



United Nations  
Educational, Scientific and  
Cultural Organization



UNESCO  
INSTITUTE  
FOR  
STATISTICS



TECHNICAL  
COOPERATION  
GROUP



# TCG4: Development of SDG thematic indicator 4.6.3

TCG4/15

16-18 January 2018

Dusit Thani Dubai

133, Sheikh Zayed Road, Trade Centre,

Dubai, United Arab Emirates





## Table of contents

1. Introduction .....	3
2. Conceptual framework.....	3
<i>Illiterate youth/adults</i> .....	3
<i>Literacy programmes</i> .....	4
3. Existing methodologies .....	5
4. Labour force surveys .....	8
5. Recommendations.....	9
Bibliography .....	11
Annex 1 – Related LFS questions .....	12
ANNEX 2 – Draft metadata.....	17
ANNEX 3 – Draft UIS survey on participation in literacy programmes.....	19
ANNEX 4 - Principles for the indicator development.....	20

DRAFT for discussion



## 1. Introduction

Following the work of the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on Sustainable Development Goal Indicators (IAEG) carried out since 2015, the global indicator framework for the SDGs was approved and endorsed by the United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC)<sup>i</sup> in June 2017. As the custodian agency for the SDG4 indicators, the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS) has also worked in parallel on a more comprehensive list of thematic indicators that complement the global indicators approved by the ECOSOC.

With this purpose, the UIS established in 2016 the Technical Cooperation Group on the Indicators for SDG 4 responsible for discussing and developing indicators in an open, inclusive, and transparent manner. Among these thematic indicators, the group suggested for the target 4.6, related to inclusive and equitable lifelong learning, the inclusion of the indicator 4.6.3 – Participation rate of illiterate youth/adults in literacy programmes.

During its second meeting, held in October 2016, the TCG has “Discussed and AGREED on the list of 29 thematic education indicators to be reported in 2017”. The indicator 4.6.3 was not incorporated among those to be used for monitoring in 2017, as this indicator needed “further conceptual or methodological development” according to the group<sup>ii</sup>.

## 2. Conceptual framework

The target 4.6 aims to ensure, by 2030, “that all youth and a substantial proportion of adults, both men and women, achieve literacy and numeracy”. The global indicator will monitor the youth and adult proficiency in literacy and numeracy, therefore, the emphasis of the thematic indicator 4.6.3 is over the participation in literacy programmes instead of literacy proficiency.

However, it is important for the monitoring framework to have a clear perspective on i) the target public of the literacy programmes; ii) what is a literacy programme; and iii) what types of literacy programmes are going to be subject of monitoring via this indicator.

### *Illiterate youth/adults*

The Belém Framework for Action (UIL, 2010, p. 6) constitutes one of the most incisive calls to avoid the literate/illiterate dichotomy and to ensure “that all surveys and data collection recognise literacy as a continuum”. However, the prevailing operational definition among surveys and data collection still the one proposed by UNESCO in 1958<sup>iii</sup>: “A person is literate who can with understanding both read and write a short simple statement on his everyday life”. The current UIS Glossary<sup>iv</sup> defines literates as those “who can both read and write with understanding a short simple statement on his/her everyday life”. This definition is not only simplistic in the sense that establishes an arbitrary and inconsistent separation of different levels of literacy but also overlooks the fact that literacy is not a fixed characteristic, and can change in the course of one’s life.

UNESCO (2004, p. 13) has more recently suggested an improved definition of literacy as an “ability to identify, understand, interpret, create, communicate and compute, using printed and written materials associated with varying contexts. Literacy involves a continuum of learning in enabling individuals to achieve their goals, to develop their knowledge and potential, and to participate fully in their community and wider society”. Initiatives such as UNESCO’s LAMP and OECD’s PIAAC have been



implemented to measure literacy in this perspective, but these methodologies are costly and difficult to be incorporated and operated by national yearly data collections.

Some methodologies have been developed to at least improve questions about literacy in household surveys (Unesco, 2008). However, according to the 2<sup>nd</sup> Global Report on Adult Learning and Education (UIL, 2013, p. 26), 105 out of the 129 countries consulted for the Report, declared that their “literacy data (essentially counts of ‘literate’ and ‘illiterate’ and estimated literacy rates) are based on a single question asked in their population census and/or household surveys”.

The low availability of sources with alternative measures and the need to maintain time series data are two of the main reasons identified by Carr-Hill and UIS (2008) to explain the prevalent use of outdated literacy questions in surveys and censuses. Taking this context of data availability into consideration, the indicator 4.6.3 metadata (UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2017, p. 64) suggests using estimates for the illiterate population based on household surveys or population censuses as they provide the best country coverage.

From the practical point of view, it is important to not exclude national literacy measures that are still based on the dichotomy literate/illiterate as they allow the inclusion of a higher number of countries and facilitate a truly universal monitoring. However, it is important to recommend countries to improve their literacy measures to enable a better assessment of literacy. At the same time, countries with existing mechanisms to assess literacy levels should be encouraged to use the estimates of population with low literacy levels as the target public for literacy programmes.

### *Literacy programmes*

Currently, there is no internationally agreed definition on what should be considered as a literacy programme. Several terms such as “campaign”, ‘programme’, ‘initiative’, ‘movement’ and ‘mission’ have been used in policy discourse to refer to “major literacy interventions”. (Hanemann, 2014, p. 9). Although some initiatives like the “Experimental World Literacy Programme (EWLP)” have attempted to apply a common format for these interventions, it has been proven that “its single-model approach was too limited” (UNESCO, 2004, p. 9).

