



## POSITION STATEMENT: MEANINGFUL INTERNATIONAL COMPARISONS 2022



### PURPOSE

To affirm NASSP's support for a global community of educators, offer recommendations for improving the relevance and significance of international comparisons, and promote appropriate comparative analysis of the data from international assessments to aid in reaching valid conclusions regarding the performance of public schools in the United States of America.

### ISSUE

International tests, such as the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), and Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS), compare achievement data from students in the United States with that of students in other countries. PISA is an international standardized test that was developed jointly by participating countries and is administered to 15-year-old students. TIMSS compares data on the mathematics and science achievement of fourth- and eighth-grade students in the United States with that of students in other countries. Recent test results have shown a decline in the performance and ranking of U.S. students relative to their overseas peers. But the United States has never fared well on international comparisons of student achievement in math or science and in 1964, actually ranked 11th of 12 countries participating in the



first major international study of student achievement in math (Loveless, 2011). Clearly, this ranking proved nothing about global economic competitiveness or future economic growth.

Several issues related to assessment and reporting practices affect the results as do certain realities of U.S. society. Both PISA and TIMSS ask our students to do something that they are not taught to do: apply math and science concepts to real-world problems. No state assessments had included that requirement until the adoption of new assessments tied to Common Core State Standards, which many states have now abandoned. The results from both international assessments are reported as averages, which “is problematic for diverse nations like the US. Even though the US leads all nations in the number of top scorers, it has many students scoring at the lowest level” (Berliner, 2014).

Such results have led to a fierce debate within the United States about the purpose, fairness, and significance of international comparisons. Supporters of international comparisons, including business groups and policymakers, argue that international assessments provide accurate, objective data about the performance of U.S. students and offer valuable insights into the quality of U.S. public schools. They believe that when, as has been the case in recent years, U.S. students lose ground on those tests, an inference can be made that schools are not providing the quality education that is required to successfully compete in a global economy. They dismiss claims that international comparisons compare disparate groups across international lines. Supporters also claim that many countries ranking at the top also have large immigrant and low-income student populations. Furthermore, the media and policymakers, for the most part, embrace this view uncritically and condemn schools for their poor performance.

Critics of international comparisons, including many practitioners and a number of researchers, argue that it is impossible to accurately compare US students’ performance against that of their international peers because the students selected by their respective countries vary widely in their demographic makeup (not all countries include language learners and students with disabilities in their samples) and the sample size of students from various socioeconomic groups can vary widely. The tests are better suited to nations that have uniform and centralized education systems, critics argue, unlike the United States where some students might not yet have been exposed to the materials the tests are covering. In addition, scores are often reported as ranks, giving the illusion of great differences when in fact, the country ranked number one and the country ranked number 10 might be separated by only a fraction of a point. Thus, critics claim that international comparisons are exploited to portray a negative image of all public schools.

A report from the Economic Policy Institute in 2015 compared achievement of U.S. states with each other and other countries using data from the 2011 TIMSS, 2012 PISA, and several years of data from the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). It determined that socioeconomically disadvantaged students from states like Massachusetts made very large gains in international tests compared to other states. The researchers argue that these gains “are reasonably likely to be related to specific state policies that are transferable across states.”

The appropriate use of comparative international assessments can be summed up best by Angel Gurría, Secretary-General of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). He stated, that by “identifying the characteristics of high-performing education systems [international assessments such as PISA] allow governments and educators to identify effective policies that they can then adapt to their local contexts” (OCED, 2013). Our nation’s students are no longer competing for jobs with just their classmates, but rather with



students all over the world. Our education system must prepare students for life in a global and interconnected society. Using meaningful international comparisons to help support increased student achievement, grow a professional and high-quality educator workforce, and use appropriate accountability mechanisms should be reasons for participating in and evaluating the results of comparative international assessments. We must view our educational system in the context of a global society while also recognizing our unique cultural characteristics as we seek to improve educational opportunities for each student and grow our nation's economy.

