European
Physical Education
Observatory

Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

EuPEO Intellectual Output 2 Intermediate Report

European Preliminary Results

English Version

Technical Sheet

Title: EuPEO Intellectual Output 2. Intermediate Report. European Preliminary Results – English Version.

Authors: Martin Holzweg, Claude Scheuer, João Costa, Marcos Onofre

Technical Review: Dora Carolo

Project Coordinator: Marcos Onofre

Number of pages: 49

Year: 2019

Cite as: Holzweg, M., Scheuer, C., Costa, J., & Onofre, M. (2018). EuPEO Intellectual Output 2. Intermediate Report. European Preliminary Results - English version. Switzerland, EUPEA.

Project: European Physical Education Observatory

Funder: European Commission

Programme: Erasmus+ Sport Collaborative Partnership 2017

Reference: 590560-EPP-1-2017-1-PT-SPO-SCP

Timeline: January 2018 – December 2020

Project Sheet: https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/erasmus-plus/projects/eplus-project-details/#project/590560-EPP-1-2017-1-PT-SPO-SCP

For further information on the EuPEO Project please follow the links:

Website: www.eupeo.eu

Facebook: www.facebook.com/European-Physical-Education-Observatory

Twitter: www.twitter.com/EuPEOproject

The authors wish to thank the European Commission for funding the EuPEO project under the Erasmus+ Sport Collaborative Partnership scheme, with the project reference: 590560-EPP-1-2017-1-PT-SPO-SCP.

The authors wish to acknowledge the contribution of the European Physical Education Observatory (EuPEO) – www.eupeo.eu – project team for the development of the tools here referenced for *EuPEO (2018)* in the persons of: Marcos Onofre (PI), Ana Quitério, Dora Carolo, João Martins, Maria João Martins, João Costa (Co-PI), Nuno Ferro, Claude Scheuer, Martin Holzweg, Bruno Cremonesi, Roland Naul, Dennis Dreiskämper, Nils Neuber, Stefanie Dahl, Michael Fahlenbock, Daniel Möellenbeck, Rose-Marie Repond, Ruedi Schmid, Fiona Chambers, Wesley O'Brien, Jana Vašíčková, Gregor Jurak, Gregor Starc, Tamáas Csanyi, Zoltán Vass, Jo Lucassen, Annet Komen.

Table of Contents

Introduction 4
1. The EuPEO Product – Initial Results 6
1.1. National External Learning Assessment System 6
1.2. EuPEO Country Questionnaire 9
1.2.1. Physical Education National Strategy 10
1.2.2. Teacher Workforce 11
1.2.3. Teacher Education 11
1.2.4. Curriculum Flexibility 14
1.3. EuPEO School Questionnaire 20
1.3.1. Community Partnerships 21
1.3.1.1. Key aspects of ESQ's Community Partnerships with public stakeholders 21
1.3.1.2. Key aspects of ESQ's Community Partnerships with private stakeholders 30
1.3.2. Facilities, Equipment and Resources 33
1.3.3. Teacher Workforce 36
1.3.4. Teacher Education 38
1.3.5. Curriculum Flexibility 39
2. EuPEO Recommendations 46

Introduction

The *European Physical Education Association* (EUPEA) identified the diversity of Physical Education (PE), School Sports (SS) and other forms of school-based Physical Activity (PA) conditions within Europe and the importance of implementing a systematic monitoring for PE and HEPA as the European Physical Education Observatory (EuPEO). The EuPEO project is co-led by the Laboratory of Pedagogy, Faculty of Human Kinetics in the University of Lisbon (FMHUL) and by the Portuguese Society of Physical Education (SPEF), involving 12 partners and two observers from a total of nine countries: Czech Republic, France, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Portugal, Slovenia, Switzerland, and The Netherlands.

The EuPEO project aims to implement a monitoring system by developing the EuPEO webpage, a manual for external monitoring (MEA) at Europe-wide country level, and a toolkit to prepare and provide internal self-monitoring (TIM) of quality PE and SS at the school level.

This intermediate report highlights the preliminary products of the activity developed during the first seven months of the project and aims to appreciate both the strengths and challenges in all dimensions contributing to Quality PE in and across the European countries participating in the project. Since January 2018, the European School Questionnaire (ESQ), the National External Assessment Systems (NELAS) inventory, and the European Country Questionnaire (ECQ) were prepared. The first step of this preparation was workshop-based and resulted in the framework dimensions for these instruments. The final framework is highly based on one adaptation of the UNESCO (2015) proposal for Quality Physical Education dimensions, all the researchers were involved in the discussion and definition of its indicators for each instrument. The original English version of the ESQ, applied in the schools of each country, and answered by the Head of the Physical Education School Department, was translated into the mother language of the participating countries and tested to verify its ecological validity. The original version ECQ was also translated into the mother-language and it was applied to representatives of National PE associations, participating in EuPEO. The NELAS questionnaire was only developed in an English version considering that the respondents were the project participants as national representatives with expert knowledge. The final versions of the questionnaires were digitised to an on-line format, using the *Limesurvey software*.

The project and these instruments were submitted to the approval of the Portuguese National Data Protection Commission, and to the Ethics Commission of the coordinating institution (FMHUL). Each questionnaire further includes an informed consent procedure. Particularly, for the ESQ application, an informing letter was written in English and translated to each national version, which was then sent to each school's principal and Head of PE.

The collected data was first exported from Limesurvey to an Excel format (version 15.17), and then to SPSS (version 23). A descriptive analyse of the different variables was run. The results were spread to the countries to develop national reports, and the complete database was used to develop this report.

The current report is critical for the EuPEO future steps, namely as it enables a data-based decision making on the innovative EuPEO Pupils Questionnaire (EPQ), thus directly in the next work-package where the EuPEO MEA and TIM will be developed and piloted. The EPQ will essentially focus on the pupils' perceptions about the required learning outcomes and respective assessment processes, from what is identified as most common across the partners' countries in terms of "curriculum flexibility". Moreover, at this level, it is envisioned that the questionnaire addresses their perceptions about participation opportunities in SS and other forms of school-based PA, as well as on the "facilities, equipment and resources" as supporting infrastructures and policies that promote participation in all forms of school-based PA. The validation process of this questionnaire will result in a pupil-centred instrument to be part of the MEA and TIM in WP3.

1.The EuPEO Product – Initial Results

In the following three chapters (1.1, 1.2 and 1.3), the European results of the National External Learning Assessment System (NELAS), EuPEO Country Questionnaire (ECQ) and EuPEO School Questionnaire (ESQ) instruments are presented and described. Is should be noted that The Netherlands did not apply the ESQ within their observer capacity, and Hungary was not involved in the stage of data collection and analysis as anticipated in the project.

Table 1 shows the distribution of the respective questionnaires that were received.

Table 1 – Demographics of Participating Countries

Categories / Level	*NELAS*	*ECQ*	*ESQ*		
			urban or suburban / rural	*public / private*	*Total*
Global	N = 8	N = 8	N= 44 / 38	N = 72 / 10	N = 82
Czech Republic	N = 1	N = 1	N = 7 / 8	N = 13 / 2	N = 15
France	N = 1	N = 1	N = 1 / 2	N = 2 / 1	N = 3
Germany	N = 1	N = 1	N = 7 / 12	N = 18 / 1	N = 19
Ireland	N = 1	N = 1	N = 5 /5	N = 8 /2	N = 10
Portugal	N = 1	N = 1	N = 6 / 0	N = 4 / 2	N = 6
Slovenia	N = 1	N = 1	N = 11 / 2	N = 12 / 1	N = 13
Switzerland	N = 1	N = 1	N = 7 / 9	N = 15 / 1	N = 16
The Netherlands	N = 1	N = 1	N/A	N/A	N/A

Note: N/A – Not Applicable since no data was collected by the observer as agreed.

1.1. National External Learning Assessment System

In this chapter, the results related to the National External Learning Assessment System (NELAS) questionnaire are presented considering the last compulsory year of each national education system. In total, representative members of eight countries participated in the NELAS questionnaire: Czech Republic, France, Germany, Ireland, Portugal, Slovenia, Switzerland and The Netherlands.

Table 2 - Key aspects of NELAS Globally and by Country

Categories Level	***1. Physical*** *N (% of countries)*	***2. Psychological*** *N (% of countries)*	***3. Social*** *N (% of countries)*	***4. Cognitive*** *N (% of countries)*
Presence = 4 countries	4 (100%)	3 (75%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)
France	This domain is assessed through physical sports and artistic activities. For each activity, a national reference system proposes an evaluation test and a points system.	This domain is assessed through physical sports and artistic activities. For each activity, a national reference system proposes an evaluation test and a points system.	This domain is assessed through physical sports and artistic activities. For each activity, a national reference system proposes an evaluation test and a points system.	This domain is assessed through physical sports and artistic activities. For each activity, a national reference system proposes an evaluation test and a points system.
Portugal	FITescola® : - Aerobic Fitness - Body Composition (BMI, fat mass, waist perimeter) - Muscular Fitness (abdominals, push-ups, horizontal Impulse, vertical impulse, shoulder flexibility, flexibility of lower limbs)	Not Present	Not Present	Not Present
Switzerland	- Motor learning outcomes - Sport activities	- Well-being - Self esteem	- Inclusion - Respect - Diversity	- Understanding what you should do - Being able to choose your PA and sport activities
The Netherlands	Elements of Eurofit test (5x10m run, shuttle run test, jump), KTK (side-jump), Bruininks-Oseretsky (balance)	- Motivation (intrinsic-extrinsic) - Attitude towards PE - Self-assessment	Not Present	Not Present

In 50 % (Czech Republic, Germany, Ireland, Slovenia) of the eight countries, there is no external learning assessment system at country level for Physical Education. Within the four countries which have such system (France, Portugal, Switzerland, and The Netherlands), all include a physical domain in the NELAS. The psychological domain is included in three of those eight countries (France, Switzerland, and The Netherlands). France and Switzerland both include the social and cognitive domains in the respective NELAS (compare table 2).

Some countries provide further remarks relevant for NELAS, as presented below.

Ireland:

In Ireland, there is no national evaluation system to track learning in PE across all or any domains in formal education [early childhood, primary, secondary school]. As of 2020 a State Examination at Senior Cycle in secondary schools [high school], which is being piloted in selected schools, will be implemented nation-wide.

Portugal:

In Portugal, FITescola® aims to assess the physical fitness and physical activity of children and adolescents. For this purpose, it integrates a battery of tests divided into three areas, Aerobic Fitness, Body Composition and Muscular Fitness. It is applied at post-primary level to school-age children and adolescents from 5th to 12th grade. Until the 2017/2018 school year, there is a Learning Assessment System in Primary School (2nd grade) and Lower secondary education (8th grade) with the purpose of assessing the acquisition of fundamental movement skills and a diverse range of Physical Activities and Sports (Physical Domain). The assessment of cognitive and psychological domains is inexistent. This external system is developed by the Educational Evaluation Institute (IAVE) with the direct purpose of monitoring the national curriculum.

Slovenia:

In Slovenia, at the end of the nine-year primary education programme, divided into three-year periods, pupils' knowledge is assessed by the National Assessment of Knowledge (NAK). The NAK is a form of external assessment with rules, procedures, content and criteria of assessment providing equal conditions of assessment for all pupils. At the end of each three year period, pupils can decide whether or not to undergo the NAK voluntarily. Results of the assessment give additional information to schools, pupils and their parents on the pupils' achieved knowledge and have no influence on the final grade in individual subjects or the pupils' general achievement.

At the end of Period 3 (in Year 9) a Final Examination of Knowledge of Pupils (FEKP) is compulsory for all pupils. Pupils take tests in Slovene, Mathematics and either a modern foreign language or another optional subject, chosen by the Minister. Among these subjects, PE can be included.