Evidences from five African countries participating in the project “*Action Research on Measuring Literacy Programme Participants’ Learning Outcomes*” (RAMAA) indicate that “it makes sense to tailor literacy programmes to the populations they target...[as] an overly constrictive structure (same programme, same number of hours, etc.) is not the ideal approach to provide the entire population, in all its diversity” (Bolly & Jonas, 2015, p. 72). An extensive literature based on Paulo Freire (1996) has argued that the process of literacy construction cannot be detached from the social context of the individual and their community. This can be observed in the diversity of the more than 200 case studies of youth and adult literacy programmes organized by the “Effective Literacy and Numeracy Practices Database (LitBase)”.

Therefore, considering the inexorable variety of literacy programmes, the operational definition must be the as broad and flexible as possible to prevent any unnecessary exclusion. As a result, it is suggested to integrate the ISCED 2011 definition for education programme (UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2012) with the aforementioned definition for literacy (UNESCO, 2004).



*A coherent set or sequence of educational activities designed and organized over a sustained period to develop the ability to identify, understand, interpret, create, communicate, and compute, using printed and written materials associated with varying contexts.*

However, such broad definition for literacy programmes implies the inclusion of programmes not specifically designed for the target public of illiterates. Although youth and adult primary education would also fit within the scope of a literacy programme, they might be undertaken by those who would respond in a survey that “can both read and write with understanding a short simple statement on his/her everyday life”. Therefore, for this particular indicator that concerns a restricted target public, it is important to have an operational guideline to not include youth and adult primary education programmes, unless it is possible to identify those who are in the initial phase of the programme.

### 3. Existing methodologies

Presently, there are methodologies implemented at national and international levels collecting relevant data for the indicator 4.6.3. The following review of these existing methodologies is based on principles for indicator’s methodological development implemented during the construction of the SDG’s monitoring framework.

#### *Cross-national initiatives*

##### **UIS survey on literacy programmes in Latin America and the Caribbean (UIS/LAC)**


The UIS survey on literacy programmes in Latin America and the Caribbean (UIS/LAC) provides the most comprehensive source of comparable information for the indicator 4.6.3. The survey was administered in 2011 using 2010 as the reference year. There are valid answers for 30 of the 43 of countries and territories of the Latin American and the Caribbean, representing 98% of the regional population.

The main objective was to collect comparable data, based on ISCED 1997, about the number of youth and adults enrolled in literacy programmes as well as second-chance primary and secondary education. The underlining rationale of the study, which is aligned with the thematic indicator, is that “The relationship between the number of participants enrolled in programmes during a given period and the total number of illiterate persons over the same period indicates the level of access of the illiterate population to these programmes.” (Infante, Letelier, & Rivero, 2014, p. 12)

The questionnaire sent to the countries requested information on the number of participants in adult literacy programmes by type of centre (public, private), duration (less than 6 months, six months or more) and sex. The indicator of “Access to literacy programmes in Latin American and Caribbean countries” (Infante et al., 2014, p. 12) resulted from the combination of these data with the number of illiterates provided by countries through the UIS Questionnaire on Literacy (LIT). This questionnaire sent to all countries every year aims to collect updated information on the number of literate and illiterate persons aged 10 years and over. The data is requested disaggregated by age-group, sex, and location (urban or rural).

The indicator calculated based on the UIS survey ranged from 53% in Bolivia to less than 1% in Puerto

Figure 1. Access to literacy programmes in Latin American and Caribbean countries, 2010  
(Infante, Letelier, & Rivero, 2014, p. 12)



**Note:** 1): Data cover the public sector only. The reference year for data on participants is 2010 except for Bolivia (2008), Brazil (2009) and Guatemala (2011). Source: UNESCO Institute for Statistics Data Centre, May 2013 and Regional Questionnaire for Latin America and the Caribbean on Statistics of Adult Education, 2011.

Rico. Even having responded to the survey, some countries such as Cuba, Chile, and Uruguay, were not included in the main analysis of the indicator considering that they had a low number of illiterates (less than 2% of the population).

The methodology adopted by the UIS/LAC survey on literacy present some limitations as a potential methodology for the thematic indicator. First, as some countries rely on governmental programmes' administrative data, it is not possible to estimate the number of participants in non-public literacy programmes. If there is no estimate of the proportion of the public provision of literacy programmes, there is no indication as to whether these figures are comparable.

Another relevant limitation regards the lack of operational rules to prevent the publication of estimates based on too few observations. Considering that the survey collected information from countries using weighted figures, and no additional sample documentation was provided, it is not possible to know the reliability of if specific cells in the table (e.g. the number of male participants in rural programmes with less than 6 months' duration).

Apart from the survey conducted by UIS, the Demographic and Health Surveys as well as the Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys have implemented national surveys in low- and middle-income countries, with instruments containing relevant questions for the thematic indicator. The main shortcoming of these data sources is that the questions related to participation in literacy programmes have been administered only to a smaller group of countries. For both projects, the relevant question also regards participation in literacy programmes in the past (see Annex 1 - Nepal and Senegal).



