two hours per day; and school climate evaluations (*evaluación de convivencia*), for 45 minutes per week. Projects should be linked to the curriculum, in particular the natural and social sciences, and lead to a final project. Student assemblies should help resolve conflicts and contribute to a good school climate. The school week should also provide time for sports (1.5 hours per week). The full-time school day provides three meals – breakfast, lunch and a snack – which are considered part of learning time (e.g. promotion of a healthy lifestyle) (CEIP, n.d.^[170]; World Bank, 2019^[139]; UNESCO-IIEP and SEP, 2010^[97]).

Figure 13. Pedagogical components and use of time in full-time and extended-time schooling in Uruguay



Note: Besides specialised staff to run the workshops, general secondary schools with a full-time schedule also provide a socio-educational team for students composed of a psychologist, a social worker and a pedagogue, among others. Workshops can take the form of sports, music arts or second language activities.

The pedagogical approach of full-time primary schools should be innovative and follow these principles:

- the production and comprehension of written texts as a cross-cutting theme to teaching
- the development of problem-solving skills through the capacity to search and process information
- the use of play-based elements in teaching, such as games and group projects, to keep students motivated to learn
- a balance of collective work in small groups and individual autonomous work
- the establishment of clear learning goals and frequent evaluations and self-evaluations to consolidate and improve learning
- an overall school environment with clear and agreed upon norms that offers students affection, and life experiences that are new for the children, to build confidence and self-esteem (CEIP, n.d._[170]; World Bank, 2019_[139]; UNESCO-IIEP and SEP, 2010_[97]).

Full-time primary schools are supported by specialised teachers to run additional activities and workshops (e.g. in the arts, music, sports, English) (Santiago et al., 2016, p. 168_[161]). The programme also includes specific policies for staff, such as salary incentives for teachers and school principals to work in full-time schools (5% wage increase for principals compared to common urban schools) and dedicated training for teachers and school principals (INEEd, 2016, pp. 154, 164_[168]). Dedicated “co-ordination” meetings (which are otherwise only organised in *Aprender* schools at primary level) provide time for school-based professional collaboration (2.5 hours per week) (Santiago et al., 2016, p. 254_[161]).

Extended-time primary schools also provide the regular curricular schedule of 20 hours per week (i.e. 4 hours per day), to which 15 hours of workshops are added per week (i.e. 3 hours per day) in areas such as sports, music, arts or second languages. The activities are decided by the school according to local contexts, needs and resources, and they are provided by dedicated staff and workshop leaders. Students participate on a mandatory basis, when enrolled in the school. The school day typically lasts from 10:00 to 17:00, with extracurricular activities in the morning, and instruction in the curriculum in the afternoon. Children have two meals per day (breakfast and lunch or a snack) (INEEd, 2016, p. 63_[168]; CEIP, n.d._[177]).

In general secondary education, students spend eight hours a day at school as part of the full-time school model. In addition to regular instruction in the curricular subjects, students can participate in tutoring and workshops (*tutorías, talleres*), such as arts and culture. Activities are proposed by workshop leaders and optional for students, but once enrolled, they have to attend. An important emphasis is on family engagement, health and nutrition. Curricular structures are more flexible, and should entail more transversal and interdisciplinary work, new pedagogical methods and practices, as well as new teaching resources and educational content. Moreover, teachers can work in pairs or groups of three. Full-time secondary schools also require a specific mix of staff, which includes a socio-educational team composed of a psychologist, a social worker and a pedagogue, among others. To co-ordinate the work of staff, schools have four hours of co-ordination a week (CES, n.d._[171]; INEEd, 2019_[178]; INEEd, 2021_[176]).

Extended-time schools at general secondary level provide at least 2 hours of tutoring and workshops per week (e.g. vocational guidance, gardening, computer science, robotics).

While this differs across schools, students should select at least one activity. The use of workshops (which should be developed based on students' needs) as an educational strategy seeks to break with traditional use of time and space. The engagement of the community is a further essential element to enrich the curricular offer, and social and sports clubs and associations should participate in the development of the pedagogical project, offering spaces to carry out the extracurricular activities. Like full-time secondary schools, extended-time secondary schools have specific staff (e.g. workshop leaders and workshop coordinator) (CES, n.d._[171]; INEEd, 2019_[178]; INEEd, 2021_[176]).

Implementation and targeting of reform

As described above, the extension of learning time in Uruguay first targeted primary school and children aged 6 to 11, but was later extended to general secondary education. In practice, nevertheless, longer school days are still the exception in general secondary schools as analysed in the next paragraphs. Since primary schools also offer pre-school education, the longer school days may also be offered to 4 and 5 year-olds, following a similar schedule, but with age-appropriate activities, such as play-based learning and using outdoor spaces such as playgrounds (World Bank, 2019_[139]).

The responsibility for planning the educational offer and network lies with the education directorates, involving areas such as the school inspection services, planning, architecture and school meal departments. The inspection generally plays an important role in this articulation. The transformation of schools into full-time or extended-time models or the construction of new schools for this purpose then rests with the education directorates, but with the approval of the central governing council (CODICEN) (INEEd, 2021_[176]; Santiago et al., 2016_[161]).

While initially full-time primary schools were established in contexts with spare capacity (e.g. rural areas), schools were subsequently selected by the responsible directorate (DGEIP) according to two main criteria, namely socio-economic disadvantage and local population growth. Targeting disadvantaged contexts, the programme has however also covered more advantaged contexts to avoid the risk for negative labels and stigma attached to it. The feasibility for implementation (e.g. the availability of sufficient space), and the existing offer of schools with longer days have also been taken into account. Within the National Public Education Administration (ANEP), a dedicated unit (*Coordinación del Proyecto de Escuelas de Tiempo Completo*) has been responsible for co-ordinating the programme and for managing the further development of the pedagogical model (ANEP, 2017_[167]; CEIP, n.d._[170]; UNESCO-IIEP and SEP, 2010_[97]).

The transformation of primary schools into extended-time models similarly requires an analysis of the context and needs, involving different departments of the directorate for primary education (DGEIP). This should involve a reflection on the following aspects: characteristics of the school community, including students and teachers; acceptance of the proposed modal; the teaching staff and their preparation in different fields; and the available infrastructure (Circular No. 108 of 2013) (CEIP, n.d._[177]). Extended-time schools are located across the socio-economic distribution (INEEd, 2019_[178]).

In the case of full-time and extended-time general secondary schools, the responsible directorate (DGES) and its educational planning and evaluation departments decide on the implementation of these different models, in consultation with other relevant departments and authorities as well as secondary school leaders. The decision typically concerns: i) the implementation of the model in an already operating school or ii) the construction of a school for that particular model. Where the decision of implementing a longer school day concerns an existing school, the match between the requirements of the pedagogical proposal and the capacities of the schools is considered. Demand can be another element

taken into account. Both models target vulnerable students at risk of dropping out of education, and socio-economic factors of the student population should therefore also be taken into account (e.g. from demographic surveys or socio-vulnerability indices), but this has been difficult in practice given availability of data on students' socio-economic status (INEEd, 2019_[178]; INEEd, 2021_[176]).

Uruguay leaves the choice of public school for their children to families themselves, and generally, students typically attend their neighbourhood school. In primary education, demand for full-time schools and extended-time schools currently exceeds supply. In these cases, students with a sibling in the same school have priority for admission, followed by students resident in the neighbourhood of the school or with parents working there at the time of enrolment. Full-time schools also take into account the household income and the mother's labour market situation in their admission process (Santiago et al., 2016, p. 77_[161]).

Different national five-year budgets and related plans for education have set targets for increasing the offer of full-time and extended-time schooling. As part of the Budget Plan for 2015 to 2019, the ANEP established annual targets for the percentage of students attending full-time schools for the period 2016 to 2020, for example (Santiago et al., 2016, p. 143_[161]). The most recent Budget Plan for 2020 to 2024 stresses in particular the need to further increase the participation of disadvantaged children in longer school days as well as the expansion of learning time in secondary education (ANEP, 2020_[179]).

Looking at trends in provision and coverage, the number of primary schools providing full-time schooling grew significantly, doubling from 46 schools in 1995 to 104 schools in 2005, and since then to 284 (Table 24). The number of students in both full-time and extended-time primary schools almost doubled in the last ten years to more than 49 000 (Table 25). The share of enrolment in schools with longer school days has increased slowly over time, but the growth in enrolment has accelerated over the last years (ANEP and CEIP, 2020_[164]). Concerning longer school days in general secondary education, the full-time model remains very limited, expanding to a total of 7 schools in 2019; 24 schools offered an extended-time schedule that year (ANEP and CES, 2020_[165]). One challenge in extending full-day school has been a significant shortage of teachers in the country (INEEd, 2016, p. 128_[168]; Santiago et al., 2016, p. 243_[161]).

There is still a broad consensus in Uruguay that it is desirable to further increase learning time, especially in primary education, which has low teaching hours compared to other countries. The National Education Plan 2010-2030 emphasises the positive impact of full-time schools and there is a broad consensus on the nature of extracurricular activities (languages, technology, leisure, and individual support). Some political parties have however made proposals to extend the school year rather than the school day (from 180 to 200 days) (INEEd, 2016, p. 175_[168]).

At the same time, the transformation of double-shift schools into full-time or extended-time schools also faces some resistance. On the one hand, not all teachers express preference for working full-time in the public sector, many times because they work at multiple schools, including in the private sector. On the other hand, not all families prefer to send their children to a full-time school. In particular, some more advantaged families prefer to choose and hire private tutors (e.g. for English) (INEEd, 2016, p. 137_[168]).

The OECD review study of Uruguay recommended that expanding programmes such as full-time and extended-time primary schools should remain a priority in Uruguay to increase learning time for students from disadvantaged backgrounds (Santiago et al., 2016_[161]).

Table 24. Number and share of schools with full-time and extended-time schooling in Uruguay, 2002-2019

			2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	
Primary education	Full-time school	Number of schools	92	95	102	104	109	111	120	132	134	
		Share of schools (%)	9.3	9.6	10.4	10.6	11.8	21.1	13.0	14.3	14.3	
				2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
		Number of schools	157	170	188	198	205	209	271	220	228	
		Share of schools (%)	16.9	18.2	20.0	21.1	22.0	22.5	23.4	23.9	24.8	
				2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
	Extended-time school	Number of schools	29	34	37	40	47	49	56	
		Share of schools (%)	3.1	3.6	4.0	4.3	5.1	5.3	6.1	
				2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
	General secondary education	Full-time school	Number of schools	1	5	6	6	7
Share of schools (%)			0.4	1.9	2.3	2.3	2.6	
			2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	
Extended-time school		Number of schools	x	x	x	x	x	12	15	24	24	
		Share of schools (%)	x	x	x	x	x	4.5	5.7	9.1	8.8	

x: not applicable ..: not available.

Note: For general secondary education, the estimates were calculated exclusively with data from lower secondary (12-14 years), the main target group of the programme.

Source: Data provided by National Institute for Educational Evaluation (INEED), based on data from the National Public Education Administration (ANEP).

Table 25. Student enrolment in full-time and extended-time schools in Uruguay, 2002-2019

			2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	
Primary education	Full-time school	Number of students enrolled	17 589	18 494	20 326	20 844	21 994	21 834	23 924	25 748	25 660	
		Share of students enrolled (%)	5.7	5.9	6.5	6.7	7.2	7.3	8.2	9.0	9.2	
				2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
	Full-time school	Number of students enrolled	28 778	30 238	32 957	34 541	35 786	36 725	37 971	38 889	40 277	
		Share of students enrolled (%)	10.5	11.4	12.6	13.5	14.3	14.9	15.6	16.0	16.6	
				2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
	Extended-time school	Number of students enrolled	x	2 239	3 559	4 566	5 583	5 840	7 700	7 745	8 751	
		Share of students enrolled (%)	x	0.8	1.4	1.8	2.2	2.4	3.2	3.2	3.6	
				2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
	General secondary education	Full-time school	Number of students enrolled	164	199	200	230	212	881	1 033	1 220	1 312
Share of students enrolled (%)			0.13	0.16	0.16	0.19	0.18	0.72	0.84	1.03	1.15	
			2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	
Extended-time school		Number of students enrolled	x	x	x	x	x	7 745	7 648	10 165	9 319	
		Share of students enrolled (%)	x	x	x	x	x	6.31	6.20	8.57	8.16	
			2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	

x: not applicable.

Note: For general secondary education, the estimates were calculated exclusively with data from lower secondary (12-14 years), the main target group of this programme.

Source: Data provided by National Institute for Educational Evaluation (INEED), based on data from the National Public Education Administration (ANEP).

Resource implications and financing

School staff and other current spending

Within the ANEP, the allocation of teaching resources to schools is principally based on the prediction of student enrolment, taking into account the modality under which the school operates and the programmes and cycles offered. This estimation allows the education authorities to compute the number of student groups (classes) the individual school should operate therefore defining the teaching resources the school is allocated. The number of teachers' working hours also depends on the type of school (in common urban schools each teacher has 20 hours, in full-time schools, a teacher has 40 hours, for example). Schools are also assigned hours of other teachers, such as support teachers or ICT teachers, as well as hours of other staff such as psychologists or social workers. Operating expenses, in turn, involve discretionary decisions by the central authorities as they distribute materials to individual schools and directly pay their utilities' bills (e.g. water, heating, electricity). In primary education, the allocation of equipment to schools also takes the modality of the school (incl. full-time) into account (Santiago et al., 2016_[161]; INEED, 2016, p. 111_[168]).

