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Introduction

From MDGs to SDGs → global vision of prosperity; “leave no one behind”

- Indicator methodology and data collection
- Example: Indicator 4.1.1

Proportion of children and young people: (a) in grades 2/3; (b) at the end of primary; and (c) at the end of lower secondary achieving at least a minimum proficiency level in (i) reading and (ii) mathematics, by sex

How many children?  
What is the minimum proficiency level?  
What does it mean to reach that level?  
What level should be achieved?
Benchmarking in the Education 2030 Agenda

**What needs to be achieved?**
- Effective monitoring and accountability
- Consensus on global level
- Consensus on measurement
- Improve quality and timeliness of reporting
- Freely accessible information

**Benefits of benchmarking**
- Setting progress and identifying objectives
- Transparent learning device
- Practical; based on situations of countries
- Information sharing and mutual learning → capacity building
- **“One fit for all”**
- **Ranking**

**Avoided by...**
- Helping countries define their own points of reference on common indicators
- Member States decide on priority areas
- Setting regional points of reference
As the official source of SDG 4, the UIS compiles education-related data and metadata from various sources at the national, regional and international levels.

Producing reports monitoring progress towards the achievement of SDG 4, as well as commitments and follow-up actions, including policies, investments, budgetary expenditures, programmes and partnerships, in support of the Education 2030 Agenda.

The UIS is supported by the UN system, international organizations, and main regional platforms, all of which serve to validate the methodological and standard setting work of UIS.
What do data tell us on regional benchmarking?

Global SDG 4 indicators covered by regional monitoring frameworks

- 4.1.1: 100%
- 4.2.2: 80%
- 4.5.1: 80%
- 4.6.1: 80%
- 4.c.1: 80%
- 4.3.1: 60%
- 4.a.1: 40%
- 4.4.1: 40%
- 4.2.1: 25%
What do data tell us on regional benchmarking?

Priority for setting benchmarks of SDG 4 global indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>High priority</th>
<th>Medium priority</th>
<th>Low priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.c.1</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.1</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.2</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.a.1</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.1</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.1</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4.1</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6.1</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.1</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What do data tell us on regional benchmarking?

Feasibility of setting regional benchmarks for global SDG 4 indicators

- 4.2.2 Participation in pre-primary education: 100%
- 4.6.1 Literacy and numeracy skills: 88%
- 4.1.1 Learning outcomes: 83%
- 4.5.1 Gender and other disparities in education: 83%
- 4.1.2 Administration of a nationally-representative learning assessment (a) in Grade 2 or 3; (b) at the end of primary education; and (c) at the end of lower secondary education: 50%
- 4.2.4 Gross early childhood education enrolment ratio in (a) pre-primary education and (b) and early childhood educational development: 33%
- 4.4.3 Youth/adult educational attainment rates by age group, economic activity status, levels of education and programme orientation: 33%

Thematic SDG 4 indicators with regional benchmarks
National Consultation on benchmarks

Distribution of countries and responses in the national consultation

Number of responses: 53

Number of target countries: 213
### National Consultation on benchmarks

Distribution of countries and responses in the national consultation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SDG 4.1.1</th>
<th>69%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SDG 4.2.2</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG 4.c.1</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG 4.a.1</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG 4.5.1</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG 4.3.1</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG 4.6.1</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG 4.4.1</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG 4.2.1</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Percentage of countries measurement progress towards the national benchmarks by SDG 4 indicators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SDG 4.5.1</th>
<th>95%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SDG 4.6.1</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG 4.2.2</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG 4.1.1</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG 4.2.1</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG 4.c.1</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG 4.3.1</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG 4.4.1</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG 4.a.1</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National Consultation on benchmarks

Distribution of countries and responses in the national consultation

Percentage of countries indicating that setting benchmarks for SDG 4 indicators is possible by SDG indicator and level of implementation

High priority for setting benchmarks for SDG 4 indicators by level
The relevance of data availability

Coverage of MDG indicators by different aggregation by year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>2010 and +</th>
<th>2012 and +</th>
<th>2014 and +</th>
<th>2016 and +</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-school rate for children of primary school age</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-school rate for adolescents of lower secondary age</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross enrolment ratio, pre-primary</td>
<td>86.9%</td>
<td>85.4%</td>
<td>81.2%</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy rate, population 15-24 years</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net enrolment rate, primary</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>81.2%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survival rate in primary education</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The relevance of data availability
Consultation on sources of information

Availability of data sources in countries

- HHS - National household surveys: 81%
- HHS - Population census: 77%
- INF - School statistical census: 73%
- AD - EMIS based on individual records: 62%
- HHS - Labour force surveys: 54%
- AD - Education statistical surveys: 52%
- AD - EMIS based on aggregated records: 50%
- AD - Human resources administrative records: 50%
- EC - EMIS based on individual records: 40%
- AD - Human resources payroll system: 38%
- EC - statistical surveys: 38%
- INF - Infrastructure administrative records: 35%
- AD - Teachers statistical surveys: 27%
- EC - EMIS based on aggregated records: 27%
- HHS - International multipurpose household: 21%
- HHS - Other sources of data: 19%
- AD - Other sources of data: 17%
- EC - Other sources of data: 17%
- INF - Other sources of data: 13%

Availability of variables from National household surveys

- Age: 97.37%
- Sex: 97.37%
- Location (Rural/Urban): 86.84%
- Years of education: 84.21%
- Participation in Formal Education or training: 78.95%
- Grade: 78.95%
- Literacy: 76.32%
- Educational attainment: 71.05%
- Wealth: 65.79%
- Education Private Expenditure: 57.89%
- Computer-related activities: 44.74%
- Disability Status: 44.74%
- Participation in Non-Formal Education: 39.47%
- Ethnicity: 34.21%
- Migration Status: 28.95%
Lessons and next steps

• Monitoring frameworks:
  • For countries to measure progress;
  • For information sharing;
  • For mutual learning; and
  • To understand what areas to prioritize

• UIS has a global role in developing methods and standards to address the monitoring challenges.

Next step is to support countries in the definition of points of reference for the global indicators at the national level in close collaboration with the regional organizations that support that level of monitoring.
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