## National initiatives

The literacy rate varies a lot among countries. According to UIS, the adult literacy rate (15+) in 2014 ranges from less than 40% in countries like Guinea and Burkina Faso, to practically 100% in several middle- and high-income countries. Considering the population of countries, it means that in absolute numbers, the illiterate population can vary from a few thousands in Maldives and Uzbekistan, to more than 10 million in Brazil and Pakistan.

In this context in which many countries have a very small target population, when compared to the entire population, national surveys are not an adequate source of information to monitor participation in literacy programmes. As discussed by the 2017 GEM Report (Unesco, 2017, p. 207), specific systems to monitor these programmes are becoming increasingly common:

A review of over 200 adult literacy and numeracy programmes, prepared for this report and published in the UNESCO Effective Literacy and Numeracy Practices Database, showed that all carried out some monitoring and evaluation, usually as part of the management and implementation cycle (Hanemann, 2017). Most produced monthly, quarterly, mid-term or annual reports.

Based on the same UNESCO's Effective Literacy and Numeracy Practices Database (LitBase) and other sources, some cases were selected to analyse the scope of monitoring activities, envisaging the potential of using the data produced by these activities as national sources for the indicator.

After a decade of successful literacy policies that reduced the adult illiteracy rate from 13% in 2001 to 4% in 2008, Bolivia has implemented in 2009 the National Post Literacy Program –PNP planning to coordinate the provision of youth and adult primary education as well as “develop literacy processes to persons aged 15 and above who are part of the residual illiterate population”<sup>v</sup>. The programme is monitored by the Ministry of Education and the data is published in the annual accountability reports. From 2006 to 2015, 978.399 persons graduated from literacy programmes, 23.923 of them in the year of 2015. The number of facilitators involved is also monitored<sup>vi</sup>.

Since 2003, more than 10 million people have enrolled in courses of the Literate Brazil Program (PBA), which is one of the largest existing literacy programmes in the world. Although the programme is administered by multiple organizations at the state and municipal levels and involves partners from private sector as well, the federal agency responsible for funding the programme, the National Fund for Educational Development (FNDE), maintains a centralized management system (SBA). The database produced by the SBA contains information of every student enrolled in the programme as well as of their teachers and it is referred to as “probably the only database of its kind in the world” (Tufani, 2016, p. 2). The consolidated figures resulting from SBA is published annually by FNDE. In 2015/2016, the programme had 167 thousand participants<sup>vii</sup>.

This figure stemming from administrative data seems to be representative of the national participation in literacy programmes. According to the Brazilian National Household Survey from 2015, around 140 thousand people attended literacy programmes that year.

In Botswana, every ten years since 1993, Statistics Botswana has conducted the National Literacy Survey with support from the Ministry of Education and Skills Development. The main objectives of the survey are to examine the “extent to which the population participates in the national literacy programmes as well as the extent to which acquired literacy and numeracy skills are utilised on day-to-day socio-economic activities”<sup>viii</sup>.



The 2014 edition had a target population of all household members aged between 10 and 70 years who were not attending formal school, have attained standard four or below, or were attending non-formal education. The results show that 23% of the eligible population attended literacy programmes and three quarters of them did so through the governmental “Adult Basic Education Programme (ABEP)”. The questionnaire contains other questions related to the type, duration and location of the programme attended and includes information on the reasons for missing classes or not attending a literacy programme. Similarly, Kenya has conducted its first National Adult Literacy Survey (KNALS) in 2006 and the development of a framework for a second cycle began in 2016.

In Bhutan, the web-based Education Management Information System (EMIS) is maintained by the schools and districts (dzongkhags) that update information on their Basic Literacy Courses (BLC) and Post-Literacy Courses (PLC) every year. The data from the Bhutanese EMIS are consolidated by the Ministry of Education and published in the Annual Education Statistics report which is in its 29th edition<sup>ix</sup>. Similar Education Management Information Systems (EMIS) that encompasses literacy programmes have been used in Cambodia, Democratic Republic of Congo, Tanzania, and Nepal.

Having reliable administrative data for literacy programmes are particularly important for countries with low illiteracy rates, given that regular national surveys are not capable of producing reliable estimates for small groups of the population. In Sweden, for instance, PIAAC data shows that less than 7% of the native-born and native-language (non-immigrant) population are classified in the Level 1 or below of literacy proficiency, whereas among those foreign-born and foreign-language (immigrants), 46% are at the lowest levels of literacy proficiency. In absolute numbers, this group represents a very small portion of the population but with particular policy needs. Therefore, Sweden has monitored yearly literacy programmes from municipal adult education (KomVux) and Swedish for Immigrants. The administrative data reported by these programmes comprise information on number of participants, credentials, and staff.

#### 4. Labour force surveys

Labour Force Surveys are a viable source of information for those countries in which the youth and adult illiteracy rates are relatively high and, therefore, the number of observations in the sample are sufficient to provide reliable estimates. Apart

The table below shows the availability of LFS information on participation in literacy programmes for the 16 countries with the highest adult illiteracy rates in 2011 based on the UIS Literacy database.