Table 26 presents unit cost estimates for schools operating with different school days for the year 2018 (full-time vs. common urban school, based on an enrolment of 225 students, considering the typical requirements of both types of schools). The unit costs of full-time schools were 81% higher than for common schools and amounted to UYU 94 680 per student annually (equivalent to about USD 3 945), compared with about UYU 52 181 pesos per year (USD 2 174) in common urban schools. For extended-time schools, no data for 2018 are available, but for 2014, the recurring costs for extended-time schools was estimated to be 54% higher than for common schools (INEEd, 2016, pp. 62-63_[168]).

The amount of salaries per student has grown on an annual basis, mainly given the expansion of the number of hours per student served (5.1% in initial and primary education per year, demonstrating the highest increase). This growth responded, among other factors, to the expansion of schools with extended pedagogical time (full-time and extended-time schedules), but also to the decrease in the ratio of students per teacher (associated with the demographic decline and repetition), and the expansion of targeted support programs (such as community teachers and Ceibal teachers) (INEEd, 2016, p. 87_[168]).

Table 26. Cost estimation for common urban schools and urban full-time schools in Uruguay, 2018

ANNUAL COSTS (UYU) 2018					
COMMON URBAN SCHOOL					
	Item	Quantity	Unit cost	Total cost	Share in spending (%)
Staff expenditure	School principal	1	909 272	909 272	
	Secretary	1	622 378	622 378	
	Teacher (20 hours)	9	622 378	5 601 402	
	Physical Education teacher (20 hours)	1	622 378	622 378	
	Workshop teacher (15 hours)	1	432 280	432 280	
	Auxiliary services assistant (30 hours)	2	350 229	700 458	
	Technical assistant (grade 2, scale D)	1	373 133	373 133	
	Substitution			982 526	
	TOTAL STAFF EXPENDITURE			10 243 827	87
Other current expenditure	Meals	225	2 171	488 475	
	Transportation subsidy for teachers			87 177	
	Other spending	225	4 095	921 375	
	TOTAL OTHER CURRENT SPENDING			1 497 027	13
	TOTAL SPENDING			11 740 854	
	STUDENT ENROLMENT			225	
	SPENDING PER STUDENT			52 182	
URBAN FULL-TIME SCHOOL					
	Item	Quantity	Unit cost	Total cost	Share in spending (%)
Staff expenditure	School principal	1	1 256 907	1 256 907	
	Secretary	1	1 139 354	1 139 354	
	Full-time teacher (40 hours)	9	1 139 354	10 254 186	
	Physical Education teacher (20 hours)	1	622 378	622 378	
	Workshop teacher (15 hours)	1	432 280	432 280	
	English teacher (20 hours)	1	622 378	622 378	
	Auxiliary services assistant (canteen) (40 hours)	2	503 488	1 006 976	
	Auxiliary services assistant (30 hours)	2	350 229	700 458	

	Technical assistant (grade 2, scale D) (30 hours)	1	373 133	373 133	
	Substitution			1 719 298	
	TOTAL STAFF EXPENDITURE			18 127 348	85
Other current expenditure	Meals	225	8 651	1 946 475	
	Transportation subsidy for teachers			103 523	
	Other spending	225	5 003	1 125 675	
	TOTAL OTHER CURRENT EXPENDITURE			3 175 673	15
	TOTAL SPENDING			21 303 021	
	STUDENT ENROLMENT			225	
	SPENDING PER STUDENT			94 680	


Notes: Spending on staff: calculated at average salary grade 4. Costs for substitutions are estimated based on the percentage of execution in the previous year. Meals: calculated according to the traditional service, plus purchase of milk. UYU: Uruguyan Pesos, in current values.

Source: ANEP (2018_[180]), "Anuario Estadístico 2017" [Statistical Yearbook 2017],

<https://www.anep.edu.uy/sites/default/files/images/Archivos/publicaciones-direcciones/DSPP/Anuario%20estad%C3%ADstico%202017.pdf> (accessed 14 August 2020).

Also in secondary education, the modalities offered directly influence the salary costs of schools per student (INEEd, 2021_[176]; INEEd, 2021_[181]). Looking at salary cost per student by type of secondary schools, full-time secondary schools have the highest cost per student, followed by rural and integrated secondary schools where this is explained by low student-teacher ratios and therefore high fixed costs. In full-time secondary schools, high costs are explained by additional hours for teachers, including for co-ordination, as well as additional staff allocations (INEEd, 2019_[178]).

Figure 14. Annual salary cost per student in different types of general secondary education in Uruguay, 2017



Note: UYU: Uruguyan Pesos, in current values.

Source: INEEd (2019_[178]), "Informe sobre el estado de la educación en Uruguay 2017-2018" [Report on the state of education in Uruguay 2017-2018], <https://www.ineed.edu.uy/images/ieeuy/2017-2018/pdf/Informe-sobre-el-estado-de-la-educacion-en-Uruguay-2017-2018.pdf> (accessed 14 August 2020).

School infrastructure

Full-time primary schools are on average smaller than other schools. This has been due to a specific policy to reduce the size of new schools, under the assumption that it facilitates working conditions, management and learning. Under this premise, many full-time schools

were built to accommodate an average of 200 students (8 classrooms for Grades 1 to 6 in primary, and two years of pre-school; a ratio of 25 students per class). Urban primary schools that do not operate a full-time or extended-time schedule use the building infrastructure in two shifts (a group of students attends 4 hours in the morning and another attends in the afternoon) (INEEd, 2016_[168]).

A dedicated investment programme (*Programa de Apoyo a la Enseñanza Primaria Pública*, PAEPU), which is funded through loans from the World Bank and also provides targeted resources for the professional development of teachers in full-time schools, has been supporting the adjustments of the school network to provide for full-time schooling since the mid-1990s to the present. In 2019, about UYU 274 million (about USD 10.8 million) were spent on the programme's infrastructure component (data provided by INEEd, reference year: 2019). A similar programme is in place for secondary education in co-operation with the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB). Funds from this Support Programme for Secondary Education and Training in Education (*Programa de Apoyo a la Educación Media y Formación en Educación*, PAEMFE) have also been used for the transformation and creation of full-time and extended-time general secondary schools (INEEd, 2016, p. 118_[168]; OECD, 2018_[85]).

In urban schools, the demographic decline has resulted in a decrease in class size that, without reaching the extremes of rural school ratios, have reached much lower levels than the established reference size (25 students per group). In view of this, the education directorate has been merging groups in double-shift common schools to transform them into full-time or extended-time schools, with a minimum or no requirement for additional infrastructure. In short, the demographic decline has been used as an opportunity to extend the instructional time at the cost of an increase in the student-teacher ratio within regulated limits (INEEd, 2016, pp. 115, 137_[168]).

Overall, the extension of learning time requires a considerable increase in infrastructure investment and a significant increase in current expenditure, mainly for staff remuneration. A continuation of the policy therefore requires, to optimise existing resources, possibly raising the ratio of students per class in schools where it is relatively low or, at least, lower than the “desirable” maximum established for primary schools, in order to minimise infrastructure requirements and additional teaching hours (INEEd, 2016, p. 175_[168]).

Some lessons learned


While different forms of extended school day models have been created, no comprehensive evaluations have thus far identified the effectiveness of each in educational outcomes (INEEd, 2016, p. 175_[168]). This also concerns in particular the impact of longer school days in general secondary education (ANEP, 2020_[179]). However, a recent evaluation sought to analyse the effect of full-time school provision on reading, writing and mathematics achievement in Grades 3 and 6, educational transitions to secondary education, as well as satisfaction, motivation and expectations among students. As the evaluation suggests, compared to students in common urban schools, students in full-time provision made more progress over three years in mathematics and writing, although the effects were moderate. There was no differential effect in gains in reading. Similarly, educational trajectories did not differ between students in common schools and full-time schools. Students and families in both types of schools reported high levels of satisfaction with their educational offer, although perceptions were even more positive in full-day school (ANEP, 2017_[167]).

4. Policy implications

Changes to the length and organisation of the school day always need to consider particular contexts and need to be informed by evidence and social and political debate. Based on the insights from the research literature and the experience of the case study countries, this working paper highlights that learning time reforms require a careful assessment of the likely benefits, drawbacks and trade-offs before embarking on such a significant change. Increasing the length of the school day might be an efficient strategy for some schools and school systems but not for all, and other policies can offer more cost-effective means for achieving the same objectives.

Figure 15 illustrates one way to structure reflections on the extension of school days and its implications for policy and stakeholders. As described in the working paper's introductory sections and case studies, extended school days can serve a range of different goals related to economic, social or academic outcomes. These goals should guide policy makers' responses to questions related to the different dimensions of the policy's design: its pedagogical model, its resource implications, and the reform's implementation and monitoring.

Figure 15. Model for thinking about school day extension policies



Some of the key questions related to each of these three dimensions in the model for reflection are listed in the following:

Pedagogical model

- Which activities are offered, when, where, and by and for whom?
- How are regular curricular instruction and other types of activities aligned?
- Who is responsible for designing activities and determining the use of time (incl. for breaks and meals)?
- How do extended school days complement other of out-of-school activities for children and youth?

Resources

- What changes are required in school staffing, educational spaces and materials, and complementary services such as school meals?
- What is the reform's likely impact on operating costs and infrastructure investments? How are these cost estimates affected by other factors, such as demographic developments and other policies?
- Who is responsible for financing the reform? How do financing mechanisms need to be adjusted?
- How can authorities be supported and held accountable for their planning and use of resources?

Implementation and monitoring

- What is the envisaged timeframe for extending the school day?
- Which levels of education, groups of students, and types of schools are targeted?
- How are schools supported to provide quality activities (e.g. through good working conditions and professional learning)?
- How are the reform's impact and implementation challenges monitored?

Extending the school day can have profound effects on school staff, students and parents. At the same time, these actors play an important role in shaping the design of school day reforms and their successful implementation, as is illustrated by the outer ring of Figure 15.

In light of this framework and based on the case studies discussed above, the following sections present some lessons that can guide debates and reflections on the design of policies in systems that consider extending and reorganising their school day. These include:

- Reflecting on the goals of a longer school day and developing a pedagogical model fit for these goals, while involving teachers, parents and students in its design.
- Ensuring quality in the different activities offered as part of the school day, from regular instruction to extracurricular programmes.
- Implementing reforms gradually and carefully, and monitoring and evaluating their impact.
- Estimating costs and adjusting funding mechanisms and governance arrangements to ensure adequate and sustainable financing.

4.1. Reflecting on the goals of a longer school day and developing a pedagogical model fit for these goals, while involving teachers, parents and students

Policies to extend the school day can pursue a range of objectives, from supporting student learning and development, innovations in teaching and learning, and greater equity in educational opportunities, to making it easier for working parents to combine their family responsibilities and professional lives. Countries need to reflect carefully about their goals and objectives for lengthening the school day to inform how the additional time at school should be used. In some contexts, it has been unclear how to use the additional time at school and different stakeholders may have different priorities, which can complicate the achievement of set policy goals.

Extending the school day affects teachers, parents and students in different ways. For teachers, longer school days often require greater presence at school, challenging traditional ways of working. Policies may also entail the hiring of new types of staff with different experiences and profiles, which can change schools' organisation and culture. For students, longer school days affects how they use their time at school and entails fewer hours available for family, friends, leisure and extracurricular activities outside of school. Similarly, for parents, changes in the length of the school day influence the time they have available for family life and work, respectively, and the management and organisation of their children's schedules. Not always will different needs and interests be aligned.

Reflections on school day extensions should therefore consider how such a change would affect different members of society and communities, and involve them in the design and implementation through extensive and continuous consultation processes, both at national and local levels. As the design of the longer school days in the case study countries shows, extended days provide an important opportunity to rethink schools and how they could support students in their learning and development, which should be fully embraced and feature in discussions about school day extensions.

Table 27. Goals and objectives of extended school days in case study countries

Country	Name of policy	Year	Main policy objectives for student learning	Other main policy objectives
Austria	<i>Ganztagsschule</i>	2008	Quality, Equity	Family/Work-life balance
Chile	<i>Jornada Escolar Completa</i>	1997	Quality, Equity	Pedagogical and curricular innovation
Colombia	<i>Jornada Única</i>	2014	Quality, Equity	Pedagogical and curricular innovation
Denmark	<i>Den længere og mere varierede skoledag</i>	2014	Quality, Equity	Pedagogical and curricular innovation
Portugal	<i>Escola a Tempo Inteiro</i>	2006	Quality, Equity	Family/Work-life balance
Uruguay	<i>Escuelas y Liceos de tiempo completo y extendido</i>	1998 / 2011	Equity	Pedagogical and curricular innovation

Note: Austria created the legal foundations for all-day school in 1993, but it has been a policy priority since 2008. Similarly, in Colombia, the legal foundations were set in 1994, but the single-day school programme in its current form began in 2014. In Colombia, the single school day also seeks to promote learning and development from a holistic educational care and management perspective. In Denmark, the reform was part of a larger reform of primary and lower secondary education. Uruguay has expanded full-time schooling to secondary education since 2011.