Switzerland:

In Switzerland, the assessment is different across cantons and sometimes even in the schools.

There is official assessment, but also quality physical education assessment using a "program" called QIMS in German or QEPS in French (Quality physical Education and Sport)

The Netherlands:

In The Netherlands, the “Peil.bewegingsonderwijs” is under the responsibility of the “Inspectie voor het Onderwijs”.

1.2. EuPEO Country Questionnaire

In the following chapter, the EuPEO Country Questionnaire (ECQ) results are presented and described. In total, the ECQ was answered by delegates from eight countries: Czech Republic, France, Germany, Ireland, Portugal, Slovenia, Switzerland, and The Netherlands. First the situation in the participating countries regarding *National PE Strategies* is described. A second sub-chapter deals with *Teacher Workforce*, followed by a sub-chapter on *Teacher Education*. This chapter will close with a description of *Curriculum Flexibility* in the eight participating countries. Table 3 shows the characterization of participating countries with regard to compulsory educational level and the distribution of students by country.

Table 3 - Compulsory Educational Levels by country

Compulsory Educational levels by country				
Educational level ***Country***	**Early childhood Education**	**Primary education**	**Lower secondary education**	**Upper secondary education**
Czech Republic		X	X	
France	X	X	X	X
Germany		X	X	X
Ireland	X	X	X	
Portugal		X	X	X
Slovenia		X	X	
Switzerland	X	X	X	
The Netherlands	X	X	X	X
Global	4 countries	8 countries	8 countries	4 countries

Primary and Lower Secondary Education are compulsory in all eight participating counties. Early childhood Education (France, Ireland, Switzerland and the Netherlands) and Upper Secondary Education (France, Germany, Portugal, The Netherlands) are compulsory in 50% of the participating countries. ISCED 0-3 are compulsory only in France and The Netherlands.

Table 4 presents the school demographics of the participating countries.

Table 4 - ECQ´s Global School Demographics

Global School Demographics (N=8 countries)				
Criteria ***Country***	**Breakdown of School Government Dependence (N=8)**	**Number and Distribution of Students (Total) (N=8)**	**Number and Distribution of Students (by Educational level)**	**Number and Distribution of Students (specific groups)**
Global	**Public:** Mean= 14.942,38 SD= 17.411,737 **Private:** Mean=3.575,50 SD= 3.748,783 **Total:** Mean=18.517,88 SD=20.683,726	**ISCED 0-3:** Mean=3.630.042,63 SD= 4.352.783,787	**ISCED 0 (N=5):** Mean= 200.361,60 SD= 129.948,752 **ISCED 1 (N=8):** Mean= 1.629.669,63 SD= 2.254.688,981 **ISCED 2 (N=8):** Mean= 1.306.583,88 SD= 1.919.333,834 **ISCED 3 (N=8):** Mean= 773.722,88 SD= 923.985,971	**Girls (N=6):** Mean= 675.946,00 SD= 394.972,347 **SEN (N=6):** Mean= 138.952,83 SD= 129.276,216 **LSS (N=3):** Mean= 155.276,33 SD= 143.111,560 **Immigrant (N=6):** Mean= 206.128,00 SD= 203.717,81 **Roma (N=2):** Mean= 7.602,50 SD= 7.580,89

Note: SEN – Special Education Needs, LSS – Low Socioeconomic Status.

Regarding to table 4, it is noted the challenge for several country representatives to collect official breakdown data on specific groups, namely Roma students (N=2) and students from a Low Socioeconomic Status (N=3). While this relates to particular ethical considerations in each country, it may reveal deficits in National monitoring systems or reporting methods when it comes to minority groups, an aspect to consider in the definition of PE and SS policies toward inclusion of minorities.

1.2.1. Physical Education National Strategy

As table 5 shows, only four countries have a national strategy for Physical Education. However, all the countries answered to the questions about the kind of supports that exist to enact a national strategy for PE. Here, the strongest support is provided in the form of *Guidelines for designing facilities*, followed by *CPD* and *legislation framework*.

Table 5 - Key aspects of ECQ's PE National Strategy

PE National Strategy	
Existence (N=8)	Present in 4 countries
Responsible for design and monitoring by number of countries	
Ministry of Education	1
National Sports Institute	1
Cantons	1
Ministry of Education + PE Trade Union	1
Kind and amount of support for enacting national strategy for PE (N=8)	***Mean (SD)***
CPD	**2,63** (SD=1,41)
Consultations	2,50 (SD=1,41)
Web platform	2,13 (SD=2,03)
Legislation framework	**2,63** (SD=1,60)
Scheme for extracurricular PA	2,25 (SD=1,17)
Recommendations for cooperation with health sector	2,50 (SD=1,41)
Monitoring system for learning outcomes	2,00 (SD=1,51)
Guidelines for designing facilities	**3,25** (SD=1,67)
Evaluation system for schools	2,00 (SD=1,77)

Note: The responses for the level of support ranged from 1 "not present" to 5 "very high support". Cells in bold represent the highest values.

1.2.2. Teacher Workforce

Little information about PE teacher demographics was available in most countries and the respective questions were only answered by two to five countries. Table 6 shows the results of the questions answered by at least four countries.

Table 6 - Key aspects of ECQ's Teacher Workforce

Teacher Demographics	
Number of PE teachers in the countries (N=5)	Mean = 18.891 (Min. 2.300; Max. 40.000)
Number of male PE teachers (N=4)	Mean = 6.511 (Min. 1.200; Max. 12.000)
Number of female PE teachers (N=4)	Mean = 8.983 (Min. 1.100; Max. 28.000)

1.2.3. Teacher Education

Table 7 provides an overview on *Initial teacher education* in the participating countries. In most of the countries, a master degree is required to teach PE and the volume for the respective PE programmes lies between 200 and 300 ECTS, during 4 to 6 years. The main expected professional competences of future PE teachers are *Teaching Practice* and *School-based community engagement*. *School placement* during initial teacher education is present in seven of the participating countries, with *Supervision* as the most common organization form. Mostly, a *Cooperative teacher* is the legal responsible during school placement. Finally, *Higher Education Institutions* are most commonly in charge of initial teacher education, most of them requesting a minimum of Bachelor

qualification to work as Teacher Educator. However, in some cases, more than one body is responsible for the Initial Teacher Education.

Table 7 - Key aspects of ECQ's Initial Teacher Education

Initial teacher education		
Required education level for PE teachers by number of countries (N=8)		
Bachelor		1
Master		**4**
Bachelor or Master		3
ECTS volume for a PETE programme (N=7)		
Mean: 268.57 ECTS (Min. 200; Max. 300)		
200 ECTS		1
240 ECTS		1
270 ECTS		2
300 ECTS		**3**
Expected professional competences (N=8)		
Teaching Practice (planning, assessment and intervention)		**8**
Research and Innovation		5
PE department coordination		6
School sports coaching		6
Class tutoring		5
School-based community engagement		**7**
School placement (N=8)		
Presence (N=7)		
ECTS Mean: 52.71 (Min. 0; Max. 200)		
Organization form (N=7)		
Split throughout all years		1
Only in final year		2
Combination of both		4
Existence of Supervision		**7**
Paid school placement		3
Legal responsible (N=7)		
Cooperative teacher		**5**
Pre-service teacher		2
School		1
Initial teacher education in charge of… (N=8)		
Higher Education Institutions		**7**
National Training Institutions		2
Private corporations		2
Minimum academic requirement for teacher educators (N=8)		
Higher Education Institutions	PhD	1
	Master	2
	Bachelor	**5**
Professional schools	Master	1
	Bachelor	**4**
	Other	3
National Training Institutions	Master	1
	Bachelor	**5**
	Other	2
Private corporations	Bachelor	4
	Other	4

Note: Cells in bold represent the highest values.

In four of the participating countries, an *Induction phase* is part of teacher education (table 8). In average, this phase has a duration of 13 months, with different institutions in charge of the programmes depending on the country. The completion of this phase is always dependent on a final evaluation, most of the times comprising multiple forms.

Table 8 - Key aspects of ECQ's Induction

Induction	
Induction phase for PE teachers (N=8)	
Presence	4
Duration (N=4)	
Mean: 13 months (Min. 10; Max. 18)	
Induction phase in charge of… (N=4)	
Higher Education Institutions	1
National Training Institutions	**2**
The teacher's school	1
Teacher role during induction (N=4)	
Takes full participation in the teaching profile	**3**
Takes only specific tasks in the teaching profile with full pedagogical workload	1
Mentoring system (N=4)	
Presence	4
Person in charge (N=4)	
PE teacher: 3	**3**
Teacher educator: 1	1
Final testing (N=4)	
Final report	3
Observation of teaching practice	3
Professional exam	1

Note: Cells in bold represent the highest values.

Continuous professional development is present in all the participating countries, but it is mandatory only in two of them (Portugal and The Netherlands). Most commonly, *Higher Education Institutions* are in charge of CPD, followed by *National Training Institutions* and *Professional associations* (table 9).

Table 9 - Key aspects of ECQ's Continuous Professional Development

Continuous Professional Development	
CPD phase for PE teachers (N=8)	
Presence	8
Mandatory	2
Compulsory CPD hours per year (N=2)	
25 hours	1
60 hours	1
CPD providers (N=8)	
Higher Education Institutions	**7**
Professional schools	1
National Training Institutions	**4**
School-based CPD providers	3
Private corporations	3
Professional associations	**4**

Note: Cells in bold represent the highest values.

1.2.4. Curriculum Flexibility

In this sub-chapter, aspects related to *Curriculum Flexibility* are presented. First, the focus lies on a) *Physical Education*, followed by b) *School Sports*.

A. Physical Education

In table 10, key aspects related to *Curriculum Organization* are summarized. In all participating countries, a core curriculum in PE - usually regulated on national level - is present, with exception of Germany. There, the PE curriculum is regulated on a federal state level. PE is compulsory in all school levels in all participating countries, except for Kindergarten and Upper Secondary School in one country. In average, classes carry over 20 students and regularly over 26 students in Lower and Upper Secondary School.

Table 10 - Key aspects of ECQ's Curriculum organization

Curriculum organization	
Presence of a core curriculum (N=8)	8
Presence of PE in the core curriculum (N=8)	8
Curriculum regulation levels (N=8)	
National level	7
District level	2
School level	4
General level of the PE curriculum (N=8)	
State level	2
Country level	6
Compulsory PE in… (N=8)	
Early Childhood Education	5
Primary Education	8
Lower Secondary Education	8
Upper Secondary Education	7
Students per class in Early Childhood Education (N=6)	Mean: 23 (Min. 14; Max. 26)
Students per class in Primary Education (N=7)	Mean: 27 (Min. 23; Max. 30)
Students per class in Lower Secondary Education (N=7)	Mean: 26 (Min. 20; Max. 30)
Students per class in Upper Secondary Education (N=7)	Mean: 27 (Min. 20; Max. 30)
Responsible for compulsory PE Curriculum Conception (N=7)	
School PE teachers	1
Teaching council specialists	2
Country specialists	3
By ministry invited PE teachers	1

Table 11 provides an overview on PE contents in the PE curricula of the participating countries. *Personal and Social competences* is the only content area that is required or at least optional in all school levels for all the participating countries. Other content areas are more or less required depending on the school level. For example, in *Early Childhood Education* and *Primary Education*, the *Fundamental Movement Skills* content is more present than in

(lower and upper) *Secondary Education*, whereas the *Fitness levels*, *Games*, *Combat* and *PA and Sport-related* or *Health-related Fitness knowledge* contents are more required in (lower and upper) *Secondary Education*. Finally, *Governments* are usually in charge of the regulation of the PE content.