Figure 2. LFS relevant questions on literacy

	Source	Literacy question	Part. Lit. Programme
Afghanistan	DHS 2015	Read sentence/Highest ed. attain.	No
Bangladesh	LFS 2015	Self-Reported read and write	No
Brazil	PNAD 2017	Self-Reported read and write	Yes
Congo	DHS 2011	Read sentence/Highest ed. attain	No
Honduras	LFS2016	Self-Reported read and write	Yes
India	71 <sup>st</sup> SES 2014	Self-Reported literate	Yes
Laos	Census 2015	Self-Reported read and write	No
Mali	EMOP 2015	Self-Reported read and write	No
Morocco	Census 2014	Self-Reported read and write	No
Namibia	LFS 2016	Self-Reported read and write	Adult. Educ.
Nepal	MICS 2014	Self-Reported read and write	Past
Pakistan	LFS 2014/15	Self-Reported read and write	No
Senegal	DHS 2016	Read sentence/Highest ed. attain	Past
Togo	DHS 2013/14	Read sentence/Highest ed. attain	No
Zimbabwe	DHS 2015	Read sentence/Highest ed. attain	No

Source: Elaborated by the author based on questionnaires available at ILO and IHSN Survey Catalogs

## 5. Recommendations

### Concept alignment

**Going beyond the dichotomy literate/illiterate:** Most countries only monitor literacy rates via *dummy* variables resulting from self-declared literacy proficiency in household surveys. However, it is recommended that the denominator of the indicator should progressively be based on better measures of the low literate population.

**A broad definition of literacy programmes:** To take as many literacy programmes as possible into consideration, it is important to adopt a broad definition for literacy programmes as the one suggested below:

*A coherent set or sequence of educational activities designed and organized over a sustained period to develop the ability to identify, understand, interpret, create, communicate, and compute, using printed and written materials associated with varying contexts.*

**Inclusion of youth and adult primary/secondary education programmes:** For this particular indicator that concerns a restricted target public (i.e. illiterates), it is important to have an operational guideline to not include youth and adult primary/secondary education programmes as literacy programmes, unless it is possible to identify those who are at the initial phase of the programme.

## **Methodology**

**Adoption of the UIS methodological framework:** The 2011 UIS survey on literacy programmes in Latin America and the Caribbean (UIS/LAC) (Infante et al., 2014) provides an appropriate methodological framework to be adopted by the SDG thematic indicator. Most countries with relevant information produced either by administrative data sources or labour force surveys will be able to provide data in this survey's format.

**Adaptation of disaggregation variables:** The UIS/LAC requested data disaggregated by three main variables: sex, type of centre (public/private), and duration of the literacy programme. To satisfy the requirements of the monitoring framework, and considering countries' data availability, it is suggested the substitution of these variables by the following: age-group, sex and location.

**Guidelines for reliability thresholds:** It is important to establish operational guidelines to prevent the publication of estimates based on too few observations. Ideally, countries will be able to indicate, with a specific code in the data collection, the estimates that are not recommended to be published.

**Countries with a small low literate population** are particularly affected by the reliability thresholds and, therefore, are encouraged to provide information stemming from administrative data sources.

## **Work Plan**

The following actions are suggested to facilitate the inclusion of the indicator in the regular monitoring:

#	Action	Period	Responsible
1	<b>Agreement on definitions and methodology:</b> Confirm conceptual and methodological definitions for the indicator	2018/1Q	TCG
2	<b>Administration of a quick survey</b> with TCG countries and others to confirm data availability	2018/1Q	UIS
3	<b>Administration of the UIS pilot survey</b> on participation in literacy programmes	2018/2Q	UIS



## Bibliography

Bolly, M., & Jonas, N. (2015). *Action research - measuring literacy programme participants' learning outcomes: results of the first phase (2011-2014)*. Hamburg: UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning.

Carr-Hill, R. A., & Unesco Institute for Statistics. (2008). *International literacy statistics: a review of concepts, methodology and current data*. Montreal: UNESCO Institute for Statistics.

Freire, P. (1996). *Pedagogia do oprimido: saberes necessários à prática educativa*. São Paulo: Paz e Terra.

Hanemann, U. (2014). Evolution of literacy campaigns and programmes and their impact since 2000. 'Paper commissioned for the EFA Global Monitoring Report 2015 "Education For All 2000-2015: Progress made, challenges ahead".'

Hanemann, U. (2017). Accountability Mechanisms in Adult Literacy. Paper commissioned for the 2017/8 Global Education Monitoring Report, Accountability in education: Meeting our commitments.

Infante, I., Letelier, M. E., & Rivero, J. (2014). Never too late to complete school: results of the UIS survey on adult education and literacy programmes in Latin America and the Caribbean. *UIS Information Paper*, 15.

Tufani, C. (2016). *The Brazilian Adult Literacy Programme: a brief overview and possible areas of research*. International Policy Centre for Inclusive Growth. Retrieved from <https://ideas.repec.org/p/ipc/pbrief/59.html>

UIL. (2010). *Belem Framework for Action: Harnessing the power and potential of adult learning and education for a viable future*. Hamburg: UIL.

UIL. (2013). *2nd Global Report on Adult Learning and Education Rethinking Literacy*. Hamburg, Germany: UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning (UIL). Retrieved from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0022/002234/223449e.pdf>

UNESCO. (2004). The Plurality of literacy and its implications for policies and programmes: position paper. UNESCO. Retrieved from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0013/001362/136246e.pdf>

Unesco. (2008). *Using a literacy module in household surveys: a guidebook*. Thailand.

Unesco. (2017). *Accountability in education: Meeting our commitments*. (First Edition). Paris: Unesco.

