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There is nowhere to hide
A world of change in baseline qualifications

Approximated by percentage of persons with high school or equivalent qualifications in the age groups 55-64, 45-55, 45-44, and 25-34 years.

1. Excluding ISCED 3C short programmes
2. Year of reference 2004
3. Including some ISCED 3C short programmes
OECD’s PISA assessment of the knowledge and skills of 15-year-olds

Coverage of world economy 87%
Average performance of 15-year-olds in science - extrapolate and apply

18 countries perform below this line
Increased likelihood of postsec. particip. at age 19 associated with reading proficiency at age 15 (Canada) after accounting for school engagement, gender, mother tongue, place of residence, parental, education and family income (reference group Level 1)
ICE, Geneva
25 November 2008
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Average performance of 15-year-olds in science – extrapolate and apply
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Strong socio-economic impact on student performance

Socially equitable distribution of learning opportunities
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Socially equitable distribution of learning opportunities
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School performance and socio-economic background

Germany

- Student performance and students' socio-economic background within schools
- School performance and schools' socio-economic background
- Student performance and students' socio-economic background

Schools proportional to size

PISA Index of socio-economic background

Disadvantage

Advantage
School performance and socio-economic background

Finland

- Student performance and students' socio-economic background within schools
- School performance and schools' socio-economic background
- Student performance and students' socio-economic background

Schools proportional to size

Student performance

Disadvantage  PISA Index of socio-economic background  Advantage
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OECD average = 500

Immigrants and science performance

PISA 2006: Science Competencies for Tomorrow's World, Figure 4.2a.
Variation in student performance

OECD (2007), Learning for tomorrow’s world: First results from PISA 2006, Table 4.1a
Variation in student performance

OECD (2004), Learning for tomorrow's world: First results from PISA 2003, Table 4.1a
How to get there

Some policy levers that emerge from international comparisons
High ambitions and universal standards

Rigor, focus and coherence

Great systems attract great teachers and provide access to best practice and quality professional development
Challenge and support

- Strong support
  - Strong performance
  - Systemic improvement

- Weak support
  - Poor performance
  - Improvements idiosyncratic

- Low challenge
  - Poor performance
  - Stagnation

- High challenge
  - Conflict
  - Demoralisation

Note: This diagram illustrates the relationship between challenge and support, with performance and improvement outcomes.
High ambitions
Access to best practice and quality professional development
Accountability and intervention in inverse proportion to success
Devolved responsibility, the school as the centre of action

ICE, Geneva
Inclusive Education
25 November 2008
Creating a knowledge-rich profession in which schools and teachers have the authority to act, the necessary knowledge to do so wisely, and access to effective support systems.

The future of education systems is “knowledge rich”

- Informed professional judgement, the teacher as a “knowledge worker”
- Uninformed professional judgement, teachers working in isolation

The tradition of education systems has been “knowledge poor”

- Informed prescription
- Professional judgement
- National prescription
- Uninformed prescription, teachers implement curricula
School autonomy, standards-based examinations and science performance

School autonomy in selecting teachers for hire

PISA score in science

- Yes
  - 63
- No
  - 0

School autonomy in selecting teachers for hire

Standards based external examinations
Local responsibility and national prescription

Towards system-wide sustainable reform

National prescription

Schools today
Detailed prescription of what schools do

Schools tomorrow?
Building capacity

Finland today
Every school an effective school

Schools leading reform

Towards system-wide sustainable reform
Public and private schools

- **Government schools**
- **Government dependent private**
- **Government independent private**

**Public and private schools perform better**

**Private schools perform better**

Score point difference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Government schools</th>
<th>Government dependent private</th>
<th>Government independent private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak Republic</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Difference after accounting for socio-economic background of students and schools**

- **Private schools perform better**
- **Public schools perform better**

**Observed performance difference**
Pooled international dataset, effects of selected school/system factors on science performance after accounting for all other factors in the model

OECD (2007), PISA 2006 - Science Competencies from Tomorrow's World, Table 6.1a
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Strong ambitions

Access to best practice and quality professional development

Accountability

Devolved responsibility, the school as the centre of action

Integrated educational opportunities

From prescribed forms of teaching and assessment towards personalised learning

Integrated educational opportunities

Access to best practice and quality professional development

Accountability

Devolved responsibility, the school as the centre

From prescribed forms of teaching and assessment towards personalised learning
Inclusive Education

Low average performance
Large socio-economic disparities
High social equity

Strong socio-economic impact on student performance

Early selection and institutional differentiation
High degree of stratification
Low degree of stratification

High science performance

Turkey
Australia
Japan
Finland
Canada
Korea

Low science performance

New Zealand
Netherlands
Germany
Belgium
Hungary
Czech Republic
Austria
Switzerland
United Kingdom
Ireland
Sweden
Poland
Iceland
Finland

High average performance

High social equity

Low average performance
Large socio-economic disparities

High science performance

High social equity

Low science performance

Early selection and institutional differentiation
High degree of stratification
Low degree of stratification

High average performance

Low average performance
Large socio-economic disparities
High social equity

High science performance

High social equity

Low science performance

Early selection and institutional differentiation
High degree of stratification
Low degree of stratification

High average performance

Low average performance
Large socio-economic disparities
High social equity
Some conclusions on inclusion

**Design**
- Limit early tracking and postpone academic selection
- Manage school choice so as to contain the risks to equity
- In upper secondary education, provide attractive alternatives, remove dead ends and prevent dropout
- Offer second chances to gain from education

**Practices**
- Identify and provide systematic help to those who fall behind at school and reduce year repetition
- Strengthen the links between school and home to help disadvantaged parents help their children to learn
- Respond to diversity and provide for the successful inclusion of migrants and minorities within mainstream education

**Resourcing**
- Provide strong education for all, giving priority to early childhood provision and basic schooling
- Direct resources to students and regions with the greatest needs
- Set concrete targets for more equity, particularly related to low school attainment and dropouts.
Some paradigm shifts

The old bureaucratic education system

Hit & miss → Universal high standards
Uniformity → Embracing diversity
Provision → Outcomes
Bureaucratic - look up → Devolved - look outwards
Talk equity → Deliver equity
Received wisdom → Data and best practice
Prescription → Informed profession
Demarcation → Collaboration

The modern enabling education system
www.oecd.org; www.pisa.oecd.org
- All national and international publications
- The complete micro-level database

email: pisa@oecd.org

Andreas.Schleicher@OECD.org

... and remember:
Without data, you are just another person with an opinion