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Terms of Reference

(a) Diagnose implementation difficulties of specific indicators; and

(b) Produce a report with a recommended work plan for the methodological development and/or data collection approach needed for the implementation of each indicator or group of indicators under consideration.
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Terms of reference

New

(a) Review the indicators and areas requiring further development

(b) Identify the indicators which the group can develop and those requiring external expertise

(c) Propose full methodologies for each indicator for approval by the TCG and then IAEG

(d) Identify additional areas requiring development such as disaggregation
Progress to date

• Selected 15 of the 22 indicators requiring further development plus additional areas identified by the TCG

• Learning outcomes related indicators and additional areas will be developed by the GAML

• Gathered existing methodologies for selected indicators

• Identified 7 indicators with existing survey specific methodologies and with expertise within the group for initial work: 4.3.1, 4.4.3, 4.7.1, 4.7.2, 4.a.2, 4.c.5, 4.c.7

• Convened 7 sub-groups to adapt and finalise these methodologies
4.3.1 • Data sources: OECD for PIAAC and European Union for Adult Education Survey

• Compared the methodologies and questions between the 2 surveys

• OECD presented and compared the results

• Looking at other sources such as ILO and possibility of adding questions to existing national surveys

• Adapting the methodology for global use

• Submit for approval by the group and the TCG

• Need to develop proposals to increase the coverage of countries
4.7.1 • UNESCO ESG Section has produced a draft methodology

• Methodology is based on a review of 82 national reports on the implementation of the 1974 Recommendation on Education for International Understanding

• UIS to provide comments and WG1 members will be invited to review

• WG1 will review recommendations on how to cross-check the results

• UNESCO ESG launched a [website](#) tracking 4.7
4.7.2 • UNESCO’s Health and Education Section has produced a draft methodology and assessment of the indicators technical merits and feasibility to collect

• Piloted in Eastern and Southern Africa

• Will be expanded to the rest of Africa and other regions

• Working group members will be invited to comment on the methodology
4.a.2

- WHO’s Global School Based Health Survey already collects data on bullying and violence in school, in about 90 countries (13-17 year olds).

- UNESCO’s Health and Education Section is working with WHO to develop a full definition of the indicator, including corporal punishment and harassment.

- UNESCO has launched a website which presents reports on school violence and bullying.

- PISA has some relevant questions covering only 15 year olds.
• Draft methodologies are in the process of being reviewed by the members
Planned Results

• Submission of recommended methodologies to the TCG for endorsement (global) and approval (thematic)

• Submission of endorsed methodologies for global indicators to IAEG for approval
Work plan

• Agreed methodology within the group for 3 indicators by the end of September 2017

• Another 4 by January 2018

• Other indicators from the 15 or the additional areas will be selected periodically for development

• Validation process or consultation with Member States? By December 2017? By UIS? Others?

• Submit to the TCG for approval (thematic) and endorsement (global) by early 2018

• Submit global indicators to the IAEG by Q4 2018
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Timeline

2017

- JAN: 3 indicators
- FEB: 4 indicators
- MAR: Additional indicators/areas
- APR: Develop methodology
- MAY: Consultation
- JUN: Agree
- JUL: TCG Approval
- AUG: Consultation
- SEP: TCG Approval
- OCT: Approval by IAEG (global indicators only)
- NOV: Agree
- DEC: Develop methodology

2018

- JAN: TCG Approval
- FEB: Consultation
- MAR: TCG Approval
- APR: Consultation
- MAY: TCG Approval
- JUN: Agree
- JUL: Develop methodology
- AUG: Consultation
Challenges

- Consulting Member States
- Need for careful interpretation of some indicators
- Ensuring global relevance
- Identifying suitable data sources
- Identifying external expertise
Conclusion

• Does the TCG approve our proposed changes to the TORs?

• Does the TCG have any feedback on work done so far?

• Is a consultation process adequate for getting feedback from countries on the draft methodologies?

• Does the TCG approve our work plan for 2017-2018?
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