Table 11 - Key aspects of ECQ's PE contents

PE contents												
Education Level	***Early childhood education (N=7)***			***Primary education (N=8)***			***Lower secondary education (N=8)***			***Upper secondary education (N=7)***		
Content Category	***Req.***	***Opt.***	***Abs.***	***Req.***	***Opt.***	***Abs.***	***Req.***	***Opt.***	***Abs.***	***Req.***	***Opt.***	***Abs.***
Fundamental movement skills	4	3	0	5	3	0	2	5	1	2	1	4
Fitness levels	2	1	3	3	3	1	5	2	0	5	2	1
Athletics	3	2	1	5	2	1	6	2	0	4	2	1
Games	3	1	2	3	1	2	6	2	0	5	3	0
Cycling	0	2	4	2	2	3	0	6	2	0	5	2
Combat	1	2	3	1	4	2	4	4	0	3	4	0
Dance	2	3	1	3	5	0	5	3	0	2	5	0
Winter sports	1	2	3	1	3	3	1	5	2	0	2	5
Gymnastics	2	2	2	6	2	0	5	2	1	2	6	0
Outdoor and adventure	1	2	3	3	3	1	4	4	0	2	6	0
Racket sports	0	3	3	2	6	0	3	5	0	3	4	0
Skating sports	1	1	4	0	5	2	0	7	1	0	5	2
Swimming	1	3	2	4	4	0	4	4	0	2	5	0
Traditional games	3	4	0	4	4	0	4	3	0	3	4	0
PA and Sport-related knowledge	2	1	3	4	2	1	8	0	0	6	2	0
Health-related Fitness knowledge	3	2	1	4	2	1	8	0	0	6	2	0
Personal and Social competences	5	1	0	6	1	0	6	2	0	6	2	0
Responsible for the regulation of the content (N=8)												
Government										5		
External Educational Bodies										2		
Schools										1		

Note: req - required; opt - optional; abs – absent.

In table 12, key aspects related to *Assessment and Grading* are summarized. It is reported that clear national guidelines for PE assessment exist in five countries (France, Ireland, Portugal, Slovenia, The Netherlands). Assessment is compulsory from primary education to Upper secondary education in Czech Republic, Slovenia and Switzerland. In Portugal and France PE assessment is compulsory in all ISCED 0-3 (Early childhood education to upper secondary education). In Ireland and Germany assessment is only compulsory at lower and upper secondary education and it is not compulsory in the Netherlands in all ISCED 0-3. In most cases, the respondents consider PE not to be on the same level with other subjects when it comes to assessment. Also, only in five of the eight countries, PE assessment is required for the progression of the pupils (Czech Republic, Germany, Ireland, Portugal,

Slovenia). In six countries, PE is examined on state level (France, Germany, Ireland, Portugal, Slovenia, the Netherlands), with *Fundamental movement skills* and *Physical fitness* as the main parameters taken under consideration. It should be noted that the difference with the NELAS results is that NELAS specifically asked about external assessment systems at the last year of compulsory education and here it is asked about nation-wide assessment systems at any stage of the educational trajectory.

Table 12 - Key aspects of ECQ's Assessment and grading

Assessment and grading							
Presence of clear national guidelines for PE assessment (N=8)							
Presence by type of assessment (N=5)							
Summative						5	
Formative						4	
Baseline						1	
Compulsory assessment (N=8)							
Early Childhood Education		*Primary Education*		*Lower Secondary Education*		*Upper Secondary Education*	
2		6		7		7	
Equity of assessment with other subjects (N=7)							
Early Childhood Education		*Primary Education*		*Lower Secondary Education*		*Upper Secondary Education*	
Yes	1	Yes	1	Yes	3	Yes	2
Uncertain	3	Uncertain	4	Uncertain	1	Uncertain	2
No	3	No	2	No	3)	No	3
PE assessment required for pupil progression (N=8)						5	
PE examined at state level (N=8)						6	
Exam is accounted for (N=6)							
Monitoring						3	
Certification						1	
Monitoring and Certification						2	
Main parameters considered in the state-wide assessment (N=6)							
Fundamental movement skills						4	
Physical fitness						4	
Specialised sport performance						3	
Cognitive-emotional-social development						3	
Sports and PA knowledge and understanding						3	
Diverse Physical Activities learning						3	

When it comes to *PE learning outcomes*, they are most often regulated by *Government* and/or *External Educational Bodies* (table 13). Again, there is wide dispersion of perceptions of importance of the main PE curriculum aims across school levels. Whereas *Learning Physical Activities* and *Social and Personal Development* are very important on all the levels, *Exercise and Health* is less important in *Early Childhood.* All other aims are generally considered as less important than these ones in all the school levels.

Table 13 - Key aspects of ECQ's PE learning outcomes

PE learning outcomes				
PE learning outcomes are regulated by (N=8)				
Government				4
External Educational Bodies				4
Local authorities				0
Schools				2
Teachers				1
Students				0
Main aims of the PE curriculum (N=8)				
	Early Childhood Education	*Primary Education*	*Lower Secondary Education*	*Upper Secondary Education*
Recreation	Mean: 2,63 SD=1,68 Min. 0; Max. 5	Mean: 2,50 SD=1,31 Min. 1; Max. 5	Mean: 2,38 SD=0,92 Min. 1; Max. 4	Mean: 2,38 SD=0,52 Min. 2; Max. 3
Exercise and Health	Mean: 2,88 SD=1,46 Min. 0; Max. 5	Mean: 3,50 SD=0,93 Min. 3; Max. 5	Mean: 4,00 SD=0,76 Min. 3; Max. 5	Mean: 4,25 SD=0,71 Min. 3; Max. 5
Learning physical activities	Mean: 3,63 SD=1,69 Min. 0; Max. 5	Mean: 4,75 SD=0,46 Min. 4; Max. 5	Mean: 4,88 SD=0,35 Min. 4; Max. 5	Mean: 4,25 SD=0,71 Min. 3; Max. 5
Sport competition	Mean: 1,13 SD=0,64 Min. 0; Max. 2	Mean: 1,50 SD=0,53 Min. 1; Max. 2	Mean: 2,25 SD=0,89 Min. 1; Max. 3	Mean: 2,25 SD=1,17 Min. 1; Max. 4
Social and personal development	Mean: 3,88 SD=1,73 Min. 0; Max. 5	Mean: 4,25 SD=0,71 Min. 3; Max. 5	Mean: 4,38 SD=0,74 Min. 3; Max. 5	Mean: 4,13 SD=0,83 Min. 3; Max. 5
PE curriculum explicitly linked to lifelong learning outcomes nationally (N=7)				
	Early Childhood Education	*Primary Education*	*Lower Secondary Education*	*Upper Secondary Education*
	2 countries	3 countries	7 countries	7 countries
Presence of clear PE learning outcomes within compulsory education (N=6)				
	Early Childhood Education	*Primary Education*	*Lower Secondary Education*	*Upper Secondary Education*
	2 countries	5 countries	5 countries	6 countries

Note: The responses for the main aims of the PE curriculum by educational level ranged from 1 "least important" to 5 "most important". Cells in bold represent the highest values.

Table 14 provides an overview on *Pedagogical Principles* that are included in the PE curricula of seven of the participating countries (France, Germany, Ireland, Portugal, Slovenia, Switzerland, and The Netherlands). The most frequently addressed pedagogical principles are *Developmentally Appropriate Content*, *Focusing on the Learning*, *Inclusion*, *Health-oriented*, *Psychologically and Physically Safe Learning Environment*, as well as *Multilateral Development*. Furthermore, the *Inclusion of All students with Special Needs* is supported in all these seven countries.

Table 14 - Key aspects of ECQ's Pedagogical principles

Pedagogical principles	
Pedagogical principles included in the PE curriculum (N=8)	
Presence	7
Developmentally appropriate content	7
Focusing on the learning	7
Emphasizing multiculturalism and/or gender equity	2
Inclusion	7
Health oriented	7
Holistic personality development focused	5
Reflectiveness	4
Psychologically and physically safe learning environment	7
Multilateral development	6
Support of the inclusion of all students with special needs	7

Another very important aspect of curriculum flexibility is *Time allocation* (table 15). The average time allocation for PE in the participating countries variates between 120.0 minutes in *Early Childhood Education* up to 142.5 minutes in *Primary Education*. In *Early Childhood Education*, the situation is very diverse, considering that there is at least one country without any time allocated to PE, where as one country requests a maximum of 300 minutes for PE every week.

Table 15 - Key aspects of ECQ's Time allocation

Time allocation				
	Early Childhood Education	***Primary Education***	***Lower Secondary Education***	***Upper Secondary Education***
Hours per week all subjects	Mean: 18,8 SD=10,7 Min. 0; Max. 25 N=5	Mean: 25,6 SD=1,71 Min. 24; Max. 28 N=6	Mean: 27,58 SD=2,90 Min. 24; Max. 31 N=6	Mean: 28,6 SD=5,44 Min. 22; Max. 36 N=6
Recommended time in PE (minutes/week)	Mean: 120,0 SD=105,36 Min. 0; Max. 300) N=7	Mean: 142,5 SD=47,4 Min. 60; Max. 180 N=8	Mean: 141,2 SD=37,20 Min. 80; Max. 180 N=8	Mean: 138,7 SD=27,48 Min. 120; Max. 180 N=8

B. School Sports

As for the organization of *School Sports*, four countries have a specific programme or curriculum (France, Germany, Portugal, Slovenia), with the provision *School Sports* being compulsory in three countries (Germany, Portugal, Slovenia). In five countries *School Sports* is funded by the state. All countries provide competitions at *national* and *local level*, these seven countries provide competitions at *regional level* (exception The Netherlands). Five countries participate in international *School Sports* competitions (France, Germany, Portugal, Slovenia, Switzerland). Usually, all students can participate in the respective competitions, with restrictions existing only in one country for students with Special Education Needs (Czech Republic). Further information from some countries

about the number of activities organized and the number of schools involved is presented in table 16 although this information was only available to very few countries.

Table 16 - Key aspects of ECQ's School Sports

School Sports	
Organization (N=8)	
Presence of a programme or specific curriculum for school sports	4
Presence of compulsory school sport provision	3
Is school sport state-funded?	5
Presence of a national governing body for School	3
Competition (N=8)	
Competition levels in school sport	
Local	8
Regional	7
National	8
International	5
All students can participate in competitions (including SEN and high-performance athletes)	7
Presence of Paralympic Sport activities and competitions in school sports	5
Participation	
Existence of data on School Sport participation (N=4)	
Number of activities (N=3)	
Mean	38
Min.; Max.	8; 94
Number of schools involved (N=2)	
Mean	8.415
Min.; Max.	382; 9.247

As for the Presence of Extracurricular Physical Activities, none of participant countries refers its compulsory offer at all school levels. Nevertheless, the presence of other forms of school PA (other than PE) is effective in the generality of ISCED 0-3 for almost all countries (table 17).

Table 17 - Key aspects of ECQ's Extracurricular Physical Activity

Other Forms of Physical Activity - After School Extracurricular PA (ECPA)	
Presence (N=8)	
Presence in Early childhood Education	5
Presence in Primary Education	8
Presence in Lower Secondary Education	8
Presence in Upper Secondary Education	8
Presence of compulsory ECPA provision	0

1.3. EuPEO School Questionnaire

In the following chapter, the results of the EuPEO School Questionnaire (ESQ) are presented. This chapter consists of five sub-chapters: the first sub-chapter relates to *Community Partnerships*; the second sub-chapter to *Facilities, Equipment and Resources*; the third sub-chapter to *Teacher Workforce*; the fourth sub-chapter to *Teacher Education*; and the fifth sub-chapter to *Curriculum Flexibility*.

In total, the ESQ was answered by 82 schools from seven countries: Czech Republic, France, Germany, Ireland, Portugal, Slovenia, and Switzerland. It should be noted that not all 82 schools answered to all questions and the valid number of answers will be presented for all dimensions and subdimensions of the ESQ. Table 18 shows the contextual distribution of the ESQ's participating schools considering their Government Dependence Status (public / private) and the School Context (urban or suburban / rural).