As the different initiatives to extend the school day analysed in this working paper illustrate, the designs of the longer school days differ widely, also in line with the different policy goals. For instance, where the focus is on social benefits for working families (e.g.

Austria and Portugal), strategies will be different to contexts that put greater emphasis on fostering student learning and development (e.g. Chile, Colombia and Denmark). In line with such different goals, changes will emphasise an increase of time for regular instruction or for other types of learning and activities, all of which in turn influences staffing, infrastructure and resource requirements.

At the same time, reforms to extend the school day may not require offering the same type of pedagogical model to all students and schools. The needs of students and families may, for instance, differ between rural and urban areas given different family structures, childcare arrangements and after-school activities. Similarly, needs may differ between younger children in primary school and adolescents in secondary education. As the existing research literature suggests, adding time at school (especially instruction time) has different effects for different students. Providing a rich array of activities geared to the specific needs of different students, including those at risk of low performance, seems an approach worth exploring (e.g. remedial lessons, enrichment programmes, outdoor and real world experiences).

This links to questions and decisions about the distribution of responsibilities for the extension of time at school, and the role of schools, education authorities and local actors. It also ties in with questions and decision about modalities for students to participate and enrol in the additional activities (e.g. if they should participate on a voluntary basis, how to admit students in case activities are over-subscribed, etc.).

Authorities and schools should monitor how changes to the school day affect different student groups, how they meet their needs and interests, but also how they affect their motivation, levels of stress and fatigue. As highlighted in the brief research summary in Section 2, it is important to bear in mind that more learning time can actually lead to fatigue and boredom among students and burnout among teachers (Marcus et al., 2020^[41]; Patall, Cooper and Batts Allen, 2010^[6]). In this context, the design of extended days also requires a reflection on the role of homework and if and how this should be incorporated into the school day.

Prior to engaging in reforms of the school day, it is essential to identify the effects of extended school days on the human resource requirements that such a change implies. A review of the staffing needs and potential changes to the staff mix will be helpful, again in light of the specific policy objectives. As the case studies demonstrate, reforms often pursue multiple goals, including holistic student development, and seek to support disadvantaged students in particular. This may require different profiles to teachers, such as social educators and psychologists. Likewise, extracurricular activities may require specific expertise (e.g. for arts or sports). Some countries, such as Portugal and Uruguay, have then made the specific choice to employ other types of staff to provide new types of activities for students rather than regular instruction, and also created new development and qualification programmes for such staff (e.g. in Austria for leisure educators). The addition of different staff profiles may be particularly impactful in primary education where in some contexts a single teacher may be responsible for a class of students.

Depending on their design, reforms may then affect teacher labour markets and working conditions in different ways and require at the same time a reflection on the organisation of teachers' working time (e.g. would reforms reduce working time, would they require extra hours from existing staff, or additional staff not readily available, would reforms increase non-teaching time, etc.). In defining the necessary staffing needs and profiles for different activities, consultation with teachers and teacher unions is therefore an important pre-condition for success, to avoid potential conflicts in labour relations, but also to ensure that the goals of the reform are met (e.g. providing different types of activities with different staff rather than more curricular hours with teachers).

Finally, plans to extend the length of the school day need to be well articulated with other existing offers of after-school care, including those offered by other authorities, to ensure that resources are used effectively and that the different programmes (which might have different goals) meet the needs of students and families. Indeed, in Denmark, the change towards a longer and more varied school day was facilitated by shifting resources and staff from available after-school activities to the new activities in the school day.

Similarly, recent plans to increase coverage in all-day school in Austria have given greater attention to making use of existing after-school care in the form of day care centres. In yet other cases, such as Colombia and Uruguay, additional models of extended learning time have been developed over time to provide more learning time but that require less resources (e.g. staffing and infrastructure due to different pedagogical models and time provided). At the same time, in Chile and Portugal, additional types of provision have been created to provide further support for families and parents or guardians to care for children before the beginning and after the end of the extended school day.

Table 28. Pedagogical design and staffing of extended school days in case study countries

Country	Name of policy	Year	Pedagogical model				Staffing
			Increase in regular instruction time	Time for extracurricular activities	Time for assisted learning	Central regulation of breaks and relaxation	
Austria	<i>Ganztagsschule</i>	2008	No	Yes	Yes, individual or subject-related learning time	No	Teachers for regular instruction and learning time, other types of staff for other activities (e.g. leisure educators)
Chile	<i>Jornada Escolar Completa</i>	1997	Yes	Yes	Not regulated	No	Teachers for all activities
Colombia	<i>Jornada Única</i>	2014	Yes	Yes	Not regulated	No	Teachers for all activities
Denmark	<i>Den længere og mere varierede skoledag</i>	2014	Yes	No	Yes, assisted learning and homework assistance	Yes	Teachers for regular instruction, teachers and other types of staff for other activities (e.g. pedagogues)
Portugal	<i>Escola a Tempo Inteiro</i>	2006	No	Yes	Yes, study support	Yes	Teachers for regular instruction, teachers and other types of staff for other activities (e.g. monitors)
Uruguay	<i>Escuelas y Liceos de tiempo completo y extendido</i>	1998 / 2011	No	Yes	Yes, tutoring in secondary school	Yes	Teachers for regular instruction, teachers and other types of staff for other activities (e.g. workshop leaders and co-ordinators)

Notes: “Time for assisted learning” includes for example homework assistance and tutoring.

In Austria, extracurricular activities during students' leisure time are defined by municipalities and schools, and should be dedicated to relaxation and individual development in creative, artistic, music or sports activities. In Chile, schools have a number of discretionary hours for which they can define activities. In Colombia, schools must provide time for other activities, such as recreation, meals and sports, artistic, social or cultural activities, in addition to regular instruction. In some municipalities and departments certified to provide education, other types of staff are involved in the activities provided through the single school day, in collaboration with the country's funds for family benefits (e.g. Bogotá, Cundinamarca and Sincelejo). In Denmark, the longer and more varied school day provides more time for teaching subject-divided lessons, supported learning, sports and exercise as well as homework assistance. In Portugal, extracurricular activities should have a playful, formative and cultural character and focus on the following activities: sports, arts, science and technology, school connections with the community, volunteering, and the European dimension in education. In Uruguay, at primary level, additional activities take the form of play, projects, and school climate evaluations. In secondary education, activities focus on tutoring and workshops (e.g. arts and culture).

4.2. Ensuring quality in the different activities offered as part of the school day, from regular instruction to extracurricular programmes

To reap the potential benefits of school day reforms, their implementation needs to consider the quality of the different activities taking place during the extended school day (e.g. through adjustments of physical spaces, regulations on group sizes, qualification requirements for staff, arrangements for school meals, and the allocation of resources and materials). Spending more time at school does not automatically lead to more learning, as demonstrated by the highly heterogeneous effects identified in the research literature (see Section 2 for a review), and much remains to be understood about its effects on other outcomes as well. It is crucial that the extension of school days, which entails a significant investment of resources, includes specific provisions on the effective use of the additional time to achieve its goals.

Inevitably, changes to the organisation of schools will take time and require the support from educational authorities, as evaluations in case study countries such as Denmark illustrate. Teachers, school leaders and other types of staff (where they are employed to provide additional activities) should have opportunities to develop their pedagogical practices so that time in class and other activities is used effectively and responds to the needs of students. Indeed, in some case study countries, the development of teachers' skills has been an integral part of longer school days (e.g. Denmark and Uruguay) or received greater attention in recent years (e.g. Colombia). Equipping schools and their staff so they engage effectively with parents also seems important to ensure continued support for children and their learning at home. The extension of the school day should then also involve a dialogue with teacher educators and teacher education institutions, on how to incorporate training needs arising from the reform in initial and continuing education programmes.

More generally, given the impact of longer school days on staffing needs, both in numbers and profiles, it is essential to consider how the different types of staff are attracted and prepared for their roles, both through favourable working conditions and high-quality education and training. To ensure a high quality in pedagogical and extracurricular activities, sufficient attention also needs to be paid to the qualification and training as well as the working conditions of all types of staff, not just teachers (OECD, 2019_[88]). In some case study countries, for example, unfavourable contract conditions of staff responsible for the additional activities have reportedly led to high staff turnover and harmed staff motivation (e.g. Portugal).

School leadership has a crucial role to play for the successful pedagogical and organisational management of longer school days. This is particularly so in contexts where schools have a large degree of autonomy to define the additional activities offered during the extended day (e.g. Chile and Colombia). Such freedoms provide schools and their

communities with the opportunity to reflect about their curriculum and pedagogical activities and practices. At the same time, curricular and pedagogical autonomy requires the right framework conditions and sufficient resources available to schools (be it in the form of funding or staff allocations) and evaluation and assessment policies. For instance, in both Chile and Colombia, standardised assessments put particular focus on specific areas of learning, which has created incentives to focus the additional time on learning in these areas, although the goals of the reforms had been much larger. In general, it has been challenging in most case study countries to achieve the reforms' pedagogical goals and to offer activities that complement regular instruction.

Policy makers should also consider how to articulate the different elements of the extended school day (e.g. how to support collaboration among staff providing regular instruction and staff providing additional activities in light of different work schedules). This has been a challenge in some case study countries, such as Austria and Portugal. Other countries, such as Uruguay, have addressed this challenge by providing dedicated time for different staff to co-ordinate their work in the week. At the same time, a longer school day that introduces other types of staff represents an opportunity for developing multi-professional teams and for professional learning and exchange, which should be encouraged and embraced.

4.3. Implementing reforms gradually and carefully, and monitoring and evaluating their impact

Overall, policies to extend the school day should be conservative and realistic in their objectives to extend coverage rates over time. The process of implementation should be gradual and informed through monitoring and evaluation processes.

As the case studies with available data show, extended school days typically entail significant costs related to investments in school infrastructure and increased current spending on staff as well as ancillary services, such as school meals. At the same time, as the evidence from the research literature and from the case studies highlights, the academic benefits of an extended school day are not always proportional to the costs involved, although the objectives of longer school days can go beyond academic achievement, of course. A more gradual approach to implementation would allow for piloting, monitoring effects and making adjustments in the process, which could involve the definition of a baseline of relevant impact indicators to assess how these evolve with the reform. Denmark and Portugal, for example, have put in place systematic evaluation mechanisms to gather information about the changes to the school day, including stakeholder perceptions, while other case study countries have relied on more ad-hoc evaluations.

As the case studies also illustrate, increasing coverage of student enrolment in schools providing a longer day has typically taken considerable time. In all countries except Denmark, at the time of writing, longer school days were not yet universal in the levels of education targeted by the respective reforms, although reforms were initiated several years ago. The full-day and full-time school policies in Chile and Uruguay, for instance, date back to the late 1990s. In several case study countries, such as Austria, Chile and Colombia, ambitious targets for roll-out of extended days had to be adjusted and the timelines extended.

Difficulties in reaching set goals could, for instance, be linked to factors such as a changing budgetary context and fiscal constraints, limited technical capacity (e.g. to plan and implement complex infrastructure investments), shortages in human resources (teachers, but also other types of staff), and concerns by stakeholders (e.g. teachers, parents, local authorities). In Chile, Portugal and Uruguay, for example, staff shortages hindered the provision of some activities. As a consequence, efforts to extend the school day should

adjust expectations and set realistic timelines, making the most of the more gradual implementation by proactively managing it, while anticipating and addressing potential difficulties, such as staff shortages (e.g. through partnerships with the local community to bring in expertise).

One way of adopting a more gradual approach in implementing longer school days is to focus efforts particular levels of the school system, such as primary education, in line with policy goals. This can help in managing tight fiscal resources and allocating them to where the benefits are expected to be most pronounced for students and families. Portugal and Uruguay constitute two examples for such an approach. Both countries targeted lower levels of education when introducing a longer school day in 1998 and 2006 respectively, and have only more recently developed initiatives to extend longer school days to later stages of school education. Austria and Denmark have also targeted the reform to specific parts of their school systems, while Chile and Colombia have applied their full-day and single-day models to all levels of school education.

Another option is to target scarce resources on disadvantaged schools and students that are more likely to benefit from a longer school day. The experiences reviewed here suggest that extended-day schools can provide an opportunity to improve the conditions for learning of the most disadvantaged schools (e.g. through investments in infrastructure), to provide a safe environment and after-school activities that would otherwise not be available to all students, and to support families with the greatest difficulty to balance work and care (e.g. single parents). Greater equity has indeed been an important policy goal in all case study countries, although targeting practices and underlying pedagogical strategies have varied between countries. Uruguay provides an interesting case, seeking to achieve equity objectives while avoiding to create a stigma around full-time and extended-time schools, by not restricting this model to disadvantaged schools and students.

Reforms can also target specific areas of school education with excess capacity, such as rural schools, where the necessary infrastructure is already in place. In Chile, Uruguay and Portugal, for example, declining student enrolments and a changing school network facilitated the implementation of extended school days by re-deploying school staff and facilities. As student enrolment decreases, resources that become available can be used in different ways, including for the extension of learning time.