## GUIDING PRINCIPLES

- NASSP believes that the value of large-scale assessments is in the information they provide to help schools analyze and improve the performance of each student and to close the achievement gap within U.S. schools.
- NASSP believes that the United States should take steps to prepare its students to become effective and active citizens of the world. NASSP supports common standards and rigorous formative and summative assessments that are aligned to those college and career-ready standards as a key step in preparing each student for success in a global society.
- NASSP considers education to be the most important and reliable investment our nation can make in its own future by preparing students to live in and thrive in a global economy.
- NASSP recognizes the power of technology to engage each student in a relevant and challenging curriculum and foster exchanges among U.S. schools, students, educators, and their counterparts overseas.
- *Building Ranks* focuses on two essential domains of school leadership—building culture and leading learning—and provides guidance for school leaders for how they can strategically apply them to help prepare each child for success in college, citizenship, career, and life.
- The Professional Standards for Educational Leaders state that effective school leaders develop and support intellectually rigorous and coherent systems of curriculum, instruction, and assessment to promote each student's academic success and well-being.
- NASSP has previously adopted position statements on common standards and assessments in K-12 education, high stakes assessments, and poverty's impact on student's education.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

### **Recommendations for Federal Policymakers**

- Cease to use international comparisons as an indictment of public education, but rather collaborate with all educators and stakeholders to analyze and use comparative international results to examine current policy and practices to ensure that the U.S. is implementing research-based best practices.
- Critically examine international test results to determine both their value and their limitations in informing policy.
- Examine results from international assessments by disaggregating results by socioeconomic status within the U.S. and to similar socioeconomic groups in other countries.



- Before changing or implementing new educational policies, review score trends on international assessments and NAEP by socioeconomic status over time within the United States and among similarly situated nations to assess and determine what actions and/or policies support student growth in various subgroups. Set realistic and measurable goals to achieve desired student growth and improved educator quality on the basis of careful examination of comparative international assessments.
- Provide all educators with an appropriate understanding on the use, purpose, and context of measuring student performance through international assessments.
- Support the responsible implementation of common, internationally benchmarked, college- and career-readiness standards that prepare each student to succeed in post-secondary education and training.
- Provide schools with the effective resources to implement academic standards, including funding, research on best practices, and continual professional development for teachers and principals.
- Address financial and social inequities that affect resources available to high-need schools and students, which can impact student performance.
- Provide educators with the resources, including relevant professional development, necessary to internationalize their schools and become active participants in a global community of practitioners.
- Ensure that practitioners have a voice when international tests that measure students' performance are developed and interpreted.

**School districts should:**

- Provide relevant and factual information on the use and interpretation of comparative international assessments to parents, students, and educators.
- Lead conversations with school leaders about international tests, such as PISA and TIMSS, and the implications of results for improving policies and practices where applicable.
- Encourage and promote international exchange opportunities among schools, educators, and students, including participation in the Fulbright Teaching Program.

**School leaders should:**

- Participate in discussions with school leaders in other countries to address common issues and exchange best practices.
- Lead efforts to offer world languages; encourage participation in international exchanges; and promote the use of technology to give students and faculty members access to programs, discussions, and conferences with their international peers in their schools.
- Advocate for the investment of resources to address the needs of high-need students and to help close funding inequities.



