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Proposals: publish ranges for regional aggregates based on HHS, to reflect uncertainty due to sampling and imputation.

Pro

• More transparent regarding true uncertainty.
• Potentially greater coverage, if publication criteria for ranges are less strict than for point estimates.
• Allows for publication of aggregates of absolute counts (e.g. number of out-of-school children) as “at least X” regardless of countries with missing data.

Con

• Less straightforward to communicate.
• Less straightforward to compare over time.
Which weights for aggregating completion rates?

- Primary/lower secondary/upper secondary completion rates are calculated on individuals aged 3-5 years above the statutory age for the final grade of the corresponding level.

- **Choice** between two reasonable sets of weights:
  
  **A. Size of the three cohorts** entering the calculation. This represents a focus on completion as individual attainment.

  **B. Size of the school-age population** of the underlying level. This represents a focus on completion as a marker of system quality.
Which weights for aggregating completion rates?

A. Size of the three cohorts entering the calculation. This represents a focus on completion as individual attainment.

Pro

• Unaffected by differences in level duration between countries.
• Follows the general principle of weighting by denominator.

Con

• Ignores differences in population exposed to different levels.
• Weights not consistent with OOS weights.
• Single-year population data for non-standard age brackets are almost always interpolated estimates.
Which weights for aggregating completion rates?

B. Size of the school-age population of the underlying level. This represents a focus on completion as a marker of system quality.

Pro

• Sensitive to differences in population exposed to different levels.
• Expected years of schooling provide precedent of weighting by population that the indicator is about, rather than mechanistically by denominator.
• Weights consistent with OOS.

Con

• Ignores the cohort perspective.