UNESCO Institute for Statistics. (2012). *International standard classification of education: ISCED 2011*. Montreal, Quebec: UNESCO Institute for Statistics. Retrieved from <http://www.uis.unesco.org/Education/Documents/isced-2011-en.pdf>

UNESCO Institute for Statistics. (2017, July). Metadata for the global and thematic indicators for the followup and review of SDG 4 and Education 2030. Retrieved from <http://sdg4monitoring.uis.unesco.org/metadata-global-thematic-indicators-follow-up-review-sdg4-education2030-2017.pdf>

## Annex 1 – Related LFS questions

### Afghanistan

Source: AFGHANISTAN DEMOGRAPHIC AND HEALTH SURVEY 2015

Available at: <https://dhsprogram.com/pubs/pdf/FR323/FR323.pdf>

Accessed [09/11/2017]

Target public: Ever-married women and men age 15-49

Filter: Respondents who had attended secondary school or higher were assumed to be literate. All other respondents were given a sentence to read, and they were considered to be literate if they could read all or part of the sentence.

Page	Variable	Wording	Alternatives
384	108	Now I would like you to read this sentence to me. SHOW CARD TO RESPONDENT. IF RESPONDENT CANNOT READ WHOLE SENTENCE, PROBE: Can you read any part of the sentence to me?	CANNOT READ AT ALL ..... 1 ABLE TO READ ONLY PARTS OF SENTENCE ..... 2 ABLE TO READ WHOLE SENTENCE 3 NO CARD WITH REQUIRED LANGUAGE 4 (SPECIFY LANGUAGE) BLIND/VISUALLY IMPAIRED ..... 5

### Bangladesh

Source: Quarterly Labour Force Survey 2015

Available at: <http://www.ilo.org/surveydata/index.php/catalog/1545/download/11983>

Accessed [05/11/2017]

Filter: Household members who are 15 years and above

Page	Variable	Wording	Alternatives
8	27	Can you read and write in any languages?	Yes=1 No=2

### Brazil

Source: Continuous National Household Sample Survey – Complete questionnaire 13/02/2017

Available at: [https://biblioteca.ibge.gov.br/visualizacao/instrumentos\\_de\\_coleta/doc5360.pdf](https://biblioteca.ibge.gov.br/visualizacao/instrumentos_de_coleta/doc5360.pdf)

Accessed [11/11/2017]

Filter: Persons aged 5 years and above

Page	Variable	Wording	Alternatives
8	V3001	Can you read and write in any languages?	Yes=1 No=2
8	V3003A	What course are you attending?	2 – Pre-school 3 – Youth and Adult Literacy 4 – Primary and Lower Secondary 5 – Youth and Adult Education (Primary and Lower Secondary) 6 – Upper secondary 7 – Youth and Adult Education (Upper Secondary) 8 – Higher education 9 – Specialization 10 – Master's degree 11 – Doctoral degree



## Honduras

Source: LIV Encuesta de Hogares de Propósitos Múltiples Junio 2016

Available at: <http://www.ilo.org/surveydata/index.php/catalog/1616/download/12497>

Accessed [10/11/2017]

Filter: All household members

Page	Variable	Wording	Alternatives
5	101	Knows how to read and write?	1=Yes 2=No
5	110	What is the highest level that you are currently enrolled in?	2. Literacy programme 3. Pre-basic (1-3) 4. Basic(1-9) 5. Common Cycle (1-3) 6. Diversified (1-4) 7. Higher technical (1-3) 8. Higher not university (1-4) 9. Higher university (1-8) 10. Post-grad (1-5) 99. DN/NA

## India

Source: SOCIO-ECONOMIC SURVEY SEVENTY-FIRST ROUND: JANUARY TO JUNE, 2014

Available at: [http://mospi.nic.in/sites/default/files/publication\\_reports/nss\\_rep\\_575.pdf](http://mospi.nic.in/sites/default/files/publication_reports/nss_rep_575.pdf)

Accessed [09/11/2017]

Filter: All household members

Page	Variable	Wording	Alternatives
618	Col 7	Educational level (code)	not literate -01, literate without any schooling -02, literate without formal schooling: through NFEC -03, literate through TLC/ AEC -04, others -05; literate with formal schooling: below primary -06, primary -07, upper primary/middle -08, secondary -10, higher secondary -11, diploma /certificate course(upto secondary)- 12 diploma/certificate course(higher secondary) -13, diploma/certificate course(graduation & above) -14, graduate -15, post graduate and above -16.

Filter: Persons aged 5-29 years

Page	Variable	Wording	Alternatives
618	Col 12	status of current educational attendance (code)	not enrolled -01, enrolled in NFEC -03, TLC/AEC -04, Other non-formal -05, below primary (nursery/ Kindergarten, etc. -06, primary (class I to V) -07, upper primary/middle -08, secondary -10, higher secondary -11, diploma /certificate course(upto secondary) - 12,



			diploma or certificate (higher secondary) -13, diploma or certificate (graduation and above)-14, graduate -15, postgraduate and above -16
--	--	--	---

### Laos

Source: Lao DPR fourth population and housing census - 2015

Available at: <http://www.lsb.gov.la/lwb/pdf/PHC-ENG-FNAL-WEB.pdf>

Accessed [12/11/2017]

Filter: For persons 6 and above

Page	Variable	Wording	Alternatives
279	Q18	Can you read and write a simple message?	Yes/No