## RESOURCES

- America Achieves. (2013). Middle Class or Middle of the Pack? [americaachieves.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/Middle-Class-Or-Middle-Of-Pack.pdf](http://americaachieves.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/Middle-Class-Or-Middle-Of-Pack.pdf)
- Berliner, D. C. (2014). Effects of inequality and poverty vs. teachers and schooling of America's youth. *Teachers College Record*, 116(1). [tcrecord.org/content.asp?contentid=16889](http://tcrecord.org/content.asp?contentid=16889)
- Bracey, G. W. (2007). U.S. performance on international comparisons: An overview. *Principal Leadership* 7(6), 66–68.
- Bracey, G. W. (2008). Ranks, rates, and numbers—and confusion. *Principal Leadership*, 9(1), 72–74.
- Bracey, G. W. (2008). The leaning (toppling?) tower of Pisa. *Principal Leadership*, 9(2), 49–51.
- Carnoy, M., Garcia, El. & Khavenson, T. (2015). *Bringing it back home: Why state comparisons are more useful than international comparisons for improving U.S. education policy*. Economic Policy Institute. [epi.org/publication/bringing-it-back-home-why-state-comparisons-are-more-useful-than-international-comparisons-for-improving-u-s-education-policy/#epi-toc-21](http://epi.org/publication/bringing-it-back-home-why-state-comparisons-are-more-useful-than-international-comparisons-for-improving-u-s-education-policy/#epi-toc-21)
- Carnoy, M., & Rothstein, R. (2013, January 15). International tests show achievement gaps in all countries, with big gains for U.S. disadvantaged students. *Economic Policy Institute*. [epi.org/blog/international-tests-achievement-gaps-gains-american-students/](http://epi.org/blog/international-tests-achievement-gaps-gains-american-students/)
- Cavanaugh, S. (2012, January 9). U.S. education pressured by international comparisons. *Education Week*. [edweek.org/ew/articles/2012/01/12/16overview.h31.html](http://edweek.org/ew/articles/2012/01/12/16overview.h31.html)
- Ginsburg, A., Cooke, G., Leinwand, S., Noell, J., & Pollock, E. (2005). *Reassessing U.S. international mathematics performance: New findings from the 2003 TIMSS and PISA*. American Institutes for Research.
- Helgason, S. (1997, February). *International benchmarking experiences from OECD countries*. [Paper presentation]. International Benchmarking, Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Hull, J. (2007). *More than a horse race: A guide to international tests of student achievement*. Center for Public Education.
- Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics. (2018). *Highlights of U.S. PISA 2018 Results Web Report (NCES 2020-166 and NCES 2020-072)*. [nces.ed.gov/surveys/pisa/pisa2018/index.asp](http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/pisa/pisa2018/index.asp)
- Kagan, S. L. & Stuart, V. (2005). A new world view: Education in a global era. Introduction. *Phi Delta Kappan* 87(3). [pdkintl.org/kappan/k\\_v87/k0511toc.htm](http://pdkintl.org/kappan/k_v87/k0511toc.htm)
- Layton, L. (2013, December 2). U.S. students lag around average on international science, math and reading test. *The Washington Post*. [washingtonpost.com/local/education/us-students-lag-around-average-on-international-science-math-and-reading-test/2013/12/02/2e510f26-5b92-11e3-a49b-90a0e156254b\\_story.html](http://washingtonpost.com/local/education/us-students-lag-around-average-on-international-science-math-and-reading-test/2013/12/02/2e510f26-5b92-11e3-a49b-90a0e156254b_story.html)
- Loveless, T. (2011). *How well are American students learning?* (Brown Center Report on American Education). Brown Center on Education Policy at Brookings. [brookings.edu/research/the-2010-brown-center-report-on-american-education/](http://brookings.edu/research/the-2010-brown-center-report-on-american-education/)



- Mathews, J. (2008). Bad rap on the schools. *The Wilson Quarterly*. [archive.wilsonquarterly.com/essays/bad-  
rap-schools](http://archive.wilsonquarterly.com/essays/bad-<br/>rap-schools)
- McNeil, M. (2008, March 12). Benchmarks momentum on increase: Governors' group, state chiefs eyeing international yardsticks. *Education Week*, 12–13.
- National Association of Secondary School Principals. (2018). *Building ranks™: A comprehensive framework for effective school leaders*.
- OECD. (2011). Lessons from PISA for the United States. [dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264096660-en](http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264096660-en)
- OECD. (2013). *PISA 2012 results in focus: What 15-year-olds know and what they can do with what they know*. [oecd.org/pisa/keyfindings/pisa-2012-results-overview.pdf](http://oecd.org/pisa/keyfindings/pisa-2012-results-overview.pdf)
- Rotberg, I. C. (2008, June 11). Quick fixes, test scores, and the global economy: Myths that continue to confound us. *Education Week*. [edweek.org/ew/articles/2008/06/11/41rotberg\\_ep.h27.html](http://edweek.org/ew/articles/2008/06/11/41rotberg_ep.h27.html)
- Schleicher, A. (2008, June). *Seeing the U.S. school systems through the prism of international benchmarks*. [Paper presentation]. National Middle School Association Board of Directors, Alexandria, VA.