Table 18 - Distribution of ESQ's participating schools by Government dependence status and School context

		Government dependence status		***Sum***
		Public	***Private***	
School context	***Urban or Suburban***	37	7	44
	Rural	35	3	38
	Sum	72	10	82

Table 19 shows the characterization of the ESQ's participating schools by education level covered by the school (some work as school clusters with multiple educational levels and replied as such for a number of dimensions), number and distribution of students of the schools, as well as numbers and distributions of students participating in Physical Education (PE) and School sport (SS) considering their total, and critical target groups of girls, special education needs (SEN), low socioeconomical status (LSS), migrants, and roma community. It has to be noted that in some cases, schools are single-sex which creates some imbalance in the gender distribution of the student population represented here (e.g. 19497 of girls in the school population represents close to 39% of all school population). Moreover, the breakdown of the schools' student distribution is not organised for all schools, creating some notable discrepancies (e.g. 7532 Low SES PE students compared to 7388 Low SES School Population, or 2508 Roma PE Students / 2189 SS students compared to 2158 Roma School Population). This type of data represents an example of key targets to be addressed in the next iteration of the ESQ.

Table 19 – Characterisation of ESQ's participating schools by Educational level, School population (Total, PE and SS)

Educational Levels (ISCED)	***School Population***	***PE Student Population***	***SS Student Population***
(0) Early Years: 9 (11 %) (1) Primary: 29 (35.4 %) (2) Lower Secondary: 66 (80,5 %) (3) Upper Secondary: 40 (48,8 %)	Total: 50.217 Girls: 19.497 SEN: 3.828 LSS: 7.388 Migrant: 4.521 Roma: 2.158	Total: 48.477 Girls: 18.582 SEN: 3.380 LSS: 7.532 Migrant: 4.311 Roma: 2.508	Total: 23.447 Girls: 7.249 SEN: 2.532 LSS: 4.170 Migrant: 2.605 Roma: 2.189

1.3.1. Community Partnerships

The description of the community partnerships is divided into two parts: public and private partnerships. Although final sample is presented as 82 participant schools, data reporting only considered the complete questionnaires (N=78). Thus, four incomplete questionnaires were removed from analysis for European Report.

1.3.1.1. Key aspects of ESQ's Community Partnerships with public stakeholders

The public partnerships part consists of:

A. Governmental partnerships;

B. Partnerships with National Governing Bodies;

C. Inter-school partnerships;

D. Partnerships with Higher Education Institutes and Research Centres;

E. Partnerships with Professional Associations.

A. Governmental partnerships.

The presentation of the results related to governmental partnerships, including Sectors of Education, of Health, of Social Work, or of Sport is divided into the following parts:

- Governmental support regarding CPD for PE teachers includes all Ministries and is mainly regarded as *important* or *very important* by the involved schools (61,5 %);
- Governmental support regarding active transport policy includes all Ministries and is mainly regarded as *important* or *very important* by the involved schools (20,5 %);
- Governmental support regarding provision of professional experts includes all Ministries and is entirely regarded as *important* or *very important* by the involved schools (11,5 %);
- Governmental support regarding provision of PE facilities includes all Ministries and is mainly regarded as *important* or *very important* by the involved schools (35,9 %);
- Governmental support regarding provision of sports equipment includes all Ministries and is mainly regarded as *important* or *very important* by the involved schools (33,3 %);

- Governmental support regarding PE teacher provision includes the Ministry of Education and Ministry of Sport and is mostly regarded as *important* or *very important* by the involved schools (17,9 %).

A1. Governmental support regarding CPD for PE teachers. More than 60 % out of 78 schools receive governmental support related to CPD for PE teachers and almost all of these schools regard this support as very important or important (95,7 %). The complete results are shown in table 20.

Table 20 – Governmental support regarding Continuing Professional Development (CPD) for PE teachers (N=78)

Governmental support regarding Continuing Professional Development for PE teachers: Presence (N=78)				
Yes	61,5 %			
No	38,5 %			
Importance of governmental cooperation (N=47)	*Very important*	*Important*	*Neither important nor unimportant*	*Unimportant or not all important*
	38,3%	57,4 %	4,3 %	0,0 %
Level of cooperation	***Ministry of Education***	***Ministry of Health***	***Ministry of Social work***	***Ministry of Sport***
	N=35	***N=13***	***N=13***	***N=34***
Local government	11,4 %	23,1 %	46,2 %	14,7 %
Regional government	20,0 %	15,4 %	15,4 %	29,4 %
National government	37,1 %	30,8 %	7,7 %	20,6 %
National government bodies	31,4 %	30,8 %	30,8 %	35,3 %
Type of cooperation	***N=35***	***N=12***	***N=12***	***N=32***
Formal	54,3 %	50,0 %	25,0 %	50,0 %
Informal	45,7 %	50,0 %	75,0 %	50,0 %
Purposes of cooperation	***N=37***	***N=13***	***N=11***	***N=33***
Financial support	27,0 %	23,1 %	36,4 %	21,2 %
Expertise/research support	59,5 %	46,2 %	45,5 %	48,5 %
Management support	5,4 %	15,4 %	9,1 %	6,1 %
Monitoring/evaluation support	5,4 %	7,7 %	0,0 %	15,2 %
Logistics support (staff/facilities/support)	2,7 %	7,7 %	9,1 %	9,1 %
Frequency of cooperation meetings	***N=36***	***N=13***	***N=13***	***N=30***
Monthly	8,3 %	15,4 %	23,1 %	13,3 %
Quarterly	16,7 %	23,1 %	7,7 %	13,3 %
Half a year	36,1 %	23,1 %	7,7 %	26,7 %
Once per year	38,9 %	38,5 %	61,5 %	46,7 %

A2. Governmental support regarding active transport policy. Only about 20 % out of 78 schools receive governmental support related to active transport policy, where most of these schools regard this support as very important or important (78,6 %). The complete results are shown in table 21.

Table 21 – Governmental support regarding active transport policy (N=78)

Governmental support regarding Active transport Policy: Presence (N=78)				
Yes	20,5 %			
No	79,5 %			
Importance of governmental cooperation (N=14)	*Very important*	*Important*	*Neither important nor unimportant*	*Unimportant or not all important*
	28,6 %	50,0 %	21,4 %	0,0 %
Level of cooperation	***Ministry of Education***	***Ministry of Health***	***Ministry of Social work***	***Ministry of Sport***
	N=7	***N=4***	***N=2***	***N=6***
Local government	57,1 %	75,0 %	50,0 %	50,0 %
Regional government	14,3 %	0,0 %	0,0 %	0,0 %
National government	14,3 %	0,0 %	50,0 %	0,0 %
National government bodies	14,3 %	25,0 %	0,0 %	50,0 %
Type of cooperation	***N=7***	***N=4***	***N=2***	***N=6***
Formal	57,1 %	75,0 %	100 %	66,7 %
Informal	42,9 %	25,0 %	0,0 %	33,3 %
Purposes of cooperation	***N=7***	***N=4***	***N=2***	***N=6***
Financial support	0,0 %	0,0 %	0,0 %	16,7 %
Expertise/research support	42,9 %	50,0 %	0,0 %	16,7 %
Management support	28,6 %	0,0 %	50,0 %	16,7 %
Monitoring/evaluation support	0,0 %	0,0 %	0,0 %	0,0 %
Logistics support (staff/facilities/support)	28,6 %	50,0 %	50,0 %	50,0 %
Frequency of cooperation meetings	***N=7***	***N=3***	***N=2***	***N=5***
Monthly	14,3 %	33,3 %	50,0 %	20,0 %
Quarterly	14,3 %	33,3 %	0,0 %	20,0 %
Half a year	28,6 %	0,0 %	50,0 %	0,0 %
Once per year	42,9 %	33,3 %	0,0 %	60,0 %

A3. Governmental support regarding provision of professional experts. Only 11,5 % out of 78 schools receive governmental support related to provision of professional experts, whereas all of these schools regard this support as very important or important (100 %). The detailed results are shown in table 22.

Table 22– Governmental support regarding provision of professional experts (N=78)

Governmental support regarding Provision of Professional Experts: Presence (N=78)				
Yes	11,5 %			
No	88,5 %			
Importance of governmental cooperation (N=8)	*Very important*	*Important*	*Neither important nor unimportant*	*Unimportant or not all important*
	62,5 %	37,5 %	0,0 %	0,0 %
Level of cooperation	***Ministry of Education***	***Ministry of Health***	***Ministry of Social work***	***Ministry of Sport***
	N=2	***N=2***	***N=3***	***N=4***
Local government	50,0 %	100 %	66,7 %	50,0 %
Regional government	0,0 %	0,0 %	33,3 %	0,0 %
National government	50,0 %	0,0 %	0,0 %	50,0 %
National government bodies	0,0 %	0,0 %	0,0 %	0,0 %
Type of cooperation	***N=2***	***N=2***	***N=3***	***N=4***
Formal	100 %	50,0 %	100 %	100 %
Informal	0,0 %	50,0 %	0,0 %	0,0 %
Purposes of cooperation	***N=2***	***N=2***	***N=3***	***N=4***
Financial support	0,0 %	0,0 %	0,0 %	0,0 %
Expertise/research support	0,0 %	50,0 %	0,0 %	25,0 %
Management support	0,0 %	0,0 %	33,3 %	0,0 %
Monitoring/evaluation support	0,0 %	0,0 %	33,3 %	0,0 %
Logistics support (staff/facilities/support)	100 %	50,0 %	33,3 %	75,0 %
Frequency of cooperation meetings	***N=2***	***N=2***	***N=3***	***N=4***
Monthly	100 %	100 %	66,7 %	100 %
Quarterly	0,0 %	0,0 %	33,3 %	0,0 %
Half a year	0,0 %	0,0 %	0,0 %	0,0 %
Once per year	0,0 %	0,0 %	0,0 %	0,0 %

A4. Governmental support regarding provision of PE facilities. More than a third of 78 schools receive governmental support related to provision of PE facilities. Almost all of these schools regard this support as very important or important (96,1 %). The complete results are shown in table 23.

Table 23 – Governmental support regarding provision of PE facilities (N=78)

Governmental support regarding Provision of PE facilities: Presence (N=78)				
Yes	35,9 %			
No	64,1 %			
Importance of governmental cooperation (N=26)	*Very important*	*Important*	*Neither important nor unimportant*	*Unimportant or not all important*
	61,5 %	34,6 %	3,8 %	0,0 %
Level of cooperation	***Ministry of Education*** ***N=9***	***Ministry of Health*** ***N=3***	***Ministry of Social work*** ***N=3***	***Ministry of Sport*** ***N=22***
Local government	77,8 %	66,7 %	100 %	86,4 %
Regional government	0,0 %	0,0 %	0,0 %	9,1 %
National government	22,2 %	33,3 %	0,0 %	0,0 %
National government bodies	0,0 %	0,0 %	0,0 %	4,5 %
Type of cooperation	***N=8***	***N=3***	***N=3***	***N=24***
Formal	50,0 %	66,7 %	33,3 %	66,7 %
Informal	50,0 %	33,3 %	66,7 %	33,3 %
Purposes of cooperation	***N=8***	***N=3***	***N=3***	***N=23***
Financial support	37,5 %	0,0 %	33,3 %	13,0 %
Expertise/research support	25,0 %	33,3 %	0,0 %	13,0 %
Management support	0,0 %	0,0 %	0,0 %	0,0 %
Monitoring/evaluation support	0,0 %	33,3 %	33,3 %	17,4 %
Logistics support (staff/facilities/support)	37,5 %	33,3 %	33,3 %	56,5 %
Frequency of cooperation meetings	***N=8***	***N=3***	***N=3***	***N=24***
Monthly	25,0 %	33,3 %	33,3 %	45,8 %
Quarterly	12,5 %	0,0 %	33,3 %	0,0 %
Half a year	12,5 %	0,0 %	0,0 %	16,7 %
Once per year	50,0 %	66,7 %	33,3 %	37,5 %

A5. Governmental support regarding provision of sports equipment. A third of the 78 schools receive governmental support related to provision of sports equipment. Most of these schools regard this support as very important or important (92,3 %). The complete results are shown in table 24.