In general, plans to accommodate a longer school day require careful planning of both infrastructure and staffing needs. This should take into account demographic trends and their effects at different levels of the school system as well as different geographical areas and parts of the country, such as cities and rural areas. It should also consider how other policies pursued in parallel might affect demand, for example those seeking to increase enrolment in early childhood and/or upper secondary education. In Colombia and Portugal, for instance, forecasting and planning demand for school places has been perceived to be challenging in the context of demographic trends and educational policies.

Table 29. Scope and target population of extended school days in case study countries

Country	Name of policy	Year	Scope	Target population	Monitoring and evaluation
Austria	<i>Ganztagsschule</i>	2008	ISCED 1-2	Not defined	Ad-hoc evaluations
Chile	<i>Jornada Escolar Completa</i>	1997	ISCED 1-3	Disadvantaged students	Ad-hoc evaluations
Colombia	<i>Jornada Única</i>	2014	ISCED 1-3	Not defined	Ad-hoc evaluations
Denmark	<i>Den længere og mere varierede skoledag</i>	2014	ISCED 1-2	Not defined	Systematic evaluation programme
Portugal	<i>Escola a Tempo Inteiro</i>	2006	ISCED 1	Not defined	Systematic evaluation programme
Uruguay	<i>Escuelas y Liceos de tiempo completo y extendido</i>	1998 / 2011	ISCED 1-2	Disadvantaged students	Ad-hoc evaluations

Note: In Austria, evaluations were foreseen linked to the financing mechanisms, but evaluations have been more ad-hoc in practice (e.g. through Federal Court of Audit, National Monitoring Reports). In Chile, evaluations were commissioned in the first years of implementation by the education ministry and carried out by higher education institutions. In Colombia, evaluations have been undertaken in particular by the National Planning Department (DNP). Denmark put in place a national evaluation and monitoring programme to systematically assess the impact of the reform. In Portugal, specific committees have been established to monitor the implementation of full-time schools. In Uruguay, evaluations have been undertaken by the National Public Education Administration (ANEP).

4.4. Estimating costs and adjusting funding mechanisms and governance arrangements to ensure adequate and sustainable financing

The costs of a longer school day will depend on the goals and related pedagogical design (e.g. the length and nature of activities offered and the types of staff employed to run them) as well as the scope of the reform (i.e. the levels of education that are targeted). Nevertheless, the case studies with available data show that the costs are typically considerable, both for investments in the school infrastructure and for increased current spending, on staff but also ancillary services, such as school meals. Where education had previously been provided in multiple shifts during the same day, infrastructure investments are likely to be particularly high (e.g. Chile, Colombia and Uruguay).

For current spending, for instance, the additional funding per student provided by the central government for children enrolled in an extended school day ranges from 20% per student in Colombia (designed as an incentive for Secretaries of Education to implement the single school day) to 33% per student for school providers in Chile. In Uruguay, the difference in actual per-student costs amount to 81% per student in full-time primary school compared to a common urban school. Besides factors such as the staffing of activities, this reflects differences in the amount of time added to the school day.

Similarly, the cost of capital investments to adjust the school infrastructure and facilities can be considerable. In Colombia, the total required infrastructure investment for universal coverage of single-day schooling was estimated at COP 7.3 trillion (about USD 6 billion) (reference year: 2014), equivalent to the construction of an estimated 51 134 classrooms necessary for the extended school day (MEN, 2018_[123]).

Reliable estimates of the costs involved in extending the school day can help ensure implementation in line with set policy objectives. Initiatives therefore need to determine the real costs for implementation, beyond the identification of infrastructure investment and equipment costs. Such cost estimates will necessarily consider the profiles of staff providing the additional contact time at school. Depending on the pedagogical design and the available resources, this may include a greater allocation of teaching hours, but also

other professionals and staff. Costing studies can be one tool for estimating additional costs for staff expenses. In addition, it is essential to estimate the costs of ancillary services, in particular school meals, to implement extended school days adequately.

Existing funding allocations for current spending, such as grants for staff, need to be increased on a permanent basis according to these cost estimates, while new regular funding mechanisms may need to be established (e.g. for school meals). To promote an efficient use of resources, some countries, such as Portugal, have put in place requirements to use staff already available in schools (e.g. where teachers have a spare teaching load) before contracting additional staff. For infrastructure investments and maintenance expenditure, specific programmes and funds can be created for financing. As highlighted in the previous point, since the demand for extended-day school is also influenced by changing demographics, the need for new classrooms at different levels of education needs to be monitored closely.

Typically, multiple levels of governance are involved in the financing and management of school education and in policies to extend the length of the school day. Except for Uruguay, where school governance is highly centralised, responsibilities in all case study countries were shared between central and sub-national authorities. Indeed, in some case study countries, such as Austria or Portugal, the creation of extended-day school has given municipalities a greater role in the provision of education and the management of school staff.

The responsibilities for financing and implementing longer school days – be it for organising and running activities, adjusting and providing the physical space or providing meals – need to be adequately reflected in school finance mechanisms, such as fiscal transfers. This can facilitate the implementation of full school days and reassure sub-national authorities that they have the necessary and stable resources to fulfil their related responsibilities. In some case study countries, such as Austria and Colombia, stakeholders were concerned that financing would not be sufficient or that funding was not incorporated into the stable funding allocation. The financing mechanisms should facilitate medium term planning for authorities and schools in charge of organising the additional activities in the new and longer school days.

In some contexts, parents may be asked to contribute to the additional costs of a longer school day, in particular for extracurricular activities or school meals (e.g. Austria). To avoid introducing inequities by excluding those who may benefit the most from participating, the extent of parental contributions should be strictly regulated and monitored (e.g. by covering the full cost of participation for disadvantaged students).

Table 30. Financing of extended school days in case study countries

Country	Name of policy	Year	Financing mechanisms of staff and current spending	Financing mechanisms of infrastructure investments	Parental contributions
Austria	<i>Ganztagsschule</i>	2008	Reflected in staff allocations from central government for federal schools; Targeted funding from central government to provinces, and from provinces to municipalities for provincial schools	Infrastructure investment programme for federal schools; Targeted funding from central government to provinces, and from provinces to municipalities for provincial schools	Yes
Chile	<i>Jornada Escolar Completa</i>	1997	Increase in school grant from central government to school providers	Infrastructure investment programme (competitive bidding)	No
Colombia	<i>Jornada Única</i>	2014	Increase in fiscal transfers from central government to certified territorial authorities	Infrastructure investment programme (competitive bidding); Public-private partnerships	No
Denmark	<i>Den længere og mere varierede skoledag</i>	2014	Reflected in lump-sum grant from central government to local authorities, and co-financed with local resources	x	No
Portugal	<i>Escola a Tempo Inteiro</i>	2006	Reflected in block grant from central government to local authorities; Possibility to apply for annual targeted funding from central authorities; co-financing with local resources	Infrastructure investment programme (competitive bidding); local co-financing; finance by European Social Funds	No
Uruguay	<i>Escuelas y Liceos de tiempo completo y extendido</i>	1998 / 2011	Reflected in additional staff allocations from central government to schools	Infrastructure investment programme, financed by international loans	No

x: not applicable.

Annex A.

Table A A.1. Organisation of the school day and extracurricular activities in select OECD countries

Country	Organisation of the school day	Additional activities before and after classes
Australia	The organisation of the school day varies across jurisdictions and between schools as well. Typically, the number and length of each lesson is at the school's discretion. On average, there are 4 to 6 lessons in the school day in primary education and 5 to 8 lessons in lower secondary education. Breaks are also at the school's discretion, but generally schools have one short recess in the morning and a longer lunch break.	Generally, schools can offer additional activities organised at the school level according to policy guidelines on outside school hours. They typically involve use of school facilities outside of school hours. In some jurisdictions, activities can be organised by external commercial or not-for-profit organisations. In other states or territories they are offered voluntarily by teachers or parents (or other volunteers). Some primary schools may provide "Out of School Hours Care" for students. This is typically staffed by additional staff to those employed at the school, and parents often pay a fee for their children to attend this care.
Canada	The start and end times of the school day vary with each school, generally, starting between 8:00 to 9:00 and ending between 14:30 to 15:30. Typically there are 4.5 to 5.75 hours of instruction time, depending on the grade. In primary education it is typically up to the teacher and/or school how instruction time is allotted within the day to achieve curriculum outcomes. In lower secondary education there are typically 4 to 6 periods per day but this varies as in some jurisdictions the number of lessons per day is at the discretion of the school. In upper secondary education there are also typically 4 to 6 periods per day. The length of periods can range from 45 minutes to 1.5 hours.	In all jurisdictions, schools can offer additional activities before and after school. Typically, this is managed at the school level and the types of activities vary by school. Activities include before and after-school child care (at the primary level), sports, clubs, and help for students. Before and after-school care for students is generally managed by staff whose salaries are paid by parents accessing these services. Activities may also be offered and organised in schools by community groups.
Czech Republic	Within the framework of the general rules set up by legislation and the curriculum, school leaders decide on the organisation of the daily schedule. Classes usually start at 8:00, but a school leader can move the starting time, as long as it is not earlier than 7:00. The last lesson must finish by 17:00 at the latest. The school leader must allow students to enter the school at least 20 minutes before the commencement of the morning and afternoon lessons respectively. One lesson lasts 45 minutes. Students can have a maximum of 6 lessons in the morning and 6 lessons in the afternoon. The maximum number of hours per week is set by the Education Act and the minimum number by the framework curriculum timetable. In primary education, the average school day has 4 to 5 lessons, depending on the grade, and in lower secondary education about 6 lessons.	Time for extracurricular activities is not stipulated and the range of activities offered is at the discretion of schools. There are two types of school programmes for developing personal interests at basic schools, which are regulated by law (<i>Školní družina</i> and <i>Školní klub</i>). In addition, some schools offer other leisure time activities like sports, art or handcraft courses etc. but this is not regulated by law or curricular documents. There are also other institutions offering after-school programmes.
England (UK)	All schools are free to decide when their school day should start and end. There are no specific legal requirements about how long the school day should be. Governing bodies of all maintained schools (that is public schools) are responsible for deciding when sessions should begin and end	Schools are free to offer additional activities before and after lessons. The Department for Education promotes the provision of activities outside normal school hours that children take part in voluntarily. They encompass a wide range of activities (breakfast clubs, after-school clubs and extracurricular

	on each school day. Governing bodies are also responsible for deciding the length of each lesson and the timings for the morning session, the midday break, and the afternoon session. The Education (School Day and School Year) (England) Regulations 1999 however require maintained schools to divide the school day into two sessions, separated by a break in the middle of the day. Other than this, there are also no specific legal requirements or recommendations for breaks between lessons.	activities such as sport), and also help meet the childcare needs of parents.
Estonia	The Basic Schools and Upper Secondary Schools Act stipulates only a weekly workload for students. At primary level, the maximum weekly workload of a student varies from 20 lessons in grade 1 up to 30 lessons in grade 6. At lower secondary level the maximum weekly workload varies between 30 and 32 lessons, depending on the grade. The workload of students may be specified in the daily schedule of the school or, where necessary, in an individual curriculum. School lessons start at 8:00 or later. If there are not enough student places in the school, instruction may be organised in two shifts. The school day in the second shift has to end at the latest at 19:00.	The daily schedule of a school is established by the school leader and stipulates the sequence and duration of instruction and extracurricular activities supporting the school curriculum such as activities organised in "long day" groups, hobby groups and workshops. The work organisation and daily schedule of a long day group will be established by the school leader, setting a time for homework, outdoor recreation and leisure. Supervision and pedagogical instruction and guidance during spare time, doing homework, pursuing hobbies and developing interests is offered to students as extracurricular activities organised in a long day group. On the basis of a proposal of the board of trustees, a school will organise the formation of a long day group jointly with the owner of the school. In extracurricular activities students have the right to use the civil engineering works, rooms and library of their school as well as the teaching and learning equipment, sports, technical and other facilities of the school in line with the school internal rules
Ireland	Primary schools plan their timetables in line with the Suggested Minimum Weekly Time Framework: National Literacy and Numeracy for Learning and Life (2011-2020). For the compulsory years of primary education (i.e. Grades 1-6), the full day for students (including breaks) is 5 hours and 40 minutes. The school day for the non-compulsory years in primary school (i.e. infant classes) is one hour shorter. Secondary schools must meet a minimum of 28 hours of instruction time per week. Most commonly, schools provide a 42-period week, with each period lasting 40 minutes, but there is no regulation on how long the duration of a lesson should be. In general secondary programmes, the organisation of the school week is generally the same, although schools may construct the week differently from each other. Lesson periods (generally 40 minutes each) may be configured as a combination of eight or nine per day, or sometimes a school may have nine periods on four days of the week and a shorter (half-day) of six periods on one day to allow for extracurricular activities.	Primary schools may offer activities including sports, music and drama, apart from normal curriculum provision in these areas. These activities tend to take place either during lunch times or before or after school and are generally offered on a voluntary basis by school staff. In secondary schools, such activities are generally offered on a voluntary basis by school staff. These activities cannot be included in the minimum of 28 hours of instruction per week and are not funded from state educational budgets, except in cases where schools have disadvantaged status, providing some resources for extracurricular supports and activities.
Italy	Schools have autonomy in the organisation of their school day. At primary level, the number of lessons that should be allocated to each subject is not established (horizontal flexibility except for religion and second and other languages). At lower and upper secondary level the number of lessons that are held during one day depends on the daily timetable set for each class, which means that it can vary (one lesson corresponds to 60 minutes). In general, one day of 5 hours includes 3 to 5 lessons. For example, Italian, mathematics and sports education are often taught for two consecutive hours (2 lessons). In this case, in a 5-hour day, students are taught only 3 subjects (for example, Italian, mathematics and English). It may also happen that in one day they attend 5 lessons of different subjects. One day of 4 hours includes 2 to 4 lessons and one day of six hours can include 3 to 6 lessons.	Schools are autonomous in offering additional activities, for example additional teaching of a second foreign language, or in-depth studies of subjects already included in the curriculum. These additional activities increase the minimum number of hours foreseen by regulations. Schools can also offer these additional subjects only to some of the classes of the school, in order to widen the offer and give families the opportunity to choose the timetable and the curriculum that best suits their and their children's needs. Schools often offer remedial courses at upper secondary level since students failing at this level in some subjects have their assessment suspended until they have passed a remedial exam. At primary and lower secondary level there are often pre- and post-school activities organised by external organisation within schools. These activities are organised to meet the needs of parents who work and need to leave their children at school before or after the official lessons.
Japan	The General Provisions of the National Curriculum Standards provide that each school may	Many lower secondary schools provide extracurricular activities after school. The general provisions