### Mali

Source: ENQUETE MODULAIRE ET PERMANENTE AUPRES DES MENAGES (EMOP) - 2015

Available at: <http://www.ilo.org/surveydata/index.php/catalog/1208/download/8555>

Accessed [12/11/2017]

Filter: All household members

Page	Variable	Wording	Alternatives
6	M16	In which language do you read and write fluently?	1=Yes 2=No French Arab English National language Other

### Morocco

Source: Recensement Général de la Population et de l'Habitat 2014 - FMLA3\_RGPH\_VB19 V. FRANCAISE

Available at: <http://rgph2014.hcp.ma/attachment/511278/>

Accessed [09/11/2017]

Filter: All persons aged 10 and above

Page	Variable	Wording	Alternatives
4	25	Do you know how to read and write?	1=yes 2=No

### Namibia

Source: Namibia Labour Force Survey 2016

Available at: [https://cms.my.na/assets/documents/Labour\\_Force\\_Survey\\_-\\_20161.pdf](https://cms.my.na/assets/documents/Labour_Force_Survey_-_20161.pdf)

Accessed [09/11/2017]

Filter: Person age 6 years and above

Page	Variable	Wording	Alternatives
80	D3	Can (NAME) read and write a message in any language with understanding?	If no enter 00, if yes enter language code
80	D4	Has (name ) ever attended school?	Never attended 1 Attending Pre-Primary 2 Attending adult education programme 3 Attending school 4 Left school 5 Don't know 9

### Nepal



Source: NEPAL MULTIPLE INDICATOR CLUSTER SURVEY 2014

Available at: <http://catalog.ihns.org/index.php/catalog/6611/download/80515>

Accessed [09/11/2017]

Filter: Household members age 5 and above

Page	Variable	Wording	Alternatives
316	ED2A	DOES (name) KNOW TO READ AND WRITE?	1 Both read and write 2 Read only 3 Can't read and write
316	ED3A	HAS (name) EVER PARTICIPATED IN LITERACY PROGRAM OR ANY OTHER PROGRAM THAT INVOLVES LEARNING TO READ AND WRITE?	1 Yes 2 No

### Pakistan

Source: Labour Force Survey (2014-15) – Annex II

Available at: <http://www.ilo.org/surveydata/index.php/catalog/1044/download/6755>

Accessed [05/11/2017]

Filter: All persons 10 years and over

Page	Variable	Wording	Alternatives
44	4.8	Can..... read and write with understanding in any language?	1. Yes 2. No

### Senegal

Source: ENQUETE DEMOGRAPHIQUE ET DE SANTE CONTINUE (EDS-CONTINUE 2016)

Available at: <https://dhsprogram.com/pubs/pdf/FR331/FR331.pdf>

Accessed [12/11/2017]

Filter: Respondents who had attended secondary school or higher were assumed to be literate. All other respondents were given a sentence to read, and they were considered to be literate if they could read all or part of the sentence

Page	Variable	Wording	Alternatives
305	108	Now I would like you to read this sentence to me. SHOW CARD TO RESPONDENT. IF RESPONDENT CANNOT READ WHOLE SENTENCE, PROBE: Can you read any part of the sentence to me?	CANNOT READ AT ALL ..... 1 ABLE TO READ ONLY PARTS OF SENTENCE ..... 2 ABLE TO READ WHOLE SENTENCE 3 NO CARD WITH REQUIRED LANGUAGE 4 (SPECIFY LANGUAGE) BLIND/VISUALLY IMPAIRED ..... 5
305	108A	Have you ever participated in a literacy program or other program that included learning to read and write (not including primary school)?	Yes 1 No 2
305	108B	In which languages were the literacy programs in which you participated?	

### Togo

Source: ENQUÊTE DÉMOGRAPHIQUE ET DE SANTÉ (EDST-III) – 2013/2014

Available at: <https://dhsprogram.com/pubs/pdf/FR301/FR301.pdf>

Accessed [12/11/2017]

Filter: Respondents who had attended secondary school or higher were assumed to be literate. All other respondents were given a sentence to read, and they were considered to be literate if they could read all or part of the sentence



Page	Variable	Wording	Alternatives
412	108	Now I would like you to read this sentence to me. SHOW CARD TO RESPONDENT. IF RESPONDENT CANNOT READ WHOLE SENTENCE, PROBE: Can you read any part of the sentence to me?	CANNOT READ AT ALL ..... 1 ABLE TO READ ONLY PARTS OF SENTENCE ..... 2 ABLE TO READ WHOLE SENTENCE 3 NO CARD WITH REQUIRED LANGUAGE 4 (SPECIFY LANGUAGE) BLIND/VISUALLY IMPAIRED ..... 5

### Zimbabwe

Source: Demographic and Health Survey 2015 – WOMAN'S QUESTIONNAIRE

Available at: <https://dhsprogram.com/pubs/pdf/FR322/FR322.pdf>

Accessed [09/11/2017]

Filter: Respondents who had attended secondary school or higher were assumed to be literate. All other respondents were given a sentence to read, and they were considered to be literate if they could read all or part of the sentence

Page	Variable	Wording	Alternatives
449	111	Now I would like you to read this sentence to me. SHOW CARD TO RESPONDENT. IF RESPONDENT CANNOT READ WHOLE SENTENCE, PROBE: Can you read any part of the sentence to me?	CANNOT READ AT ALL ..... 1 ABLE TO READ ONLY PARTS OF SENTENCE ..... 2 ABLE TO READ WHOLE SENTENCE 3 NO CARD WITH REQUIRED LANGUAGE 4 (SPECIFY LANGUAGE) BLIND/VISUALLY IMPAIRED ..... 5





## ANNEX 2 – Draft metadata

The following metadata come from the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (2017, p. 64):

### 4.6.3 Participation rate of youth/adults in literacy programmes

#### Definition:

Number of youth (aged 15-24 years) and adults (aged 15 years and older) participating in literacy programmes expressed as a percentage of the illiterate population of the same age.