Table 24 – Governmental support regarding provision of sports equipment (N=78)

Governmental support regarding Provision of sports equipment: Presence (N=78)				
Yes	33,3 %			
No	66,7 %			
Importance of governmental cooperation (N=26)	*Very important*	*Important*	*Neither important nor unimportant*	*Unimportant or not all important*
	61,5 %	30,8 %	7,7 %	0,0 %
Level of cooperation	***Ministry of Education***	***Ministry of Health***	***Ministry of Social work***	***Ministry of Sport***
	N=10	***N=2***	***N=3***	***N=17***
Local government	30,0 %	0,0 %	66,7 %	47,2 %
Regional government	30,0 %	0,0 %	0,0 %	11,7 %
National government	30,0 %	100 %	33,3 %	29,4 %
National government bodies	10,0 %	0,0 %	0,0 %	11,7 %
Type of cooperation	***N=9***	***N=2***	***N=3***	***N=17***
Formal	44,4 %	100 %	100 %	76,5 %
Informal	55,6 %	0,0 %	0,0 %	23,5 %
Purposes of cooperation	***N=8***	***N=2***	***N=3***	***N=19***
Financial support	87,5 %	100 %	100 %	63,2 %
Expertise/research support	0,0 %	0,0 %	0,0 %	0,0 %
Management support	12,5 %	0,0 %	0.0%	5,3 %
Monitoring/evaluation support	0,0 %	0,0 %	0,0 %	0,0 %
Logistics support (staff/facilities/support)	0,0 %	0,0 %	0,0 %	31,5 %
Frequency of cooperation meetings	***N=8***	***N=2***	***N=3***	***N=18***
Monthly	0,0 %	0,0 %	0,0 %	27,8 %
Quarterly	0,0 %	0,0 %	0,0 %	0,0 %
Half a year	25,0 %	50,0 %	0,0 %	33,3 %
Once per year	75,0 %	50,0 %	100 %	38,9 %

A6. Governmental support regarding PE teacher provision. Less than a fifth of 78 schools receive governmental support related to PE teacher provision. 62,8 % of these schools regard this support as very important or important. The complete results are shown in table 25.

Table 25 – Governmental support regarding PE teacher provision (N=78)

Governmental support regarding PE teacher provision: Presence (N=78)				
Yes	17,9 %			
No	82,1 %			
Importance of governmental cooperation (N=14)	*Very important*	*Important*	*Neither important nor unimportant*	*Unimportant or not all important*
	57,1 %	35,7 %	7,1 %	0,0 %
Level of cooperation	***Ministry of Education N=10***		***Ministry of Sport N=11***	
Local government	0,0 %		27,4 %	
Regional government	10,0 %		18,1 %	
National government	70,0 %		36,4 %	
National government bodies	20,0 %		18,1 %	
Type of cooperation	***N=10***		***N=10***	
Formal	90,0 %		60,0 %	
Informal	10,0 %		40,0 %	
Purposes of cooperation	***N=9***		***N=11***	
Financial support	33,3 %		27,3 %	
Expertise/research support	55,6 %		45,5 %	
Management support	0,0 %		0,0 %	
Monitoring/evaluation support	0,0%		0,0 %	
Logistics support (staff/facilities/support)	11,1 %		18.2%	
Frequency of cooperation meetings	***N=9***		***N=10***	
Monthly	22,2 %		20,0 %	
Quarterly	0,0 %		0,0 %	
Half a year	11,1 %		30,0 %	
Once per year	66,7 %		50,0 %	

B. Partnerships with National Governing Bodies

Almost two thirds (63,7 %) of 78 schools regard the cooperation with national governing bodies as *very important* or *important*, whereas 10,4% consider it *unimportant* or *not at all important*. Most of the support from national governing bodies is received in *organizing extracurricular activities/events* (61,5 %), followed by *coaching or organising school sports activities* (47,4 %). These partnerships occur for *coaching pupils during PE class time* with 24% of the schools. The detailed results are shown in table 26.

Table 26 – Support of National Governing Bodies

Support of National Governing Bodies (N=78)					
			Yes		**No**
Coaching pupils during PE class time			24,4 %		75,6 %
Coaching pupils during extracurricular activities			30,8 %		69,2 %
Designing PE curriculum elements			37,2 %		62,8 %
Coaching or organising school sport activities			47,4 %		52,6 %
Awarding coaching badges to school staff/pupils			37,2 %		62,8 %
Organizing extracurricular activities/events			61,5 %		38,5 %
Providing Talent Identification programmes			23,1 %		76,9 %
Importance of cooperation with National Governing Bodies (N=77)	*Very important*	*Important*	*Neither important nor unimportant*	*Unimportant*	*Not all important*
	28,6 %	35,1 %	26,0 %	3,9 %	6,5 %

C. Inter-school partnerships

Almost half of 78 schools have cooperation with other schools, most of which related to *School Sports* (83,3 %) and *continuous professional development* (61,1 %). This level of cooperation is regarded as *important* or *very important* by 66,7 % and *unimportant* or *not at all important* by 7 % of the schools. The detailed results are shown in table 27.

Table 27 – Cooperation with other schools

Cooperation with other schools (N = 78)					
			Yes		**No**
Presence			46,2 %		53,8 %
Physical Education Curriculum			50,0 %		50,0 %
School Sports			83,3 %		16,7 %
Other forms of Physical Activity			27,8 %		72,2 %
Teacher Provision			52,8 %		47,2 %
Initial Teacher Education			33,3 %		66,7 %
CPD			61,1 %		38,9 %
Resources			5,6 %		94,4 %
Equipment			38,9 %		61,1 %
Facilities			41,7 %		58,3 %
Importance of cooperation with other schools (N=72)	*Very important*	*Important*	*Neither important nor unimportant*	*Unimportant*	*Not all important*
	25,0 %	41,7 %	26,4 %	5,6 %	1,4 %

D. Partnerships with Higher Education Institutes and Research Centres

About two thirds of 78 schools have cooperation with Higher Education Institutes and Research Centres, most of which related to the *provision of initial teacher education* (96,7 %) and *provision of CPD for PE teachers* (93,3 %), considered at 65,7 % as *important* or *very important*. 10 % of the schools consider this level of cooperation *unimportant*. The detailed results are shown in table 28.

Table 28 – Cooperation with Higher Education Institutes and Research Centres

Cooperation with Higher Education Institutes and Research Centres (N = 78)					
			Yes		**No**
Presence			38,5 %		61,5 %
Provision of Initial Teacher Education			96,7 %		3,3 %
Provision of CPD for PE teachers			93,3 %		6,7 %
Monitoring/evaluation of PE teaching			30,0 %		70,0 %
Monitoring/evaluation of extra-curricular settings			33,3 %		66,7 %
Research			53,3 %		46,7 %
School community guidance/counselling			40,0 %		60,0 %
Importance of cooperation with Higher Education Institutes and Research Centres (N=70)	*Very important*	*Important*	*Neither important nor unimportant*	*Unimportant*	*Not all important*
	25,7 %	40,0 %	24,3 %	10,0 %	0,0 %

E. Partnerships with Professional Associations

Almost half of 78 schools have cooperation with Professional Associations, most of which related to the *provision of CPD for PE teachers* (75,7 %). This level of cooperation is regarded by 62,3 % of the schools as *important* or *very important* and by 7,2 % as *unimportant*. The detailed results are shown in table 29.

Table 29 – Cooperation with Professional Associations

Cooperation with Professional Associations			**Yes**		**No**
Presence (N=78)			47,4 %		52,6 %
Provision of Initial Teacher Education			43,2 %		56,8 %
Provision CPD for PE teachers			75,7 %		24,3 %
Monitoring/evaluation of PE teaching			35,1 %		64,9 %
Monitoring/evaluation of extra-curricular settings			24,3 %		75,7 %
Research			32,4 %		67,6 %
School community guidance/counselling			37,8 %		62,2 %
Importance of cooperation with Professional Associations (N=69)	*Very important*	*Important*	*Neither important nor unimportant*	*Unimportant*	*Not all important*
	23,2 %	39,1 %	30,4 %	7,2 %	0,0 %

1.3.1.2. Key aspects of ESQ's Community Partnerships with private stakeholders

The private partnerships part consists of:

A. Partnerships with Sports Organisations, which involve 56,4 % of the schools;

B. Partnerships with Corporate Partners, which involve 16,7 % of the schools;

C. Partnerships with Parents, which involve 46,2 % of the schools;

D. Partnerships with Higher Education Institutes and Research Centres, which involve 30,8 % of the schools.

A. Partnerships with Sports Organisations

More than half of the 78 schools have cooperation with Sports Clubs or Associations. Most of the sport organisation partnerships are mainly on local level (90,9 %) and almost all of these schools cooperate with sport clubs (93,2 %). The main purposes of these partnerships are for *training/coaching a school sport squad* (52,3 %), *promotion of sports competitions/events* (50 %), and *provision of facilities* (45,5 %). This level of partnership is regarded by 62,3 % of the schools as *important* or *very important*. The detailed results are shown in table 30.

Table 30 – Cooperation with Sports Clubs or Associations

Cooperation with Sports Clubs or Associations (N = 78)	
Presence	56,4 %
Level of sport organization partnership (N=44)	
Mainly local	90,9 %
Mainly regional	29,5 %
Mainly national	6,8 %
Mainly international	2,3 %
Partner of sport organization partnership (N=44)	
Sports clubs	93,2 %
Sport academies	13,6 %
Community-based school PE board	9,1 %
Regional school sport organization	27,3 %
School sport federation	27,3 %
City/sport council	25,0 %
Purposes of partnerships (N=44)	
Teaching at school/PE class	34,1 %
Training/coaching of a school sport squad	52,3 %
Promotion of sports competition/events	50,0 %
Special kinds of sport offer to special education needs:	9,1 %
Youth sport affiliation in the club community	27,3 %
Health promotion	38,6 %
Social inclusion	27,3 %
Provision of CPD for PE teachers	29,5 %
Provision of CPD for school sport coaches	4,5 %
Provision of facilities	45,5 %
Provision of sports equipment	34,1 %
Financial support	11,4 %.

Importance of cooperation with Sports Clubs or Associations (N=75)	*Very important*	*Important*	*Neither important nor unimportant*	*Unimportant*	*Not all important*
	24,0 %	42,7 %	30,7 %	2,7 %	0,0 %

B. Partnerships with Corporate Partners

Only about one sixth of the 78 schools have cooperation with private industry/agencies (16,7 %) for *promotion of sport events* (61,5 %) or for *teaching at school/PE class* and *teaching/coaching a school sport squad* (46,2 %) as main purposes. This level of partnership is regarded as *very important* or *important* by 29,1 % and as *unimportant* or *not at all important* by 23,6 % of the schools. The detailed results are shown in table 31.