	develop their own class schedules that provide flexible structures in accordance with the circumstances of the students, the school and the local community and in accordance with the characteristics of each subject and learning activity.	of the National Curriculum Standards for lower secondary schools provide that activities should familiarise participants with sports, culture and science, contribute to motivation for learning and the cultivation of a sense of responsibility, feelings of solidarity, etc. Schools should pay attention to ensuring the relevance of extracurricular activities to the curriculum as part of school education and to adopting appropriate operational methods (e.g. through co-operation with the local community and partnerships with various types of organisations, such as social education facilities).
Korea	In primary school, students have 4 to 6 lessons a day on average; and in secondary school, students have 6 to 8 lessons a day on average. Generally, lessons are followed by a short break of 10 minutes. Block lessons can be organised to combine lesson times into larger blocks of time. Such combined lessons are followed by longer breaks.	Most primary and secondary schools offer extracurricular activities. After-school activities vary in nature and include art, music, cooking, foreign language study, dance, sports, and other areas of student interest. At secondary school level, schools may offer remedial courses as after-school activities. Principals make the final decision on all after-school activity-related matters by taking school conditions into account after having discussions with the school board and committee members.
New Zealand	Schools are required to be open for instruction for at least two hours in the morning and two hours in the afternoon to fulfil the requirement of being open for a half-day (section 65B of the Education Act 1989), which implies a minimum of four hours per full day. There are no explicit restrictions on the number of lessons that are to be delivered during this minimum period, or any longer period for which the school is open each day.	Additional activities may be organised by the school (teachers, other staff members, or contractors taking activities on either a voluntary or paid basis) or by third parties which are permitted by the school to come on to the premises to provide activities or other services to students. Additional government funding is provided for Study Support Centres, which provide additional support for students in late primary/intermediate education, particularly those in socio-economically disadvantaged communities. These centres are run by schools or community groups, and operate outside normal school hours.
Poland	In line with ministry regulations on safety and hygiene in public and non-public schools and institutions, the school timetable should be organised so that lessons are distributed equally among the school days, within a standard school week of five days.	Schools have to organise additional activities for the development of students' interests and abilities/talents, and legislation provides for hours left to the discretion of the school leader for this purpose (2 hours per week in Grades 1-3, and 3 hours per week in Grades 4-8). Moreover, primary schools are obliged to provide day care for students who stay longer at school. Also day care centres (<i>Swietlica</i>) provide out-of-school activities and for children and young people, offering activities that should support students' interests and development.
Spain	In primary education, the school week consists of 25 hours and each day is usually divided into morning and afternoon sessions (from 9:00/10:00 to 12:00/13:00 and from 14:30/15:30 to 16:00/17:00) with a break between the two periods. However, autonomous communities and schools have a certain degree of autonomy to organise the school day, and some have chosen to adopt a continuous day (from 9:00 to 14:00). There are typically 5 one-hour lessons, although there are some differences across jurisdictions. In secondary education, the school week consists of 30-32 hours. The school day, usually from 8:30 to 15:00, is typically divided into 6 to 7 lessons, and includes a break in the middle of the day, which is not considered as instruction time.	Schools may be open after school hours to offer remedial courses as well as extracurricular activities. Extracurricular activities are defined as related to areas such as the following: foreign languages, ICT, sports, fine arts, reading and writing workshops, directed study activities, etc. At the same time, municipalities are responsible for the maintenance of pre-primary, primary and special education schools and can use this time for other educational, cultural, sports or social activities, subject to the authorisation from education authorities of the jurisdiction. By law, education, sports and municipal administrations must collaborate to facilitate the double use of the sports facilities of both the schools and the municipalities. Moreover, in pre-primary and primary schools child care activities are organised before and/or after school hours, which can include breakfast and games, sometimes in collaboration with the municipalities.

Source: “Annex 3 Sources, Methods and Technical notes, Indicator D1: How does time spent by students vary over the years” in OECD (2020_[100]), *Education at a Glance 2020: OECD Indicators*, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/69096873-en> (accessed 10 April 2021).

References

- Abrantes, P., R. Campos and A. Alves Ribeiro (2009), *Actividades de Enriquecimiento Curricular: Casos de Inovação e Boas Práticas*, CIES-ISCTE, Lisbon, https://www.dge.mec.pt/sites/default/files/Basico/AEC/aec_estudos_de_caso_2008_2009.pdf (accessed on 1 December 2020). [160]
- Aguirre, E. and A. Molina (2014), “Oportunidades educativas y calidad integral en el sistema escolar chileno: Un análisis de las características y distribución de los talleres extraprogramáticos”, *Informes para la Política Educativa*, No. 5, Centro de Políticas Comparadas de Educación, Universidad Diego Portales, Santiago, Chile, <http://www.cpce.cl/ipe> (accessed on 6 October 2020). [105]
- Alfaro, P., D. Evans and P. Holland (2015), “Extending the school day in Latin America and the Caribbean”, *Policy Research Working Paper*, No. 7309, World Bank Group, Washington DC, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1596/1813-9450-7309>. [20]
- Almeida, R. et al. (2016), “Assessing the impacts of Mais Educação on educational outcomes: Evidence between 2007 and 2011”, *Policy Research Working Paper*, No. 7644, World Bank Group, Washington, DC, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1596/1813-9450-7644>. [27]
- Andersen, S., M. Humlum and A. Nandrup (2016), “Increasing instruction time in school does increase learning”, *PNAS*, Vol. 113/27, pp. 7481-7484, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1516686113>. [25]
- ANEP (2020), *Proyecto de Presupuesto y Plan de Desarrollo Educativo 2020-2024*, Administración Nacional de Educación Pública, Montevideo, <https://www.anep.edu.uy/sites/default/files/images/2020/noticias/setiembre/200910/TOMO%201%20MOTIVOS%20Presupuesto%202020-2024%20v12%20WEB.pdf> (accessed on 12 April 2021). [179]
- ANEP (2018), *Anuario Estadístico 2017*, Administración Nacional de Educación Pública, Montevideo, <https://www.anep.edu.uy/sites/default/files/images/Archivos/publicaciones-direcciones/DSPP/Anuario%20estad%20C3%ADstico%202017.pdf>. [180]
- ANEP (2017), *Evaluación de impacto de las escuelas de Tiempo Completo en Uruguay 2013 – 2016*, Administración Nacional de Educación Pública, Montevideo, <https://www.anep.edu.uy/15-d/evaluacion-impacto-escuelas-tiempo-completo> (accessed on 15 October 2020). [167]
- ANEP (n.d.), *Marco Curricular de Referencia Nacional. Una construcción colectiva*, <https://mcrn.anep.edu.uy> (accessed on 4 April 2021). [162]
- ANEP (n.d.), *Oferta educativa*, <https://pcentrales.anep.edu.uy/oferta-educativa> (accessed on 16 April 2021). [169]
- ANEP and CEIP (2020), *Monitor Educativo de Enseñanza Primaria Estado de Situación 2019*, Administración Nacional de Educación Pública, Departamento de Investigación y Estadística Educativa, Montevideo, <https://www.anep.edu.uy/estadisticas-evaluaciones/monitores-educativos> (accessed on 6 October 2020). [164]

- ANEP and CES (2020), *Monitor Educativo Liceal Año 2019*, Consejo de Educación Secundaria, Dirección de Planeamiento y Evaluación Educativa, Montevideo, <https://www.anep.edu.uy/estadisticas-evaluaciones/monitores-educativos> (accessed on 6 October 2020). [165]
- Arango Vallejo, M. (2013), *Estado del Arte de Experiencias Relacionadas con la Implementación de la Jornada Única en Establecimientos Educativos del Sector Rural y Recomendaciones para la Construcción de Políticas Públicas en Colombia. Informe de Resultados*, Ministerio de Educación Nacional, Bogotá, DC, <http://aprende.colombiaaprende.edu.co/sites/default/files/naspublic/per/documentos/8EstudioJornadaUnicaVersionPDF.pdf> (accessed on 4 December 2020). [120]
- Atteberry, A. and A. McEachin (2020), “School’s out: The role of summers in understanding achievement disparities”, *American Educational Research Journal*, Vol. 58/2, pp. 239-282, <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/0002831220937285>. [11]
- Aylwin, M. (2016), *Gestión e Implementación de la Jornada Escolar Completa en Chile. Presentación 1o. Seminario Internacional Jornada Escolar Completa Secundaria, MINEDU Perú*, <http://www.minedu.gob.pe/seminariojec/pdf/laura-maria-aylwin-chile.pdf> (accessed on 30 November 2020). [108]
- Battistin, E. and E. Meroni (2016), “Should we increase instruction time in low achieving schools? Evidence from Southern Italy”, *Economics of Education Review*, Vol. 55, pp. 39-56, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2016.08.003>. [29]
- BCN (n.d.), *Historia de la Ley N° 19.532 crea régimen de Jornada Escolar Completa diurna y dicta normas para su aplicación*, Biblioteca del Congreso Nacional de Chile, Valparaíso, <https://www.bcn.cl/historiadelaley/historia-de-la-ley/vista-expandida/6762> (accessed on 3 April 2021). [96]
- Bellei, C. (2009), “Does lengthening the school day increase students’ academic achievement? Results from a natural experiment in Chile”, *Economics of Education Review*, Vol. 28/5, pp. 629-640, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2009.01.008>. [26]
- Bellei, C. (2005), “Twenty years of secondary education policy in Chile, 1980-2000: From self-regulating market to public commitment”, in Carióla, M., C. Bellei and I. Núñez Prieto (eds.), *Twenty years of secondary education policy in Chile*, UNESCO-IIEP, Paris, <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000133062>. [95]
- Bellei, C. et al. (2014), *Lo aprendí en la escuela ¿Cómo se logran procesos de mejoramiento escolar?*, Lom Ediciones, Universidad de Chile, UNICEF, Santiago de Chile, http://www.ciae.uchile.cl/docs/LoAprendiEscuela/libro/B_Loaprendienlaescuela/mobile/index.html (accessed on 21 April 2021). [113]
- Berthelon, M. and D. Kruger (2011), “Risky behavior among youth: Incapacitation effects of school on adolescent motherhood and crime in Chile”, *Journal of Public Economics*, Vol. 95/1, pp. 41-53, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2010.09.004>. [42]
- Bishop, J., W. Worner and L. Weber (1988), “Extending the school day: An evaluation study of a seven-period class schedule”, *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, Vol. 14/3, pp. 361-380, [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0191-491X\(88\)90029-6](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0191-491X(88)90029-6). [39]
- BMBWF (2020), *Checkliste zur Errichtung einer ganztagig geführten Schule. Infos für Schulleitungen und Schulerhalter*, Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung, Vienna, https://www.bmbwf.gv.at/dam/jcr:259ea492-cd93-4ad7-b840-488b69ef34eb/gts_gruendung_checkliste.pdf (accessed on 7 April 2021). [81]

