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Support to countries to establish national benchmarks for SDG 4

• UIS has developed a model to produce three reference points to support countries in developing their national benchmarks:
  1. Country-specific feasible benchmarks for 2025/2030
  2. Country-specific minimum benchmarks for 2025/2030
  3. Regional minimum benchmarks for 2025/2030

• These 3 reference points, are to assist countries to establish their own targets or benchmarks (if they have not done so already)
Overview

1. Country specific minimum benchmark
   - Global 75th Percentile growth rate historically relative to level

2. Country specific feasible benchmarks
   - Global Median growth rate historically relative to level

3. Regional minimum benchmarks
   - Baseline (latest level for the country)
   - (average country-specific minimum benchmark for the lowest third of countries)
How country-specific benchmarks are defined
Example: 4.1.2 Upper Secondary Completion

This figure shows each country’s average level of lower secondary completion (x-axis) and average growth rate in lower secondary completion (y-axis) since 2000. Historically, countries with lower levels have made more rapid progress in the indicator. As a result, a country with a lower starting point is expected to progress more rapidly than those with a higher starting point. Assessing whether a country is progressing well is therefore thought of in terms of relative to its level or, in other words, conditional on level.
Step 1. Determine the feasible annual growth rate of an indicator for each level of the indicator. In order to define a country-specific feasible benchmark, a feasible growth rate for an indicator is estimated for each level of the indicator. For the country-specific feasible benchmark, a feasible growth rate was defined as the median annual growth witnessed historically for each level of the indicator. Using this conditional median is considered feasible because its growth rate is balance of probabilities: half of countries were able to achieve higher and half were able to achieve lower. The orange line is the estimated median annual growth rate for each level of the indicator and output of Step 1.
How country-specific feasible benchmarks are defined
Example: 4.1.2 Upper Secondary Completion Tajikistan

Step 2: Use the feasible annual growth rate growth at each level from Step 1 to project future levels and annual growth going forward. Starting from the latest level of the indicator, its annual growth rate is determined using the feasible rate of growth for that level from Step 1 (orange line). The resulting level is used to determine the next year’s rate of growth, and so on, until a level for 2030 is determined (orange points). This offers a country-specific feasible benchmark because it is (1) tailored to the country’s starting point and (2) represents a feasible level of annual progress.
How country-specific feasible benchmarks are defined
Example: 4.1.2 Upper Secondary Completion Tajikistan

This figure presents the country-specific feasible benchmarks (orange points) for Tajikistan across time. The orange points correspond with the orange points in the previous slide. The country-specific feasible benchmark for Tajikistan for 2030 is 84.6 percent.
Step 1. Determine a target annual growth rate of an indicator for each level of the indicator. In order to define a country-specific minimum benchmark, the 75th percentile annual growth witnessed historically was estimated for each level of the indicator. The green line is the estimated 75th percentile annual growth rate for each level of the indicator and output of Step 1.
Step 2: Use the target annual growth rate growth at each level from Step 1 to project future levels and annual growth going forward. Starting from the latest level of the indicator, its annual growth rate is determined using the target rate of growth for that level from Step 1 (green line). The resulting level is used to determine the next year’s rate of growth, and so on, until a level of for 2030 is determined (green points). This offers a country-specific minimum benchmark because it is (1) tailored to the country’s starting point and (2) and more ambitious than the feasible level of annual progress.
How country-specific minimum benchmarks are defined
Example: 4.1.2 Upper Secondary Completion Tajikistan

This figure presents the country-specific feasible benchmarks (orange points) and
the country specific minimum benchmarks across time (green points),
for Tajikistan. The green points correspond with the orange points in the
previous slide. The country-specific feasible benchmark for Tajikistan for 2030
is 84.6 percent while the country-specific minimum benchmark for Tajikistan for
2030 is 88.8 percent.
**How regional minimum benchmarks were defined**  Example: 4.1.2.iii Completion rate upper secondary, SDG: Central Asia Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Latest Year</th>
<th>Latest value</th>
<th>Country-specific feasible benchmark</th>
<th>Country-specific minimum benchmark</th>
<th>Regional minimum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkmenistan</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>95.9</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The *regional minimum benchmark* is defined as the average country-specific feasible benchmark for the lowest third of countries in the region.