Table 31 – Cooperation with private industry/agencies

Cooperation with private industry/agencies (N = 78)	
Presence	16,7 %
Level of sport corporate partnership (N=13)	
Mainly local	76,9 %
Mainly regional	30,8 %
Mainly national	0,0 %
Mainly international	0,0 %
Corporate partner for (N=13)	
Teaching recruitment enterprises	0,0 %
Insurance enterprises	7,7 %
Health organizations	38,5 %
Food	23,1 %
Sports equipment and facilities	46,2 %
Sport events	76,9 %
Wholesale enterprises	0,0 %
Information and communication technology enterprises	30,8 %
Purposes of partnerships (N=13)	
Teaching at school/PE class	46,2 %
Training/coaching of a school sport squad	46,2 %
Promotion of sports competition/events	61,5 %
Special kinds of sport offer to special education needs:	0,0 %
Youth sport affiliation in the club community	15,4 %
Health promotion	38,5 %
Social inclusion	15,4 %
Provision of CPD for PE teachers	15,4 %
Provision of CPD for school sport coaches	7,7 %
Provision of facilities	30,8 %
Provision of sports equipment	15,4 %
Financial support	0,0 %

Importance of cooperation with Corporate Partners (N=72)	*Very important*	*Important*	*Neither important nor unimportant*	*Unimportant*	*Not all important*
	6,9 %	22,2 %	47,2 %	15,3 %	8,3 %

C. *Partnerships with Parents*

About half of the 78 schools have cooperation with parents (46,2 %), almost entirely (88,9 %) with *individual parents*, for multiple purposes (*health promotion* = 47,2 %; *social inclusion* = 38,9 %; *coaching school sport squad* = 36,1 %; *participation in school sport festivals* = 33,3 %). This level of partnership is regarded as *very important* or *important* by 60,8 % of the schools. The detailed results are shown in table 32.

Table 32 – Cooperation with parents

Cooperation with parents (N = 78)					
Presence					46,2 %
Level of parental involvement (N=36)					
Mainly individual parents					88,9 %
Mainly local parents' association					55,6 %
Mainly regional					0,0 %
Mainly national parents' association					0,0 %
Setting of parental involvement/participation (N=36)					
Single school					91,7 %
Local community-based school PE					19,4 %
Regional school sport organization					2,8 %
School sport federation					5,6 %
City/sport council					2,8 %
Purposes of partnerships (N=13)					
Coach of school sport squad					36,1 %
Special kinds of sport offer to special education needs:					19,4 %
Participation in school sport festivals					33,3 %
Participant in PE school conferences					13,9 %
Expert for regular PETE further education units					2,8 %
Co-sponsor of any PETE conferences/workshops					5,6 %
Youth sport affiliation in the club community					16,7 %
Health promotion					47,2 %
Social inclusion					38,9 %
Active transport					27,8 %
Promotion of financial support:					22,2 %
Importance of parents' involvement (N=74)	*Very important*	*Important*	*Neither important nor unimportant*	*Unimportant*	*Not all important*
	23,0 %	37,8 %	29,7 %	8,1 %	1,4 %

D. Partnerships with Higher Education Institutes and Research Centres

About one third of the 78 schools (30,8 %) have cooperation with Higher Education Institutes and Research Centres. Three quarters of those cooperation are in the *provision of initial teacher education* with a second key purpose of *providing CPD for PE teachers* (62,5 %). The detailed results are shown in table 33.

Table 33 – Cooperation with Higher Education Institutes and Research Centres

Cooperation with Higher Education Institutes and Research Centres (N = 78)					
Presence				30,8 %	
Focus of school and HEI cooperation (N=24)					
Provision of Initial Teacher Education				75,0 %	
Provision CPD for PE teachers				62,5 %	
Monitoring/evaluation of PE teaching				20,8 %	
Monitoring/evaluation of extra-curricular settings				25,0 %	
Research				33,3 %	
School community guidance/counselling				25,0 %	
Importance of cooperation with Higher Education Institutes and Research Centres (N=74)	*Very important*	*Important*	*Neither important nor unimportant*	*Unimportant*	*Not all important*
	10,8 %	37,8 %	36,5 %	12,2 %	2,7 %

1.3.2. Facilities, Equipment and Resources

The description of the facilities, equipment and resources is divided in the following three parts:

A. Facilities

B. Equipment

C. Resources

A. Facilities

All the 82 schools have *school owned facilities*. In average, the schools have between two and three indoor facilities and two outdoor facilities. The mean of the indoor area is approximately 740 m², the mean of the outdoor area is 15.500 m². Still, 51,2 % of the schools outsource at least 1 indoor and 1 outdoor facility on top of their own. Moreover, 62,2 % of the schools confirm that they have at least 1 outdoor facility for free-play, and most (89 %) provide facilities to accommodate active transport, despite only half have safe ways for active transport. The detailed results are shown in table 34.

Table 34 – Key aspects of ESQ's Facilities number and space

School Facilities (N = 82)			
	Presence	*Indoor (Mean)*	*Outdoor (Mean)*
School owned facilities			
facilities per school	N=82	2,6	2,1
m^2 per school	100 %	738,4	15.500
Other facilities locally outsourced			
facilities per school	N=42	1,1	1,2
m^2 per school	51,2 %	465,2	3.835,1
Facilities for free play			
facilities per school	N=51	0,53	1,76
m^2 per school	62,2 %	105,4	1.432,3
School surroundings with safe ways for active transport	N=46 51,2 %		
Facilities to accommodate active transport	N=73 89,0 %		

Note: Different response rates are present as follows: school owned facilities [n=73 indoor; n=82 outdoor]; other facilities [n=36 indoor; n=41 outdoor]; free-play facilities [n=44 indoor; n=51 outdoor]

During recess time, 70,7 % of participating schools refer that students are allowed to access schools' outdoor PE and SS facilities. In relation to indoor facilities, the rate of school that allow students to access it is considerably lower (all indoor facilities: 7,3 % and some of indoor facilities: 31,7 %; students are not allowed: 61 %), nevertheless, indoor facilities use is more often monitored. Out of school time PE and SS facilities access is lower with relation to indoor facilities when compared to the facilities use during recess. In 71,9 % of the participating schools allow students access to free play facilities out of school time and only 19 % of these cases, this utilization is monitored. Showering and clothes changing facilities access out of school time is allowed in 76,8 % of the participating schools. The detailed results are shown in table 35.

Table 35 - Key aspects of ESQ's Access to School Facilities

Access to School facilities			
	Yes to all	***Yes to some***	***No***
School owned outdoor PE and SS facilities during recess (N=82)	34,1 %	36,6 %	29,3 %
	Monitored use: 45,1 %		
School owned indoor PE and SS facilities during recess (N=82)	7,3 %	31,7 %	61,0 %
	Monitored use: 87,5 %		
School owned indoor PE and SS facilities out of school time (N=81)	12,3 %	29,6 %	58,0 %
	Monitored use: 67,6 %		
School owned outdoor PE and SS facilities out of school time (N=82)	39,0 %	35,4 %	25,6 %
	Monitored use: 24,6 %		
School owned free play facilities out of school time (N=82)	51,2 %	20,7 %	28,0 %
	Monitored use: 19,0 %		
School showering and clothes changing facilities during the school day (N=82)	***Yes:*** 76,8 %		23,2 %
	Monitored use: 47,6 %		

Participants' perception about the level of accessibility of schools' PE and SS facilities to pupils with locomotor impairments is presented in table 36. Outdoor and free play facilities are more likely to *don't have architectural barriers* to the access of students with locomotor impairments (70,7 % and 72,0 %, respectively). Indoor or showering and clothing facilities are more likely to have *insuperable architectural barriers* (6,1 % and 7,8 %, respectively) or being *required aid to overcome such architectural barriers* (46,3 % and 46,9 %, respectively).

Table 36 - Key aspects of ESQ's Level of Accessibility

Level of accessibility to students with locomotor impairments			
	Without architectural barriers	*Aid required to overcome architectural barriers*	*Insuperable architectural barriers*
Indoor facilities (N=82)	47,6 %	46,3 %	6,1 %
Outdoor facilities (N=82)	70,7 %	28,0 %	1,2 %
Free Play facilities (N=82)	72,0 %	25,6 %	2,4 %
Showering and clothes changing facilities (N=64)	45,3 %	46,9 %	7,8 %

School owned and outsourced polyvalence of facilities designated to PE and SS is presented at table 37. Participant schools' Outsourced PE and SS facilities tend to have less polyvalence than their owned facilities. Indoor spaces are perceived with the highest polyvalence (*High polyvalence:* 42,7 %; *Complete polyvalence:* 18,7 %) when compared with their owned outdoor spaces or outsourced facilities (indoor and outdoor).

Table 37 - Key aspects of ESQ's Facilities Polyvalence

Facilities Polyvalence						
		No polyvalence	*Limited polyvalence*	*Some polyvalence*	*High polyvalence*	*Complete polyvalence*
Owned	*Level of Indoor spaces Polyvalence (N=82)*	3,7 %	13,4 %	22,0 %	42,7 %	18,7 %
	Level of outdoor spaces Polyvalence (N=81)	4,9 %	13,6 %	30,9 %	40,7 %	9,9 %
Outsourced	*Level of Indoor spaces Polyvalence (N=70)*	24,3 %	15,7 %	24,3 %	28,6 %	7,1 %
	Level of outdoor spaces Polyvalence (N=82)	25,6 %	11,0 %	34,1 %	25,6 %	3,7 %

B. Equipment

Overall, the reported maintenance level of equipment has a positive appreciation as less than 10 % of the schools report a low standard equipment level and less than 3 % report that injuries due to the level of maintenance of the equipment is *very likely* or *likely*. More than half of the 80 schools agree that the equipment is used during recess by the students (51,2 %). The detailed results are shown in table 38.

Table 38 – Key aspects of ESQ's Equipment

Equipment					
Level of adequacy of equipment (N=81)	*Superb standard, including SEN*		*Excellent standard*	*Standard equipment*	*Low standard equipment*
	13,4 %		36,6 %	42,7 %	6,1 %
Injuries due to level of maintenance of equipment (N=80)	*Very likely*	*Likely*	*Neutral*	*Unlikely*	*Very Unlikely*
	1,3 %	1,3 %	21,3 %	52,5 %	23,8 %
Use of equipment during recess by students (N=80)	Yes: 51,2 %				

C. Resources

Less than half of the 78 schools (fully) agreed that there is an *adequate budget for acquisition* (41,0 %) and an *adequate budget for maintenance* (42,3 %). The detailed results are shown in table 39.

Table 39 – Key aspects of ESQ's Resources

Adequate and accessible equipment and adapt facilities for all (N=78)			
	Yes	*Partly*	*No*
Adequate budget for acquisition	41,0 %	42,3 %	16,7 %
Adequate budget for maintenance	42,3 %	42,3 %	15,4 %

1.3.3. Teacher Workforce

The results of this chapter are presented in three parts:

A. Weekly workload
B. Performed roles
C. Teacher Demographics

A. Weekly workload

The average of PE lessons per week per teacher at the 76 schools is approximately 15 lessons, the average PE teaching minutes per week is approximately 770 minutes (equating to almost 13 hours) and the average of School Sport activity minutes per week is approximately 240 minutes (equating to 4 hours). The detailed results (PE time, students per class, school sport activities and time for other duties) are shown in table 40. It has to be noted that there are some highly discrepant values, which seem to arise from different interpretations on how to answer to some items (e.g. 2.600 PE teaching minutes per week which equates to 43 hours of teaching, or 1.400 SS activity in minutes per week which equates to 20 hours per week). A possibility is that the heads of department might

have answered by combining all hours of their teachers. This represents another key target to address in the future iteration of the survey.

