





# SDG 4 Summary of Day 1



### Reporting and measuring progress in SDG4

- What are now accepted as standard features of assessment systems that produce comparable results?
- What are some of the implementation problems detected even in relatively well-designed testing programmes?
- How to build comparable results?
- Whole debate around measuring learning outcomes.
  - cross-country comparability has been over-emphasised relative to comparability over time within countries
  - It is the latter the one of greatest importance for national policymakers



### **Indicator 4.1.1**

The reporting format aims to communicate two pieces of information:

- ➤ the percentage of students meeting minimum proficiency standards for the relevant domains (mathematics and reading) for each point of measurement (grades 2/3; end of primary and end of lower secondary); and
- when different programs can be considered comparable and the conditions under which the percentage can be considered comparable to the percentage reported from another country.

### The 2030 Agenda and Reporting

- A dialogue about definitional issues
  - What is the construct (for instance, reading?)
  - What are the contents?
  - What is the minimum proficiency?
  - How to express everybody in same scale?
- No matter what methodology that is used there are assumptions need to be met...
  - Learning domains and target population need similarities to have valid outcomes.
  - Ensure procedural consistency
- Respect to national ownership, meet national needs and sensitivity to cultural values



### **Countries at GAML 5**

**Afghanistan** Chile Kenya Sweden **Dominican** Bangladesh **Maldives Tunisia** Republic Belgium **Estonia** Mali **Turkey** Brazil **Mexico Uruguay France** Burundi Nepal Gambia, the Cambodia Grenada Russia Slovakia Canada India St Vincent Indonesia Chad and the **Grenadines** 





#### **Country Highlights**

- Need to build capacities, funding, technical expertise, etc...
- Paradox: too much data, but not enough of the right kind
- National examination as a source of data for 4.1.1
- Sustainability of grant funded assessments
- Motivation for assessment and validation
- MPLs are different
- Timely dissemination of data
- Better coordination at country-level is needed
- Mother tongue of instruction in the first year of schooling



### **Challenges and Needs**

#### We need tools to address:



 Data coverage – not every country has data for every measurement point that is requested.



 Data quality – content and procedural alignment tool go some way to help countries reflect on the quality of assessments they are using to collect data points



 Data coherence – if pulling different assessments for different points, to what extent can you use the alignment or linking strategies that have been proposed, statistical or not, pedagogical or not, to improve coherence.



### Tools to help countries align to 4.1.1

- Content Alignment Tool
  - Alignment with global framework, allows for mapping
  - http://unesco.desarrollo.melocoton.la/
- 2. Procedural Alignment Tool
  - Ensure procedural consistency
  - Capacity development needs
  - https://www.research.net/r/ProceduralAlignmentTool
- Definition of MPL
  - Proficiency Level descriptors
- 4. Linking methodologies:
  - a. Pedagogical linking
  - b. Non-pedagogical linking Portfolio approach





## Thank you!

Silvia Montoya s.montoya@unesco.org

Learn more:

http://gaml.uis.unesco.org/index.html/@UNESCOstat