- BMBWF (2020), *Ganztägige Schulformen oder schulische Tagesbetreuung*, [76]
<https://www.bmbwf.gv.at/Themen/schule/schulsystem/gts.html> (accessed on 6 October 2020).
- BMBWF (2020), *Schulbau*, [84]
<https://www.bmbwf.gv.at/Themen/schule/schulsystem/schulbau.html>
 (accessed on 6 October 2020).
- BMBWF (2020), *Schulentwicklungsprogramm 2020. SCHEP 2020*, Bundesministerium für Bildung, [86]
 Wissenschaft und Forschung, Vienna, <https://www.bmbwf.gv.at/dam/jcr:466fff77-3f83-4632-928c-b53c0b12c9c9/schep2020.pdf> (accessed on 6 October 2020).
- BMBWF (2019), *Autonomiepaket*, [71]
<https://www.bmbwf.gv.at/Themen/schule/zrp/bilref/ap.html> (accessed on 6 October 2020).
- BMBWF (2019), *Bildungsreform 2017*, [69]
<https://www.bmbwf.gv.at/Themen/schule/zrp/bilref.html>
 (accessed on 6 October 2020).
- BMBWF (2019), *Richtlinien zum Bildungsinvestitionsgesetz. Gemäß § 6 des Bildungsinvestitionsgesetzes, BGBl. I Nr. 8/2017 idF. BGBl. I Nr. 87/2019*, Bundesministerium für Bildung, Wissenschaft und [82]
 Forschung, Vienna, https://www.bmbwf.gv.at/dam/jcr:12b3bd3e-2c24-48ee-8dca-ade950506d0e/big_rl.pdf (accessed on 6 October 2020).
- BMBWF (2018), *Betreuungspläne für ganztägige Schulformen. Ein Leitfaden*, Bundesministerium [80]
 Bildung, Wissenschaft und Forschung, Vienna, https://www.bmbwf.gv.at/dam/jcr:01809dd3-13c2-469e-886d-7504890ebe72/betreuungsplaene_lf.pdf (accessed on 6 October 2020).
- BMBWF (2018), *Informationen zum Schulrecht. Handbuch Erweiterung der Schulautonomie durch das [70]
 Bildungsreformgesetz 2017*, Bundesministerium für Bildung, Wissenschaft und Forschung, Vienna,
<https://www.bmbwf.gv.at/dam/jcr:349f2d1c-695e-4637-9480-712ceb4c5d0d/autonomiehandbuch.pdf>
 (accessed on 6 October 2020).
- Bonilla, L. (2014), “Doble jornada escolar y calidad de la educación en Colombia”, in Sánchez Jabba, A. [118]
 and A. Otero (eds.), *Educación y Desarrollo Regional en Colombia*, Banco de la República, Bogotá,
 DC, <https://babel.banrepcultural.org/digital/collection/p17054coll18/id/17> (accessed on 16 April 2021).
- Borrero Escobar, S. (2017), “Longer school days, less teenage mothers: Evidence from Colombia”, [43]
Documentos CEDE, No. 61, Universidad de los Andes, Facultad de Economía, Bogotá, DC,
<http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3069039>.
- Brown, C. et al. (2005), *Getting smarter, becoming fairer: A progressive education agenda for a stronger [47]
 nation*, Center for American Progress and Institute for America’s Future, Washington DC,
<https://cdn.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/kf/TASKFORCEREPORTFINAL.PDF> (accessed
 on 4 September 2020).
- Bruneforth, M. et al. (2015), *OECD Review of Policies to Improve the Effectiveness of Resource Use in [73]
 Schools Country Background Report for Austria*, Bundesministerium Bildung und Frauen,
 Bundesinstitut für Bildungsforschung, Innovation und Entwicklung des österreichischen Schulwesens,
 Institut für Höhere Studien, Vienna, <http://www.oecd.org/edu/school/schoolresourcesreview.htm>.
- Bundeskanzleramt (2020), *Aus Verantwortung für Österreich. Regierungsprogramm 2020–2024*, [79]
 Bundeskanzleramt, Vienna, <https://www.bundeskanzleramt.gv.at/dam/jcr:7b9e6755-2115-440c-b2ec-cbf64a931aa8/RegProgramm-lang.pdf> (accessed on 2 December 2020).
- Calvo Marinkovich, A. (2013), *La Implementación de la Jornada Escolar Completa en una de red de [109]
 colegios efectivos: El caso la Red de la Sociedad de Instrucción Primaria. Tesis para optar al grado
 de Magíster en Economía*, <http://repositorio.uchile.cl/handle/2250/115322> (accessed on 16 April 2021).

- Castillo, H. and M. Martínez (2017), “¿En qué usan los establecimientos sus horas de libre disposición? Análisis de la Encuesta Horas de Libre Disposición 2017 en establecimientos con Jornada Escolar Completa”, *Documentos de Trabajo*, No. 11, Centro de Estudios, Ministerio de Educación, Santiago, Chile, <https://centroestudios.mineduc.cl>. [104]
- Cattaneo, M., C. Oggenfuss and S. Wolter (2017), “The more, the better? The impact of instructional time on student performance”, *Education Economics*, Vol. 25/5, pp. 433-445, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09645292.2017.1315055>. [38]
- CEIP (n.d.), *Proyecto de Escuelas de Tiempo Completo*, <http://www.ceip.edu.uy/programas/tiempo-completo> (accessed on 6 April 2021). [170]
- CEIP (n.d.), *Proyecto de Escuelas de Tiempo Extendido*, <https://www.dgeip.edu.uy/programas/tiempo-extendido/> (accessed on 5 April 2021). [177]
- Centro de Estudios MINEDUC (2021), *Resumen Estadístico de la Educación 2020*, Unidad de Estadísticas, Centro de Estudios, Ministerio de Educación, Santiago, Chile, https://centroestudios.mineduc.cl/wp-content/uploads/sites/100/2021/03/APUNTES-14_2021.pdf (accessed on 19 April 2021). [93]
- Centro de Estudios MINEDUC (2016), *Reporte Nacional de Chile: Revisión OCDE para mejorar la efectividad del uso de recursos en las escuelas, informe preparado por el Ministerio de Educación, la Agencia de Calidad de la Educación y la Superintendencia de Educación*, Ministerio de Educación, Santiago, Chile, <http://www.oecd.org/edu/school/schoolresourcesreview.htm>. [92]
- Cerdan-Infantes, P. and C. Vermeersch (2007), “More time is better: An evaluation of the full-time school program in Uruguay”, *Policy Research Working Paper*, No. 4167, World Bank Group, Washington DC, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1596/1813-9450-4167>. [34]
- CES (n.d.), *Extensión del tiempo pedagógico*, Consejo de Educación Secundaria, Dirección de Planeamiento y Evaluación Educativa, Montevideo, https://www.ces.edu.uy/files/Planes%20y%20programas/tiempo%20extendido/Doc_en_profundidad_de_TC_y_TE.pdf (accessed on 6 October 2020). [171]
- CETP (2019), *Reporte de matrícula 2019*, Consejo de Educación Técnica Profesional, Universidad del Trabajo, Montevideo, https://planeamientoeducativo.utu.edu.uy/sites/planeamientoeducativo.utu.edu.uy/files/2019-10/REPORTE_DE_MATRI_2019.pdf (accessed on 2 December 2020). [166]
- Contreras, D. and P. Sepúlveda (2017), “Effect of lengthening the school day on mother’s labor supply”, *World Bank Economic Review*, Vol. 31/3, pp. 747-766, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/wber/lhw003>. [51]
- Cooper, H. et al. (1996), “The effects of summer vacation on achievement test scores: A Narrative and meta-analytic review”, *Review of Educational Research*, Vol. 66/3, pp. 227-268, <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/00346543066003227>. [13]
- Cruz, T., A. Loureiro and E. Sa (2017), “Full-time teachers, students, and curriculum: The single-shift model in Rio de Janeiro”, *Policy Research Working Paper*, No. 8086, World Bank Group, Washington, DC, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1596/1813-9450-8086>. [28]
- DANE (2020), *Educación formal (EDUC)*, <https://www.dane.gov.co/index.php/estadisticas-por-tema/educacion/poblacion-escolarizada/educacion-formal> (accessed on 15 March 2021). [117]
- Dee, T. and M. West (2011), “The non-cognitive returns to class size”, *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, Vol. 33/1, pp. 23-46, <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/0162373710392370>. [58]

- DESUC (2005), *Informe Final Evaluación Jornada Escolar Completa*, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Dirección de Estudios Sociológicos, Santiago, Chile, http://www.opech.cl/bibliografico/Participacion_Cultura_Escolar/Informe_final_jec.pdf (accessed on 6 October 2020). [107]
- DGAL (2021), *O Fundo Social Municipal*, <http://www.portalautarquico.dgal.gov.pt/pt-PT/financas-locais/transferencias/municipios/#searchTabs2> (accessed on 1 June 2021). [158]
- DGE (2020), *Atividades de Enriquecimento Curricular (AEC)*, <https://www.dge.mec.pt/aec-atividades-de-enriquecimento-curricular> (accessed on 30 November 2020). [152]
- DGEEC (2021), *Nota de Apresentação. Atividades de Enriquecimento Curricular, 2020/2021*, Direção-Geral de Estatísticas da Educação e Ciência, Lisbon, [https://www.dgeec.mec.pt/np4/%7B\\$clientServletPath%7D/?newsId=161&fileName=DGEEC_DEEB_S_AEC2021_Nota_apresentacao.pdf](https://www.dgeec.mec.pt/np4/%7B$clientServletPath%7D/?newsId=161&fileName=DGEEC_DEEB_S_AEC2021_Nota_apresentacao.pdf) (accessed on 30 November 2020). [155]
- DGEEC (n.d.), *Atividades de Enriquecimento Curricular*, <https://www.dgeec.mec.pt/np4/99> (accessed on 14 June 2021). [157]
- DGEEC-DSEE (2021), *Estatísticas da Educação 2019/2020*, Direção-Geral de Estatísticas da Educação e Ciência, Lisbon, <https://www.dgeec.mec.pt/np4/96> (accessed on 2 December 2020). [150]
- DGES (n.d.), *Propuesta Educativa. Programas de asignaturas*, <https://www.ces.edu.uy/index.php/propuesta-educativa/20234> (accessed on 10 April 2021). [174]
- Dias Cordeiro, A. (2020), “Escola a tempo inteiro “só com mais professores”, avisam os directores”, *O Público*, <https://www.publico.pt/2020/01/17/sociedade/noticia/escola-tempo-inteiro-so-professores-avisam-directores-1900712> (accessed on 30 November 2020). [154]
- DNP (2019), *Plan Nacional de Desarrollo 2018-2022: Pacto por Colombia, pacto por la equidad*, Departamento Nacional de Planeación, Bogotá, DC, <https://www.dnp.gov.co>. [126]
- DNP (2015), *Plan Nacional de Desarrollo 2014-2018: Todos por un nuevo país*, Departamento Nacional de Planeación, Bogotá, DC, <http://www.dnp.gov.co>. [125]
- Dobbie, W. and R. Fryer (2013), “Getting beneath the veil of effective schools: Evidence from New York City”, *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, Vol. 5/4, pp. 28-60, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1257/app.5.4.28>. [59]
- Dominguez, P. and K. Ruffini (2018), “Long-term gains from longer school days”, *IRLE Working Paper*, No. 103-18, UC Berkeley Institute for Research on Labor & Employment, Berkeley, CA, <http://irle.berkeley.edu/files/2018/10/Long-Term-Gains-from-Longer-School-Days.pdf> (accessed on 9 September 2020). [49]
- Durlak, J., R. Weissberg and M. Pachan (2010), “A meta-analysis of after-school programs that seek to promote personal and social skills in children and adolescents”, *American Journal of Community Psychology*, Vol. 45, pp. 294-309, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10464-010-9300-6>. [40]
- Econometría-SEI (2019), *Evaluación de operaciones y de resultados del programa Jornada Única que permita analizar el proceso de implementación y los resultados generados en los beneficiarios*, Departamento Nacional de Planeación, Bogotá, DC, <https://sinergiapp.dnp.gov.co/#Evaluaciones/EvalFin/1170>. [133]
- Elías, R., G. Walder and A. Portillo (2016), “Más tiempo, mejores resultados? Un análisis crítico de las investigaciones sobre jornada escolar extendida en América Latina”, in Cueto, S. (ed.), *Innovación y calidad en educación en América Latina*, ILAIPP, Lima. [99]

- Engzell, P., A. Frey and M. Verhagen (2021), “Learning loss due to school closures during the COVID-19 pandemic”, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, Vol. 118/17, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2022376118>. [4]
- Eurydice (2020), *Database of National Education Systems*, https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/national-policies/eurydice/national-description_en. [67]
- Feldman, D. and M. Palamidessi (2015), *Continuidad y cambio en el currículum. Los planes de estudio de educación primaria y media en Uruguay*, Instituto Nacional de Evaluación Educativa (INEED), Montevideo. [173]
- Felfe, C., M. Lechner and P. Thiemann (2016), “After-school care and parents’ labor supply”, *Labour Economics*, Vol. 42, pp. 64-75, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.labeco.2016.06.009>. [52]
- Fialho, I. et al. (2013), *Avaliação Externa do Programa de Atividades de Enriquecimento Curricular no 1.º Ciclo do Ensino Básico*, Centro de Investigação em Educação e Psicologia da Universidade de Évora (CIEP UE), Évora, https://www.dge.mec.pt/sites/default/files/Basico/AEC/relatorio_final_aec_site.pdf (accessed on 1 December 2020). [159]
- Figlio, D., K. Holden and U. Ozek (2018), “Do students benefit from longer school days? Regression discontinuity evidence from Florida’s additional hour of literacy instruction”, *Economics of Education Review*, Vol. 67, pp. 171-183, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2018.06.003>. [18]
- Fredrick, W. and H. Walberg (1980), “Learning as a function of time”, *The Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 73/4, pp. 183-194, <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/27539747>. [56]
- Fryer, R. (2017), “The production of human capital in developed countries: Evidence from 196 randomized field experiments”, in *Handbook of Economic Field Experiments*, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/bs.hefe.2016.08.006> (accessed on 7 August 2020). [23]
- Gambaro, L., J. Marcus and F. Peter (2019), “School entry, afternoon care, and mothers’ labour supply”, *Empirical Economics*, Vol. 57, pp. 769-803, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00181-018-1462-3>. [55]
- García-Huidobro, J. and C. Concha (2009), *Jornada Escolar Completa: la Experiencia Chilena*, CEPPE, Santiago, Chile, <https://web.archive.org/web/20160418160401/http://www.ceppe.cl/images/stories/recursos/publicaciones/Carlos%20Concha/Jornada-escolar-completa.-la-experiencia-chilena.pdf> (accessed on 30 November 2020). [106]
- García, S., C. Fernández and C. Weiss (2013), “Does lengthening the school day reduce the likelihood of early school dropout and grade repetition: Evidence from Colombia”, *Documentos de Trabajo Escuela de Gobierno Alberto Lleras Camargo*, No. 7, Universidad de los Andes, Bogotá, DC, <https://repositorio.uniandes.edu.co/handle/1992/8754> (accessed on 16 April 2021). [33]
- García, S., D. Maldonado and C. Rodríguez (2018), “Educación básica y media en Colombia: diagnóstico y recomendaciones de política”, *Documentos de Trabajo Escuela de Gobierno Alberto Lleras Camargo*, No. 56, Escuela de Gobierno Alberto Lleras Camargo, Universidad de los Andes, Bogotá, DC, <https://repositorio.uniandes.edu.co/handle/1992/40724> (accessed on 12 April 2021). [131]
- Gómez Fernández, M. (2019), “Educación y crimen: el impacto de la ampliación de la jornada escolar sobre la criminalidad en Bogotá alrededor de los colegios”, *Documentos CEDE*, No. 14, Universidad de los Andes, Facultad de Economía, Bogotá, DC, <https://repositorio.uniandes.edu.co/handle/1992/41078>. [44]