Table 40 – Key aspect of ESQ's Teacher Workforce: Weekly workload

Weekly Workload				
	Mean	**SD**	**Min.**	**Max.**
PE time				
PE lessons per week per teacher (N=76)	15,1	8,3	2	34
PE teaching minutes per week (N=70)	767,6	512,8	40	2.600
School sport activity minutes per week (N=66)	243,8	311,9	0	1.400
Classes (N=78)				
Classes per week	7,3	6,4	1	33
Minimum and maximum number of students per class				
Early childhood (Min.)	8,3	7,5	1	30
Early childhood (Max.)	16,1	10,9	1	30
Primary Education (Min.)	12,8	8,1	1	25
Primary Education (Max.)	20,3	10,4	1	35
Lower secondary education (Min.)	16,1	8,1	1	35
Lower secondary education (Max.)	25,2	8,0	1	48
Upper secondary education (Min.)	15,0	9,0	1	30
Upper secondary education (Max.)	24,3	10,3	1	48
School sport activities				
Number of school sport activities per week (N=73)	1,45	2,7	0	12
Time for other duties				
Hours per week for other duties (N=76)	9,2	8,6	0	40

B. Performed roles

Most of the roles performed by the PE teachers at the 78 schools are *teaching practice* (92,3 %) and *school intermediate management* (92,3 %). The least performed role is *research and innovation* (15,4 %). The detailed results are shown in table 41.

Table 41 – Key aspect of ESQ's Teacher Workforce: Performed roles

Roles performed by PE teachers (N=78)	
Teaching Practice	92,3 %
Research and Innovation	15,4 %
School intermediate management	92,3 %
School sports coaching	62,8 %
Class tutoring	65,4 %
School-based community engagement	74,4 %

C. Teacher Demographics

The average number of PE teachers in the 78 schools is between seven and eight PE teachers (balanced male and female distribution). On the range of teachers based on gender, career status and time data shows that, for the minimum number for each category, some schools have no male or female PE teachers, some schools have no permanent PE teachers, and some schools have no full-time PE teachers. The detailed results are shown in table 42.

Table 42 – Key aspect of ESQ's Teacher Workforce: Teacher demographics

Teacher demographics	Mean	SD	Min.	Max.
Number of PE teachers	7,5	7,5	2	52
Gender (N=78)				
Male	3,9	3,6	0	17
Female	3,9	5,1	0	35
Career status (N=78)				
Permanent	6,8	7,0	0	45
Contract	0,8	1,3	0	7
Freelance	0,1	0,4	0	3
Time (N=77)				
Full-time	6,0	7,3	0	45
Part-time	2,3	3,3	0	14

1.3.4. Teacher Education

All schools state their engagement with PE-specific CPD. Urban/suburban and public schools engage the most with PE-specific CPD (78,6 % and 79,7 % respectively). The complete data is shown in table 43.

Table 43 - Key aspects of ESQ's Teacher Education Globally and by School Type

1. Physical Education Continuous Professional Development		
Global sample **(N=79)**	*Yes*	75,9 %
	Partly	24,1 %
	No	0,0 %
Urban or suburban schools **(N=79)**	*Yes*	78,6 %
	Partly	21,4 %
	No	0,0 %
Rural schools **(N=79)**	*Yes*	73,0 %
	Partly	27,0 %
	No	0,0 %
Public schools **(N=79)**	*Yes*	79,7 %
	Partly	20,3 %
	No	0,0 %
Private schools **(N=79)**	*Yes*	50,0 %
	Partly	50,0 %
	No	0,0 %

1.3.5. Curriculum Flexibility

In this chapter, the following aspects are presented:

A. Physical Education – Contents
B. Physical Education – Assessment and grading
C. Physical Education – Learning outcomes
D. Physical Education – Fields Trips
E. Physical Education – Allocated time
F. School Sports – Characteristics
G. School Sports – Participation and offer
H. Other forms of Physical Activity – Characteristics I
I. Other forms of Physical Activity – Characteristics II
J. Other forms of Physical Activity and other types of after school activities – Offer

A. Physical Education – Contents

In 78 schools the Physical Education contents of *Games* (98,7 %), *Gymnastics* (97,4 %) *Athletics* (96,2 %), and *Fundamental Movement Skills* (93,6 %) are the most common, whereas *Cycling* (16,7 %), *Combat* (35,9 %) and *Skating Sports* (41,0 %) are the least common. The detailed results are shown in table 44.

Table 44 - Key aspects of ESQ's Curriculum Flexibility: Physical Education - Contents

Physical Education: Contents taught (N=78)	
Fundamental Movement Skills	93,6 %
Fitness levels	88,5 %
Athletics	96,2 %
Games	98,7 %
Cycling	16,7 %
Combat	35,9 %
Dance	73,1 %
Winter Sports	52,6 %
Gymnastics	97,4 %
Outdoor and adventure	44,9 %
Racket Sports	89,7 %
Skating Sports	41,0 %
Swimming	66,7 %
Traditional Games	83,3 %
PA and Sport-related knowledge	69,2 %
Health-Related Fitness knowledge	74,4 %
Personal and Social competences	78,2 %

B. Physical Education – Assessment and grading

At over 80 % of participating schools, criteria-based PE assessment is present. While considering the drop of response rate in the remaining subsections to 63 schools, it is visible that *summative assessment* is the most formally established dimension in the school assessment guidelines (87,3 %), with criteria mainly designed at the department level (81 %). Moreover, students tend to participate both in summative and formative assessment (42,9 %) but in 25 % of the school's students do not have any participation in the assessment process. However, in 73 % of the schools, the assessment data is shared with students and their parents/legal guardians. The detailed results (e.g. information on summative assessment, formative assessment and initial assessment) are shown in table 45.

Table 45 - Key aspects of ESQ's Curriculum Flexibility: Physical Education – Assessment and grading

Physical Education: Assessment and grading	
Presence of PE assessment criteria (N=78)	80,8 %
Presence of school-based set of guidelines for (N=63)	
Summative assessment	87,3 %
Formative assessment	62,9 %
Initial assessment	33,3 %
Responsible to design PE assessment criteria (N=63)	
PE teacher	19,0 %
PE department	81,0 %
Implication of students in the PE assessment process (N=63)	
Yes, in the formative process	19,0 %
Yes, in the summative process	12,7 %
Yes, in both the formative and summative process	42,9 %
No implication	25,4 %
Sharing of assessment data with students/parents/legal guardians (N=63)	73,0 %

C. Physical Education – Learning outcomes

In 67,9 % of the schools, school-specific learning outcomes are present in multiple formats (criteria, normative tables, and student progression), either as *combinations of two formats* (34%) (e.g. normative tables and student progression) or with *all formats combined* (39,6 %), but always without *normative tables* as a single feature. The learning outcomes are also designed to represent *diverse contents* in most cases (73,6 %). The detailed results (including information on definitions of learning outcomes as well as on foci of learning outcomes) are shown in table 46.

Table 46 - Key aspects of ESQ's Curriculum Flexibility: Physical Education – Learning outcomes

Physical Education: Learning outcomes	
Presence of school specific learning outcomes (N=78)	67,9 %
Learning outcomes mostly defined by (N=53)	
Criteria	17,0 %
Normative tables	0,0 %
Student progression	9,4 %
A combination of two	34,0 %
All formats combined	39,6 %
Learning outcomes focusing on… (N=53)	
A single PE content	5,7 %
Some PE contents	20,8 %
Diverse contents	73,6 %

D. Physical Education – Field Trips

At 85,9 % of schools, PE field trips are provided to students, happening occasionally (1 or 2 times per year) in 56,4 % of the schools. Results are shown in table 47.

Table 47- Key aspects of ESQ's Curriculum Flexibility: Physical Education – Field Trips

Physical Education: Field Trips	
***Existence of PE Field Trips* (N=78)**	85,9 %
Occasionally (1 or 2 per year)	56,4 %
Regularly (3 or more per year)	29,5 %
Never	14,1 %

E. Physical Education – Allocated time

The amount of timetabled hours for PE in minutes per week differs according to the educational level in the schools. In Early Years, PE is delivered at around 8 (±15,7) lessons per week to a total of 60 (±82,5) minutes per week. For Primary Education, the average is 11 (±18,6) lessons per week adding just over 95 (±92,5) minutes per week. For Lower Secondary Education, the average is 13 (±18,5) lessons per week adding just over 210 minutes (±308,8) per week and for Upper Secondary there are 18 (±37,9) lessons per week adding just over 165 minutes (±324,8) minutes per week. The detailed results are shown in table 48. It has to be noted that there are some highly discrepant values which seem to arise to different interpretations on how to answer to some items (e.g. the maximum value of 2.439 PE teaching minutes per week and of SS activity in minutes per week which equates to 40 hours per week; or the maximum value of 240 timetabled PE lessons per week). A possibility is that the

heads of department might have answered by combining all hours and lessons of their teachers. This represents another key target to address in the future iteration of the survey.

Table 48 - Key aspects of ESQ's Curriculum Flexibility: Physical Education – Allocated time

Physical Education: Allocated time				
	Mean	**SD**	**Min.**	**Max.**
Timetabled hours for PE in minutes per week				
Early childhood (N=47)	60,7	82,5	0	400
Primary Education (N=54)	96,8	92,5	0	400
Lower secondary education (N=63)	213,1	308,8	0	2.430
Upper secondary education (N=59)	167,4	324,8	0	2.430
Timetabled lessons for PE in sessions per week				
Early childhood (N=48)	7,8	15,7	0	60
Primary Education (N=55)	11,2	18,6	0	90
Lower secondary education (N=69)	13,4	18,5	2	90
Upper secondary education (N=63)	18,1	37,9	2	240

F. School Sports – Characteristics

In just over 80 % of the 78 schools, school sport activities are present, mostly delivered by the PE teachers (88,7 %) and by out *of school sport coaches* at 50 % of the cases. These activities are provided mainly *during the week on school time* (77,8 %), with 50 % occurring *during the week out of school time*, and in over half of schools (57,1 %) there is *no obligation at all* to participate. Considering the participation of critical groups, Girls are the most represented (50 %) whereas Roma students are the least represented (11,3 %). In 56,9% of the schools there are high-performing student-athletes in SS competitions who combine with sport clubs' competitions. The detailed results (including information on participation groups as well as on providers of school sport activities) are shown in table 49.

Table 49 - Key aspects of ESQ's Curriculum Flexibility: School Sports – Characteristics

School Sports: Characteristics	
Presence of school sport activities (N=78)	80,8 %
Obligation to pay participation (N=63)	
Not at all	57,1 %
Yes, for some activities	31,7 %
Yes, for all activities	11,1 %
Significant participation of groups (N=62)	
Girls	50,0 %
SEN	29,0 %
Low SES	33,9 %
Migrants	21,0 %
Roma	11,3 %
Providers of school sport activities (N=62)	
School sport coach	11,3 %
Out of school sport coach	50,0 %

PE teacher	88,7 %
Other subject teacher	33,9 %
Other community-based non-qualified people	14,5 %
Competitions are held (N=62)	
During the school week on school time	77,8 %
During the school week out of school time	50,0 %
During the weekend	29,2 %
Highest competition level (N=62)	
Local	4,2 %
Regional	40,3 %
National	48,6 %
International	6,9 %
Presence of high-performance students participating in school sport competitions	56,9 %

G. School Sports – Participation and offer

Table 50 shows that the average of students participation rate in school sport is at 32 % (±25,1), the frequency of school sport activities averages at 6 (±8,7) times per week and 336,7 (±429,3) minutes per week, that eight activities are offered in average and around 13 (±12,2) of competitions per year.

Table 50 - Key aspects of ESQ's Curriculum Flexibility: School Sports – Participation and offer

School Sports: Participation and offer				
	Mean	**SD**	**Min.**	**Max.**
Students participation rate (N=61)	32,1	25,1	2	100
Frequency of school sport activities (times per week) (N=62)	5,9	8,7	0	64
Frequency of school sport activities (minutes per week) (N=30)	336,7	439,3	0	2880
Number of activities offered (N=63)	7,8	9,9	0	74
Number of competitions per year (N=72)	12,7	12,2	1	60

H. Other forms of Physical Activity – Characteristics 1

Only about 10 % of the 78 schools reports the use of PA in other subjects to promote/facilitate learning as a school policy, although more than half of them agree that it is used by some teachers (57,7 %). Over half of the schools (53,8 %) implement recess activities with 30,1 % unsupervised. In addition to PE and SS, 76,1 % of the schools provide other after-school activities for PA, which are mostly catered by the PE teachers (78,1 %), although out of school sport coaches are also very present (59,4 %). The detailed results are shown in table 51.