#### Purpose:

To show the level of participation of illiterate youth and adults in literacy programmes.

#### Calculation method:

The indicator is calculated as the number of illiterate persons in the relevant age group participating in literacy programmes expressed as a percentage of the illiterate population of the same age.

$$PRLTP^t_a = \frac{PartLit^t_a}{IllitP^t_a}$$

where:

$PRLTP^t_a$  = participation rate of the population of age group **a** in literacy programmes in year **t**

$PartLit^t_a$  = participants in literacy programmes of age group **a** in year **t**

$IllitP^t_a$  = Illiterate population of age group **a** in year **t**

**a** = 15-24 years (youth) or 15 years and older (adults)

#### Interpretation:

A high rate denotes a high degree of coverage of the illiterate population by the programmes designed to reach that specific group. The theoretical maximum value is 100%. Increasing trends can be considered as reflecting improved coverage by the literate programmes of their target population.

#### Type of data source:

Administrative data, household surveys, and population censuses.

#### Disaggregation:

By age, sex, location, and income (depending on the data source). Disability status is not currently available from most data sources.

**Data required:**

Number of participants in the relevant age group in literacy programmes; illiterate population estimates for the same age groups.

**Data sources:**

Administrative or household data on participation in literacy programmes for the age groups defined, combined with illiterate population estimates for the same age groups.

**Limitations and comments:**

The indicator values must be analysed with caution and together with other indicators reflecting the literacy situation of the population because of its limitations. The theoretical maximum value of 100% is under the assumption that literate population will not enroll or attend literacy programmes.

The degree of coverage of the illiterate population measured by this indicator might be underestimated because of the exclusion of illiterate population that have decided to attend primary education programmes instead of specifically-designed literacy programmes. When numerator and denominator are taken from household surveys, special attention should be given to the estimations' standard errors mainly in countries with very high levels of literacy where the sample sizes and design might not be appropriate for producing the indicator. When numerator and denominator are taken from different data sources (e.g. administrative data and household survey or population estimates), there will be possibilities of inconsistencies.



### ANNEX 3 – Draft UIS survey on participation in literacy programmes

The following table was adapted from the “REGIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE FOR LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN ON STATISTICS OF ADULT EDUCATION” UIS/AE/2011 (Table 3.1)

#### Participants in adult literacy programmes by age-group, sex and location

Sex	Age group (years)	Urban Literacy Programmes			Rural Literacy Programmes			Total		
Males	15 - 24									
	>25									
	Age unknown									
	Total									
Females	15 - 24									
	>25									
	Age unknown									
	Total									
Males and females	15 - 24									
	>25									
	Age unknown									
	Total									

DRAFT FOR



## ANNEX 4 - Principles for the indicator development

The expert groups responsible for building the monitoring framework have established several principles for the selection, development, and refinement of the indicators. The observation of these principles is essential to prevent the methodological development from deviating the indicators' original purposes. Apart from the "[Fundamental Principles of Official Statistics](#)", the indicators are expected to be also based on three sets of principles proposed for their selection and development, as well as refinement and revision.

### *Selection and development*

In its report to the 47<sup>th</sup> Session of the UN Statistical Commission, the IAEG stated that the indicator framework for global monitoring followed five principles during the review of proposals and selection of the global indicators. These five principles had been taken into account since the presentation of a discussion paper by the United Nations Statistics Division (UNSD) in 2015<sup>x</sup>. This paper stressed the importance of the indicators to be methodologically sound, measurable, accessible, relevant, timely, internationally comparable, and limited in number.

These general principles were created with the intention of guiding the selection of indicators for the 169 targets of the SDGs in the beginning of the process. More recently, the UIS (2016, p. 26), as the custodian agency for the SDG4 indicators, has implemented five criteria to choose their indicators: relevance, alignment, feasibility, communicability and interpretability.

### *Refinement and revision*

At the same time, the IAEG was also called to outline the basis for the long-term development of the indicators. For the benefit of the "alignment [...] with the target and issues of methodological soundness"<sup>xi</sup>, the indicators may experience yearly refinements or undergo two general revisions, planned for 2020 and 2025. For that, the IAEG has agreed on the criteria to define whether specific developments ought to be considered a refinement or a revision.

According to the IAEG, the scope of the refinements is limited to "specifying or correcting unit of measurement; simple clarification of terms used in the indicator; spelling and other obvious errors; "splitting" indicators into their components in multiple component indicators.". It is also conceded as a refinement "a minor change in an indicator [...] that will, in a simple way, solve a problem that is spotted when the collection of data has begun". All alterations beyond these refinements, including removing or adding new indicators, must only be considered at the 2020 and 2025 revisions.