Among the 5 countries here, 1/3 is represented by 2 countries. The average of the lowest 2 countries (highlighted) is **88.0%**. This average is the regional minimum benchmark.
Summary of methodology

Country-specific feasible benchmarks: computed based on the median growth rate (conditional on level)

Country-specific minimum benchmarks: more ambitious, computed based on the 75th percentile growth rate (conditional on level).

Regional benchmark: The average of the feasible benchmarks for the lowest third of countries
The benchmarking approach provides three reference points for each county (a. *country-specific feasible benchmark*, b. *country-specific minimum benchmark*, and c. *regional minimum benchmark*) to assist Member States in benchmarking their progress towards the selected SDG 4 indicators.

Countries without data are not shown.
### Central Asia Regional Minimum Benchmarks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1.1.a Proportion of students in Grade 2 or 3 achieving at least a minimum proficiency level in mathematics</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.1.a Proportion of students in Grade 2 or 3 achieving at least a minimum proficiency level in reading</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>69.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.1.b Proportion of students at the end of primary achieving at least a minimum proficiency level in mathematics</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.1.b Proportion of students at the end of primary achieving at least a minimum proficiency level in reading</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.1.c Proportion of students at the end of lower secondary achieving at least a minimum proficiency level in mathematics</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.1.c Proportion of students at the end of lower secondary achieving at least a minimum proficiency level in reading</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.2.i Completion rate primary</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.2.i Completion rate primary (GMR)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.2.ii Completion rate lower secondary</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.2.ii Completion rate lower secondary (GMR)</td>
<td>95.9</td>
<td>98.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.2.iii Completion rate upper secondary</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.2.iii Completion rate upper secondary (GMR)</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>86.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.4.i Out-of-school rate, primary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.4.ii Out-of-school rate, lower secondary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.4.iii Out-of-school rate, upper secondary</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.2 Participation rate in organized learning (one year before the official primary entry age)</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.c.1.a Proportion of teachers with the minimum required qualifications, pre-primary</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>96.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.c.1.b Proportion of teachers with the minimum required qualifications, primary</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.c.1.c Proportion of teachers with the minimum required qualifications, lower secondary</td>
<td>90.3</td>
<td>98.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.c.1.d Proportion of teachers with the minimum required qualifications, upper secondary</td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td>89.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Benchmarks dashboard

Applying the benchmark methodology to actual data builds a basis for discussion at global, regional and national level. The TCG Secretariat presents three dashboards to facilitate such discussions, in particular to synthesize progress and identify data gaps, but also to guide monitoring and follow-up.

The dashboards present for each of the seven indicators (and their dimensions, for instance by education level), for each country and for several regional groups, the following information:

- the baseline in 2015;
- a projection for 2025 and 2030 based on past rates of progress (national projection), and
- a projection for 2025 and 2030 based on average rates of progress (feasible benchmark) to initiate a discussion; countries and regional entities can decide whether they would adopt these proposed benchmarks or they prefer to establish their own, more ambitious benchmarks.

Summary of progress

This indicative dashboard shows how progress can be monitored and reported in 2025 and 2030 taking into account the level countries have reached and their rate of progress.

Regional Dashboard

This dashboard shows the baseline, national projection and feasible/proposed benchmarks for 2025 and 2030 in a range of regional entities and groupings, as a basis for decisions on regional and national benchmark setting.

Country Dashboard

This dashboard shows the baseline, national projection and feasible/proposed benchmarks for 2025 and 2030 for all seven indicators and their dimensions, by country as a basis for decisions on national benchmark setting.

Documents

- Glossary to navigate the dashboards
- Regional Groupings
Discussion (20 minutes)

- Has your country set own benchmarks for the SDG 4 indicators?
- If yes, a) what are the benchmark values and b) for which indicators?
- Do you think setting benchmarks would be useful in your country?
Thank you.

Learn more [http://uis.unesco.org/](http://uis.unesco.org/)
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