Table 51 - Key aspects of ESQ's Curriculum Flexibility: Other forms of Physical Activity – Characteristics I

Other forms of Physical Activity: Characteristics	
Use of Physical Activity in other subjects to promote/facilitate learning (N=78)	
Yes, as a school policy	10,3 %
Yes, by some teachers	57,7 %
No	32,1 %
Recess – Active and Self (N=78)	
Implementation of recess activities	53,8 %
Presence of supervision in recess (N=73)	
No supervision	30,1 %
Assistant	4,1 %
PE teacher	26,0 %
Other subjects' teacher	39,7 %
After-School	
Presence of after-school activities involving students (N=78)	53,8 %
Presence of after school PA in addition to PE and SS (N=42)	76,2 %
Providers of other PA activities (N=32)	
School sport coach	18,8 %
Out of school sport coach	59,4 %
PE teacher	78,1 %
Other subject teacher	37,5 %
Other community-based non-qualified people	12,5 %

I. Other forms of Physical Activity – Characteristics 2

The presence of other types of after-school activities, not PA-focused, amounts to almost 90 % at 42 responding schools. Almost one third of the providers are PE teachers. The detailed results (including information on active transport/commute) are shown in table 52.

Table 52 - Key aspects of ESQ's Curriculum Flexibility: Other forms of Physical Activity – Characteristics II

Other types of after-school activities: Characteristics 2	
Presence of other types of after-school activities (N=42)	88,1 %
Religious or Spiritual (N=37)	29,7 %
Cultural (N=37)	78,4 %
Civic (N=37)	56,8 %
Providers of other activities (N=36)	
PE teacher	30,6 %
Other subject teacher	80,6 %
Other community-based people	38,9 %
Active Transport/Commute	
Promotion of active transport to and from school (N=78)	37,2 %
Formal organization of active transport (walking, cycling) (N=28)	32,0%
Formal information about benefits of active transport (N=29)	79,3 %
Collection of data on students using active transport (N=29)	51,7 %

J. Other forms of Physical Activity and other types of after school activities – Offer

Table 53 shows the recess time (active recess and self-organised recess) in minutes per day as well as the frequency (after school PA in addition to PE and SS and other types of after school activities) in times per week at the respective schools.

Table 53 - Key aspects of ESQ's Curriculum Flexibility: Other forms of Physical Activity and other types of after school activities – Offer

Other forms of Physical Activity and after school activities: Offer				
	Mean	**SD**	**Min.**	**Max.**
Recess time in minutes per day				
Active recess (N=62)	42,5	51,1	0	225
Self-organized (N=68)	89,5	205,0	0	999
Frequency				
Frequency of after school PA in addition to PE and SS in times per week (N=31)	4,1	3,4	1	15
Frequency of other types of after school activities in times per week (N=37)	3,1	2,0	1	10

2. EuPEO Recommendations

While considering that these are preliminary results from the first versions of the tools that will be refined towards the development of the EuPEO Manual for External Assessment at Europe, Regional and National levels, and of the EuPEO Toolkit for Internal Monitoring at school level, a number of recommendations can be advanced for each of the main EuPEO dimensions based on the data from most common aspects across the countries. The purpose of the recommendations in the last table of this report is to demonstrate the potential of the EuPEO process in providing clear points of consideration for Quality PE at system and school levels considering key conclusions on each targeted dimension based on the reported data.

Table 54 - Recommendations

Level of Recommendation **EuPEO Dimension** ***Key Conclusions***	**System**	**School**
PE National Strategy *- Four countries have a PE National Strategy for Physical Education.* *- The responsibility for the PE National Strategy is different in all countries.* *- The strongest support is provided in the form of Guidelines for designing facilities, followed by CPD and legislation framework.* *- Two countries report NELAS and School Evaluation as part of the strategy.* *- NELAS for the last compulsory year of education is present in four countries, with multiple formats and having the physical dimension as the only common one across the four.*	• A National Strategy for Physical Education can be designed, either as a standalone policy, or as part of an Educational policy or Physical Activity Promotion Plan, with established priorities, clear and measurable outcomes and monitoring strategies, and with key actions. • A NELAS can be defined and implemented in this strategy as part of the monitoring, ideally from a perspective that can be used locally by the schools as part of their own pedagogical repertoire. • The Physical dimension (including health-related fitness levels and psychomotor outcomes) seems to be the most developed one but some countries can provide experience for the other dimensions (cognitive, social, psychological) as part of an holistic and integrated view of PE.	• Schools can be involved, engaged and aware of such policies, especially from a "user" perspective in how they can avail and use the different priorities, outcomes and key actions. • Schools can engage with appropriate training and dissemination events to effectively use NELAS results and tools, from a pedagogical perspective, namely with critical groups of students.
Community Partnerships *- Schools leverage on partnerships with multiple stakeholders, public and private, valuing multiple purposes depending on the partnership to support their PE programmes.*	• The quality of Physical Education facilities can be supported by supporting actions for partnerships with Government, Industry, and Sports Organisations as highly valued by the schools.	• Schools can develop local partnerships with partner schools and Sports Organisations for increased opportunities in PE and SS as events and sharing of facilities. • Schools value their role in health promotion, social inclusion and

- The main purposes for partnerships focus on facilities/equipment, extra-curricular activities and teacher education (initial and continuous). *- Partnering with Higher Education and Research Institutions for research purposes is lowly valued.*	• The amount of support to PE Teachers education (Initial and Continuous) can be enhanced by partnering with Government, Higher Education and Research Institutes, and Professional Associations as highly valued by the schools. • Research and Innovation is a less-developed (and less-performed) dimension in Quality PE that needs to be strengthened in the countries by supporting partnerships with Higher Education and Research Institutes.	school engagement by partnering with students' parents and their legal guardians. • When Schools seek to provide further PA opportunities, partnerships with Sports Organisations for their coaches should have a critical stance on relying on non-qualified people (namely parents and legal guardians).
Facilities, Equipment and Resources *- On average, the schools have between two and three indoor facilities and two outdoor facilities, despite half still outsource at least 1 outdoor and 1 indoor facility.* *- During recess time, most schools mainly allow the access to the outdoor PE and SS facilities with considerable less access to indoor facilities for recess but with more monitoring.* *- Most facilities are reported as having universal access with more architectural obstacles in the indoor facilities which are also more flexible to teach the curriculum.* *- The equipment is mainly perceived as with standard quality with a minority of schools reporting superb standard as facilitative of including SEN students.* *- Less than half of the schools perceive that their budget is adequate to cover the maintenance of facilities and equipment.*	• The amount and level of facilities and equipment across the schools needs to be actively planned and sustained. • Funding for schools to update and maintain their facilities and equipment needs to be continuously provided to maintain optimum levels of health and safety that protect students from injury due to poor quality facilities and equipment.	• Schools can outsource and engage through partnerships towards raising and maintaining the qualify of their facilities and equipment. • When facing lack of spaces for free-play, schools can develop usage policies of their PE and SS spaces for a pleasurable and safe practice of informal Physical Activity.
Teacher Workforce *- Little information about PE teacher demographics was available in most countries.* *- On average PE teachers provide 15 lessons per week over 770 minutes (almost 13 hours) and 240 minutes (4 hours) of School Sports activities.*	• Robust and updated databases of teachers workload, roles and demographics need to be developed and made publicly available, by curriculum subject. • Actions towards promoting a consistent and diverse teacher workforce in the educational system are important to be considered for learning and as an inclusion process considering the	• Schools without a consistent and diverse PE teacher workforce can develop partnerships that support student learning and inclusion. • Schools can map the workload and strategically distribute it across their PE teacher workforce considering the over-working of some of their teachers and the under-development of Research and Innovation as a teacher role as

- PE teachers mainly perform teaching practice and school intermediate management. *- The least performed role is research and innovation and no account of workload is provided for school-based teacher educators.* *- On average each school has seven to eight PE teachers (balanced male and female distribution). However, some schools report absence of female or male teachers, no permanent PE teachers, and no full-time PE teachers.*	cases without male or female teachers, without permanent teachers, and without full-time teachers.	well as the frequent involvement of school-based teacher educators.
Teacher Education *- In most of the countries, a master degree is required to teach PE, during 4 to 6 years.* *- The main expected professional competences of future PE teachers are Teaching Practice and School-based community engagement.* *- School placement during initial teacher education is present in seven of the participating countries.* *- Mostly, Higher Education Institutions are most commonly in charge of initial teacher education with Bachelor as a minimum qualification to work as Teacher Educator.* *- In four of the participating countries, an Induction phase is part of teacher education with an average duration of 13 months, with different institutions in charge of the programmes depending on the country, and is always dependent on a final evaluation.* *- Continuous professional development is present in all the participating countries, but it is mandatory only in two. Following the data from partnerships, Higher Education Institutions, National Training Institutions and Professional associations are the main CPD providers.* *- All schools state their engagement with PE-specific CPD, with more reported activity from urban/suburban and public schools.*	● Initial Teacher Education needs to ensure that PE teachers are being prepared for school-wide key-roles. Particularly, Research and Innovation is a least prominent, but critical, competence dimension. ● Support for the University-School partnerships in the Initial Teacher Education stage of PE teachers is important, considering the importance and amount of schools that engage with this important stage, namely during School Placement. ● PE teachers need to be continuously supported through continuous professional development at system level, namely when this is a compulsory element for their career.	● Schools have a fundamental role in the initial education of PE teachers as enablers of placement experiences, as well as for the induction process compulsory in several countries. ● The school-based teacher educators are fundamental in the initial education, and need to have this role accounted in their workload, while strategically leveraged for Research Innovation as linking members with Higher Education and Research Institutions in PE. ● Induction programmes represent good opportunities to develop mentoring practices to facilitate the newly qualified teachers entry into the profession and school environment but the requested structure needs appropriate accounting of the mentor-teacher role in the workload mapping and distribution exercise. ● Schools provide important opportunities for continuous professional development, namely considering the expectation in all countries and the compulsory dimension when present.

Curriculum Flexibility *- A number of aspects are common in PE, SS and Other forms of PA provision, typically identified as good practices namely:* - *PE is compulsory in all educational levels, with dedicated time, country-level learning outcomes, pedagogical principles, and assessment guidelines, occasionally with external evaluation;* - *Most PE curricula include diverse physical activities and other areas of personal and social competences, and requesting the development of health-related fitness levels among the students;* - *Assessment in Physical Education is mainly dependent on a combination of formats, without presence of normative tables for grading as an exclusive criterion;* - *A reduced number of schools provide further opportunities for PA towards Quality PE as part of their school culture (e.g. active recess, facilities for active transport) or associated to their local context (e.g. active transport);* - *Most formal and non-formal PA activities are provided by PE teachers and/or sport coaches based on a wider view of Quality PE.*	● It needs to be disseminated that several aspects are common in the education system and PE curricula of different countries as a benchmark for countries where PE needs to have support to raise the standards. ● It needs to be disseminated that key-aspects potentially constrain the effective development of Quality PE, namely: - The time provided for PE is consistently below international recommendations for PA; - Critical groups (girls, migrants, low socioeconomical status, special education needs, roma) are the least enrolled with PE and School Sports; - The de-regulation or non-monitoring of minimum qualifications to provide PA and Sports or teach PE.	● Schools can avail of opportunities to learn about good examples nationally, but also internationally, on positive actions and policies that support Quality PE. ● Schools can identify and learn about how to overcome challenging issues towards providing Quality PE.