- Governo da República Portuguesa (2019), *Programa do XXII Governo Constitucional. 2019-2023*, [153]
<https://www.portugal.gov.pt/pt/gc22/governo/programa-do-governo> (accessed on 30 November 2020).
- Gromada, A. and C. Shewbridge (2016), “Student Learning Time: A Literature Review”, *OECD Education Working Papers*, No. 127, OECD Publishing, Paris, [8]
<https://dx.doi.org/10.1787/5jm409kqqkj-en>.
- Hincapie, D. (2016), “Do longer school days improve student achievement? Evidence from Colombia”, [32]
IDB Working Paper Series, No. 679, Inter-American Development Bank, Washington, DC,
<http://dx.doi.org/10.18235/0000268>.
- Hjalmarsson, R., H. Holmlund and M. Lindquist (2014), “The effect of education on criminal convictions and incarceration: Causal evidence from micro-data”, *The Economic Journal*, Vol. 125, pp. 1290-1326, [46]
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/eoj.12204>.
- Hörl, G. et al. (2012), “Ganztägige Schulformen – Nationale und internationale Erfahrungen, Lehren für die Zukunft”, in Herzog-Punzenberger, B. (ed.), *Nationaler Bildungsbericht Österreich 2015, Band 2. Fokussierte Analysen bildungspolitischer Schwerpunktthemen*, Leykam, Graz, [75]
<http://dx.doi.org/10.17888/nbb2012-2-7>.
- Houlberg, K. et al. (2016), *OECD Review of Policies to Improve the Effectiveness of Resource Use in Schools: Country Background Report for Denmark*, Danish Institute for Local and Regional Government Research (KORA), Copenhagen, [135]
<http://www.oecd.org/education/schoolresourcesreview.htm> (accessed on 30 November 2020).
- Huebener, M., S. Kuger and J. Marcus (2017), “Increased instruction hours and the widening gap in student performance”, *Labour Economics*, Vol. 47, pp. 15-34, [37]
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.labeco.2017.04.007>.
- INEEd (2021), *Identificación de los elementos que inciden en la asignación de recursos en los liceos públicos*, Instituto Nacional de Evaluación Educativa, Montevideo, [176]
<https://www.ineed.edu.uy/images/publicaciones/informes/Elementos-que-inciden-en-la-asignacion-de-recursos-a-los-liceos-publicos.pdf> (accessed on 20 May 2021).
- INEEd (2021), *Un análisis de la asignación de recursos humanos a los liceos públicos de Uruguay*, Instituto Nacional de Evaluación Educativa, Montevideo, [181]
<https://www.ineed.edu.uy/images/publicaciones/informes/Un-analisis-de-la-asignacion-de-recursos-humanos-a-los-liceos-publicos.pdf> (accessed on 31 May 2021).
- INEEd (2019), *Informe sobre el estado de la educación en Uruguay 2017-2018*, Instituto Nacional de Evaluación Educativa, Montevideo, [178]
<https://www.ineed.edu.uy/images/ieeuy/2017-2018/pdf/Informe-sobre-el-estado-de-la-educacion-en-Uruguay-2017-2018.pdf> (accessed on 6 October 2020).
- INEEd (2016), *Los salarios docentes (2005-2014)*, Instituto Nacional de Evaluación Educativa, Montevideo, [175]
https://www.ineed.edu.uy/images/Los_salarios_docentes_en_uruguay_2005-2014.pdf (accessed on 12 April 2021).
- INEEd (2016), *OECD Review of Policies to Improve the Effectiveness of Resource Use in Schools: Country Background Report for Uruguay*, Instituto Nacional de Evaluación Educativa, Montevideo, [168]
<http://www.oecd.org/education/schoolresourcesreview.htm> (accessed on 30 November 2020).
- INEEd (n.d.), *Aristas*, <https://www.ineed.edu.uy/nuestro-trabajo/aristas.html> (accessed on 20 April 2021). [163]
- IQS (2020), *Informelle Kompetenzmessung (IKM)*, <https://www.iqs.gv.at/themen/nationales-monitoring/informelle-kompetenzmessung-ikm> (accessed on 8 October 2020). [68]

- Jacob, B. and L. Lefgren (2003), “Are idle hands the devil’s workshop? Incapacitation, concentration, and juvenile crime”, *The American Economic Review*, Vol. 93/5, pp. 1560-1577, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1257/000282803322655446>. [45]
- Kraft, M. (2015), “How to make additional time matter: Integrating individualized tutorials into an extended day”, *Education Finance and Policy*, Vol. 10/1, pp. 81-116, http://dx.doi.org/10.1162/EDFP_a_00152. [16]
- Kraft, M. and G. Falken (2021), “A Blueprint for Scaling Tutoring Across Public Schools”, *EdWorkingPapers*, No. 20-335, Annenberg Institute, Brown University, Providence, RI, <http://dx.doi.org/10.26300/dkjh-s987>. [2]
- Lavy, V. (2015), “Do differences in schools’ instruction time explain international achievement gaps? Evidence from developed and developing countries”, *The Economic Journal*, Vol. 125/588, pp. 397-424, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/eoj.12233>. [22]
- Levin, H. (1986), “Are longer school sessions a good investment?”, *Contemporary Policy Issues*, Vol. 4/3, pp. 63-75, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1465-7287.1986.tb00851.x>. [57]
- Levin, H. and M. Tsang (1987), “The economics of student time”, *Economics of Education Review*, Vol. 6/4, pp. 357-364, [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0272-7757\(87\)90019-7](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0272-7757(87)90019-7). [10]
- Liebowitz, D. et al. (2018), *OECD Reviews of School Resources: Portugal 2018*, OECD Reviews of School Resources, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264308411-en>. [147]
- Llach, J., C. Adrogué and M. Gigaglia (2009), “Do longer school days have enduring educational, occupational, or income effects? A natural experiment in Buenos Aires, Argentina”, *Economía*, Vol. 10/1, pp. 1-43. [48]
- Marcus, J. et al. (2020), “Increased instruction time and stress-related health problems among school children”, *Journal of Health Economics*, Vol. 70, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jhealeco.2019.102256>. [41]
- Mardones, C. (2016), “Estudio estima que faltan 5.717 salas para implementar en 100% la Jornada Escolar Completa”, *La Tercera*, <https://accioneducar.cl/la-tercera-estudio-estima-que-faltan-5-717-salas-para-implementar-en-100-la-jornada-escolar-completa/> (accessed on 2 December 2020). [110]
- Martinic, S., D. Huepe and A. Madrid (2008), “Jornada Escolar completa en Chile. Evaluación de Efectos y Conflictos en la Cultura Escolar”, *Revista Iberoamericana de Evaluación Educativa*, Vol. 1/1, pp. 124-139, <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=2602524>. [101]
- Matthews, P. et al. (2009), *Policy measures implemented in the first cycle of compulsory education in Portugal (International evaluation)*, Ministry of Education, Office for Education Statistics and Planning, Lisbon, <http://www.oecd.org/education/school/42065538.pdf> (accessed on 6 October 2020). [151]
- Mayrhofer, L. et al. (2019), “Indikatoren C: Prozesse des Schulsystems”, in Oberwimmer, K. et al. (eds.), *Nationaler Bildungsbericht Österreich 2018, Band 1. Das Schulsystem im Spiegel von Daten und Indikatoren*, Leykam, Graz, <http://doi.org/10.17888/nbb2018-1-C>. [83]
- MEN (2020), *Informe de gestión 2019*, Ministerio de Educación Nacional, Bogotá, DC, https://www.mineducacion.gov.co/1759/articles-385377_recurso_12.pdf (accessed on 6 October 2020). [128]
- MEN (2020), *Informe de Gestión 2019 - 2020. Rendición de cuentas y agradecimiento.*, Ministerio de Educación Nacional, Bogotá, DC, https://www.mineducacion.gov.co/1759/articles-402288_recurso_1.pdf (accessed on 15 March 2021). [129]

- MEN (2019), *Informe de gestión 2018*, Ministerio de Educación Nacional, Bogotá, DC, [127]
https://www.mineduccion.gov.co/1759/articles-362777_recurso_12.docx.
- MEN (2018), *Informe de gestión 2017*, Ministerio de Educación Nacional, Bogotá, DC, [121]
https://www.mineduccion.gov.co/1759/articles-362777_recurso_10.pdf.
- MEN (2018), *Informe de Gestión 2014-2018*, Ministerio de Educación Nacional, Bogotá, DC, [123]
https://www.mineduccion.gov.co/1759/articles-385377_recurso_10.pdf (accessed on 12 March 2021).
- MEN (2018), *Lineamientos para la implementación de la Jornada Unica en Colombia durante 2018*, Ministerio Nacional de Educación, Bogotá, DC, [124]
https://www.mineduccion.gov.co/1759/articles-367130_recurso.pdf.
- MEN (2017), *Guía de fortalecimiento curricular*, Ministerio de Educación Nacional, Bogotá, DC, [115]
https://aprende.colombiaaprende.edu.co/sites/default/files/naspublic/guia_fortalecimiento_curricular.pdf (accessed on 14 December 2020).
- MEN (2014), *Guía para la implementación de la Jornada Escolar Complementaria*, Fundación Carvajal, Santiago de Cali, [122]
https://www.mineduccion.gov.co/1759/articles-358656_foto_portada.pdf.
- MEN-SIMAT (2021), *Sistema Integrado de Matrícula de Educación Preescolar, Básica y Media*, [116]
<http://bi.mineduccion.gov.co:8380/eportal/web/planeacion-basica> (accessed on 16 March 2021).
- Meroni, E. and G. Abbiati (2016), “How do students react to longer instruction time? Evidence from Italy”, *Education Economics*, Vol. 24/6, pp. 592-611, [30]
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09645292.2015.1122742>.
- Meyer, E. and C. Van Klaveren (2013), “The effectiveness of extended day programs: Evidence from a randomized field experiment in the Netherlands”, *Economics of Education Review*, Vol. 36, pp. 1-11, [24]
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2013.04.002>.
- MINEDUC (n.d.), *Educación Pública*, <https://educacionpublica.cl> (accessed on 1 June 2021). [91]
- Ministério da Educação (2018), *OECD Review of Policies to Improve the Effectiveness of Resource Use in Schools: Country Background Report for Portugal*, Ministério da Educação, Lisbon, [148]
<http://www.oecd.org/education/schoolresourcesreview.htm> (accessed on 30 November 2020).
- Ministerio de Educación (2004), *La Educación Chilena en el Cambio de Siglo: Políticas, Resultados y Desafíos. Informe para la Oficina Internacional de Educación.*, Ministerio de Educación, Santiago, Chile, [98]
http://www.ibe.unesco.org/fileadmin/user_upload/archive/National_Reports/ICE_2004/chile.pdf (accessed on 30 November 2020).
- Mitterer, K. and M. Seisenbacher (2020), “Fact Sheets: Pflichtschule und Tagesbetreuung Grundlagen und Finanzierung”, *KDZ-Studien*, KDZ - Zentrum für Verwaltungsforschung, Vienna, [77]
<https://www.kdz.eu/de/wissen/studien/fact-sheets-pflichtschule-und-tagesbetreuung> (accessed on 6 October 2020).
- Myrup Jensen, V. et al. (2020), *Den længere og mere varierede skoledag – En analyse af reformens elementer*, VIVE, Copenhagen, [146]
<https://www.vive.dk/da/udgivelser/den-laengere-og-mere-varierede-skoledag-14679> (accessed on 6 October 2020).
- Nusche, D. et al. (2016), *OECD Reviews of School Resources: Austria 2016*, OECD Reviews of School Resources, OECD Publishing, Paris, [66]
<https://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264256729-en>.