Furthermore, the UN Statistical Commission, as well as the TCG, have emphasized in multiple occasions the need for the indicators to be disaggregated by, at least, sex, location, wealth, disability status, indigenous peoples and conflict-affected. It has also been subject of constant concern to the international organizations the use of official statistics produced at the national level. As stressed by the ECOSOC<sup>xii</sup>, "official statistics and data from national statistical systems constitute the basis needed for the global indicator framework". Similarly, during its third meeting, the TCG<sup>xiii</sup> highlighted that "Data must be used and the focus should always be focussed at production at the national level."

As shown in the box below, some principles are consistent over time and fora. In addition, some principles are clearly related such as "communicability and interpretability", proposed by UIS, and



“accessibility”, which was originally formulated by the UNSD as “Easy to interpret and communicate”, and “Easily accessible”.

### Box 1 – SDG general principles for the indicator development

Forum	Year	Purpose	Principles
UNSD	2015	Selection of indicators	Methodologically sound, measurable, accessible, relevant, timely, internationally comparable, and limited in number.
IAEG	2016	Refinement and Revision	Alignment of indicators with the target, and methodological soundness
UIS	2016	Selection of indicators	Relevance, alignment, feasibility, communicability, and interpretability
ECOSOC and TCG	2016-2017	Development of indicators	Disaggregation, Use of official data produced at the national level

Source: Elaborated by the author.

The review of existing methodologies for the indicator 4.3.1, presented in this report, makes use of these general principles as parameters for appraisal, particularly the principles outlined by UIS and ECOSOC, considering their level of development and adequacy for the work of the TCG. These principles are also used as guidelines for the recommendations detailed in the second part of the overall work.

<sup>i</sup> ECOSOC, 2017. Resolution adopted by the Economic and Social Council on 7 June 2017. E/RES/2017/7. Available at: <http://undocs.org/E/RES/2017/7> [Accessed in 10/10/2017].

<sup>ii</sup> TCG, 2016. Second meeting Summary. Available at:

[http://tcg.uis.unesco.org/files/resources/meetings/2nd/Summary\\_TCG%20meeting\\_29.Nov.2016.pdf](http://tcg.uis.unesco.org/files/resources/meetings/2nd/Summary_TCG%20meeting_29.Nov.2016.pdf) [Accessed in 06/10/2017].

<sup>iii</sup> ‘Recommendation Concerning the International Standardization of Educational Statistics’. Records of the General Conference, tenth session, Paris, 1958: Resolutions. Pg. 93. Available at

<http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0011/001145/114584e.pdf> [Access: 17/10/2017]

<sup>iv</sup> The UIS Glossary. Available at <http://uis.unesco.org/glossary> [Access: 17/10/2017]

<sup>v</sup> Freely translated by the author from Decreto Supremo 004-2009 changed by Decreto Supremo 1318-2012.

Available at [http://www.minedu.gob.bo/micrositios/biblioteca/disco-1/documentos\\_normativos/legislacion/278.pdf](http://www.minedu.gob.bo/micrositios/biblioteca/disco-1/documentos_normativos/legislacion/278.pdf) [Access: 11/11/2017]

<sup>vi</sup> Viceministerio de Educación Alternativa y Especial - Rendición de cuentas. Available at

<http://www.minedu.gob.bo/files/transparencia/formularios/rendicion-cuentas-veave.pdf> [Access: 11/11/2017]

<sup>vii</sup> Available at <http://portal.mec.gov.br/component/tags/tag/32636> [Access: 11/11/2017]

<sup>viii</sup> Statistics Botswana. National Literacy Survey 2014 - Report. Page 4. Available at

<http://www.statsbots.org.bw/sites/default/files/Literacy%20Survey%202014%20%202.pdf> [Access: 11/11/2017]

<sup>ix</sup> Bhutan. Ministry of Education. Annual Education Statistics 2017. Available at

<http://www.education.gov.bt/statistic> [Access: 09/11/2017]

<sup>x</sup> UNSD, 2015. Discussion paper on Principles of Using Quantification to Operationalize the SDGs and Criteria for Indicator Selection. ESA/STAT/441/2/58A/14. Available at:



---

[https://unstats.un.org/unsd/post-2015/activities/egm-on-indicator-framework/docs/Background%20note\\_Principles%20of%20using%20quantification%20to%20operationalize%20the%20SDGs%20and%20criteria%20for%20indicator%20selection\\_Feb2015.pdf](https://unstats.un.org/unsd/post-2015/activities/egm-on-indicator-framework/docs/Background%20note_Principles%20of%20using%20quantification%20to%20operationalize%20the%20SDGs%20and%20criteria%20for%20indicator%20selection_Feb2015.pdf) [Accessed: 09/10/2017]

<sup>xi</sup> IAEG, 2016. 4<sup>th</sup> IAEG Meeting. General principles for refining the indicator framework.

<sup>xii</sup> ECOSOC, 2017. Resolution adopted by the Economic and Social Council on 7 June 2017. E/RES/2017/7. Available at: <http://undocs.org/E/RES/2017/7> [Accessed in 10/10/2017].

<sup>xiii</sup> TCG, 2017. Summary of the Third Meeting of the Technical Cooperation Group on SDG 4 – Education 2030 Indicators. Available at [http://tcg.uis.unesco.org/files/resources/meetings/3rd/TCG\\_Meeting3\\_Summary\\_Finalized.pdf](http://tcg.uis.unesco.org/files/resources/meetings/3rd/TCG_Meeting3_Summary_Finalized.pdf) [Accessed: 06/10/2017]

DRAFT for discussion