- Nusche, D. et al. (2016), *OECD Reviews of School Resources: Denmark 2016*, OECD Reviews of School Resources, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264262430-en>. [134]
- OECD (2021), *The State of School Education: One Year into the COVID Pandemic*, OECD Publishing, Paris, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/201dde84-en>. [5]
- OECD (2020), *Education at a Glance 2020: OECD Indicators*, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://dx.doi.org/10.1787/69096873-en>. [100]
- OECD (2020), *PISA 2018 Results (Volume V): Effective Policies, Successful Schools*, PISA, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://dx.doi.org/10.1787/ca768d40-en>. [15]
- OECD (2019), *Education Policy Outlook 2019: Working Together to Help Students Achieve their Potential*, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://dx.doi.org/10.1787/2b8ad56e-en>. [1]
- OECD (2019), *Working and Learning Together: Rethinking Human Resource Policies for Schools*, OECD Reviews of School Resources, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://dx.doi.org/10.1787/b7aaf050-en>. [88]
- OECD (2018), *Education at a Glance 2018: OECD Indicators*, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://dx.doi.org/10.1787/eag-2018-en>. [61]
- OECD (2018), *OECD Family Database*, <http://www.oecd.org/social/family/database>. [50]
- OECD (2018), *PISA 2018 Database*, <https://www.oecd.org/pisa/data/2018database> (accessed on 2 February 2021). [60]
- OECD (2018), *Responsive School Systems: Connecting Facilities, Sectors and Programmes for Student Success*, OECD Reviews of School Resources, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264306707-en>. [85]
- OECD (2017), *The Funding of School Education: Connecting Resources and Learning*, OECD Reviews of School Resources, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264276147-en>. [87]
- OECD (2016), *PISA 2015 Results (Volume II): Policies and Practices for Successful Schools*, PISA, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264267510-en>. [64]
- OECD (2015), *PISA 2015 Database*, <https://www.oecd.org/pisa/data/2015database> (accessed on 2 February 2021). [65]
- OECD (2014), “Does Homework Perpetuate Inequities in Education?”, *PISA in Focus*, No. 46, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://dx.doi.org/10.1787/5jxrhqhtx2xt-en>. [62]
- OECD (2011), *Quality Time for Students: Learning In and Out of School*, PISA, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264087057-en>. [21]
- OECD (2004), *Reviews of National Policies for Education: Chile 2004*, Reviews of National Policies for Education, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264106352-en>. [94]
- Padilla-Romo, M. and F. Cabrera-Hernández (2019), “Easing the constraints of motherhood: The effects of all-day schools on mothers’ labour supply”, *Economic Inquiry*, Vol. 57/2, pp. 890-909, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/ecin.12740>. [53]
- Park, H. et al. (2016), “Learning beyond the school walls: Trends and implications”, *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 41/1, pp. 231-252, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-081715-074341>. [17]

- Patall, E., H. Cooper and A. Batts Allen (2010), “Extending the school day or school year: A systematic review of research (1985-2009)”, *Review of Educational Research*, Vol. 80/3, pp. 401-436, <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/0034654310377086>. [6]
- Quinn, D. et al. (2016), “Seasonal dynamics of academic achievement inequality by socioeconomic status and race/ethnicity: Updating and extending past research with new national data”, *Educational Researcher*, Vol. 45/8, pp. 443-453, <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/0013189X16677965>. [12]
- Radinger, T. et al. (2018), *OECD Reviews of School Resources: Colombia 2018*, OECD Reviews of School Resources, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264303751-en>. [114]
- Reimers, F. and A. Schleicher (2020), *Schooling Disrupted, Schooling Rethought: How the Covid-19 Pandemic is Changing Education*, OECD, https://globaled.gse.harvard.edu/files/geii/files/education_continuity_v3.pdf (accessed on 24 September 2020). [3]
- RH (2018), *Bericht des Rechnungshofes. Tagesbetreuung von Schülerinnen und Schülern.*, Rechnungshof, Vienna, <https://www.rechnungshof.gv.at> (accessed on 6 October 2020). [89]
- Rice, J., R. Croninger and C. Roellke (2002), “The effect of block scheduling high school mathematics courses on student achievement and teachers’ use of time: Implications for educational productivity”, *Economics of Education Review*, Vol. 21/6, pp. 599-607, [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0272-7757\(01\)00045-0](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0272-7757(01)00045-0). [14]
- Rivkin, S. and J. Schiman (2015), “Instruction time, classroom quality, and academic achievement”, *The Economic Journal*, Vol. 125/588, pp. F425-F448, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/econj.12315>. [9]
- Rønning, M. (2011), “Who benefits from homework assignments?”, *Economics of Education Review*, Vol. 30/1, pp. 55-64, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2010.07.001>. [63]
- Sánchez, J. (2018), *OECD Review of Policies to Improve the Effectiveness of Resource Use in Schools: Country Background Report for Colombia*, Ministerio de Educación Nacional, Bogotá D.C., <http://www.oecd.org/education/schoolresourcesreview.htm>. [119]
- Santiago, P. et al. (2016), *OECD Reviews of School Resources: Uruguay 2016*, OECD Reviews of School Resources, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264265530-en>. [161]
- Santiago, P. et al. (2012), *OECD Reviews of Evaluation and Assessment in Education: Portugal 2012*, OECD Reviews of Evaluation and Assessment in Education, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264117020-en>. [149]
- Santiago, P. et al. (2017), *OECD Reviews of School Resources: Chile 2017*, OECD Reviews of School Resources, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264285637-en>. [90]
- Scheerens, J. (ed.) (2014), *Effectiveness of Time Investments in Education: Insights from a Review and Meta-Analysis*, Springer, Cham, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-00924-7>. [19]
- Scheipl, J. et al. (2019), “Pädagogische Ausgestaltung und förderliche Bedingungen erfolgreicher ganztägiger Schulformen”, in Breit, S., Eder, F., Krainer, K., Schreiner, C., Seel, A., Spiel, C. (ed.), *Nationaler Bildungsbericht Österreich 2018, Band 2. Fokussierte Analysen und Zukunftsperspektiven für das Bildungswesen*, Leykam, Graz, <http://dx.doi.org/10.17888/nbb2018-2-6>. [74]
- Semana (2019), “7 de cada 10 proyectos de infraestructura educativa tienen graves problemas de ejecución”, *Semana*, <https://www.semana.com/educacion/articulo/infraestructura-educativa-atrasada-la-construccion-de-8000-aulas/600491> (accessed on 16 March 2021). [130]

- Shure, N. (2019), “School hours and maternal labor supply”, *Kyklos*, Vol. 72/1, pp. 118-151, [54]
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/kykl.12195>.
- Statistics Denmark (2021), *StatBank*, [136]
<https://www.statbank.dk/statbank5a/SelectTable/Omrade0.asp?PLanguage=1> (accessed on 15 April 2021).
- Statistik Austria (2021), *Kindertagesheimstatistik*, [78]
http://www.statistik.at/web_de/statistiken/menschen_und_gesellschaft/bildung/kindertagesheime_kind_erbetreuung/index.html (accessed on 4 April 2021).
- Statistik Austria (2021), *Schulstatistik*, [72]
http://www.statistik.at/web_de/statistiken/menschen_und_gesellschaft/bildung/schulen/schulbesuch/index.html (accessed on 2 April 2021).
- Statsrevisorerne (2018), *Rigsrevisionens beretning om folkeskolereformen afgivet til Folketinget med Statsrevisorernes bemærkninger*, Statsrevisorerne Folketinget, Copenhagen, <https://www.ft.dk/-/media/sites/statsrevisorerne/dokumenter/2017/beretning-10-2017-om-folkeskolereformen.ashx> [143]
 (accessed on 7 December 2020).
- Steinmann, I., R. Strietholt and D. Caro (2019), “Participation in extracurricular activities and student achievement: Evidence from German all-day schools”, *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, Vol. 30/2, pp. 155-176, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2018.1540435>. [35]
- Strietholt, R. et al. (2015), “Bildung und Bildungsungleichheit an Halb- und Ganztagschulen”, *Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft*, Vol. 18/4, pp. 737-761, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11618-015-0634-6>. [36]
- STUKUVM (2020), *Kortlægning af skoledagens længde 2020*, <https://www.stukuvvm.dk/-/media/filer/uvvm/aktuelt/pdf21/mar/210303-kortlaegning-af-skoledagens-laengde-2020.pdf> [144]
 (accessed on 1 April 2021).
- UCE MINEDUC (2021), *Vigencia de instrumentos curriculares Año 2021. Unidad de Currículum y Evaluación. Ministerio de Educación*, https://www.curriculumnacional.cl/614/articles-241604_recurso_pdf.pdf [102]
 (accessed on 16 June 2021).
- UCE MINEDUC (n.d.), *Horas de Libre Disposición. Unidad de Currículum y Evaluación Ministerio de Educación.*, https://www.curriculumnacional.cl/portal/Innovacion/Horas-de-libre-disposicion/89502:Horas-de-Libre-Disposicion#in_presentacion [103]
 (accessed on 2 April 2021).
- UNESCO IBE (2010), *World Data on Education: Uruguay*, UNESCO International Bureau of Education, Geneva, <http://www.ibe.unesco.org/sites/default/files/Uruguay.pdf> [172]
 (accessed on 15 April 2021).
- UNESCO-IIEP and SEP (2010), *Estado del arte: Escolaridad primaria y jornada escolar en el contexto internacional. Estudio de casos en Europa y América Latina*, UNESCO-IIEP Oficina para América Latina; Secretaría de Educación Pública de México, Buenos Aires, <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000372220.locale=es> [97]
 (accessed on 30 November 2020).
- Universidad de Chile (2017), *Los impactos de la Jornada Escolar Completa a 20 años de su implementación*, <https://www.uchile.cl/noticias/131177/los-impactos-de-la-jec-a-20-anos-de-su-implementacion>. [111]
- UVM (2020), *400 millioner kroner til flere lærere på vej til folkeskolen*, <https://www.uvm.dk/aktuelt/nyheder/uvvm/2020/dec/201210-400-millioner-kroner-til-flere-laerere-paa-vej-til-folkeskolen> [145]
 (accessed on 3 April 2021).

- UVM (2020), *Afkortning af skoledagens længde*, <https://www.uvm.dk/folkeskolen/fag-timetal-og-overgange/afkortning-af-skoledagens-laengde> (accessed on 3 April 2021). [140]
- UVM (2020), *Lektiehjælp og faglig fordybelse*, <https://www.uvm.dk/folkeskolen/laering-og-laeringsmiljoe/lektiehjaelp-og-faglig-fordybelse> (accessed on 10 April 2021). [142]
- UVM (2020), *Timetal*, <https://www.uvm.dk/folkeskolen/fag-timetal-og-overgange/timetal> (accessed on 4 December 2020). [141]
- UVM (2020), *Undervisningstidens samlede længde*, <https://www.uvm.dk/folkeskolen/fag-timetal-og-overgange/undervisningens-samlede-laengde> (accessed on 4 December 2020). [138]
- UVM (2013), *Agreement between the Danish Government (the Social Democrats, the Social-Liberal Party and the Socialist People's Party), the Liberal Party of Denmark and the Danish People's Party on an Improvement of Standards in the Danish Public School*, <https://www.uvm.dk/-/media/filer/uvm/udd/folke/pdf14/okt/141010-endelig-aftaletekst-7-6-2013.pdf> (accessed on 4 December 2020). [137]
- Valenzuela, J. (2016), “*Muchas veces es más importante aprender a través de talleres o del juego que con muchas horas de clases frontales y con poca participación*”, http://ciae.uchile.cl/index.php?page=view_noticias&id=858&langSite=es (accessed on 3 December 2020). [112]
- Vega Carvajal, A. (2018), “Efectos de corto plazo de la estrategia Jornada Única en variables de calidad y permanencia educativa”, *Documentos DSEPP*, Departamento Nacional de Planeación, Bogotá, DC, <https://sinergiapp.dnp.gov.co/#Evaluaciones/EvalFin/1130> (accessed on 15 January 2021). [132]
- Viana, C. (2020), “Escolas do 1.º ciclo têm de continuar a funcionar a “tempo inteiro””, *O Público*, <https://www.publico.pt/2020/08/21/sociedade/noticia/escolas-1-ciclo-continuar-funcionar-tempo-inteiro-1928800> (accessed on 30 November 2020). [156]
- World Bank (2019), *Selected Cases Studies in the Expansion of Student Learning Time. A Background Paper to inform the preparation of the project Transforming Croatia: Better Schools, Better Learning, Better Life*, unpublished. [139]
- Wu, D. (2020), “Disentangling the effects of the school year from the school day: Evidence from the TIMSS assessments”, *Education Finance and Policy*, Vol. 15/1, pp. 104-135, http://dx.doi.org/10.1162/edfp_a_00265. [7]
- Zimmer, R., L. Hamilton and R. Christina (2010), “After-school tutoring in the context of no Child Left Behind: Effectiveness of two programs in the Pittsburgh Public Schools”, *Economics of Education Review*, Vol. 29/1, pp. 18-28, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2009.02.005>. [31]