



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization



UNESCO
INSTITUTE
FOR
STATISTICS



TECHNICAL
COOPERATION
GROUP



Issues for consultation and decision

TCG6/REF/16

Introduction

The Technical Cooperation Group on the Indicators for SDG 4 – Education 2030 will hold its sixth meeting (TCG 6) in Yerevan on 29 and 30 August 2019. This document summarizes issues for which the TCG will be asked to make a decision.

Session 2: Report on methodological development and standards

4.1.4: Completion rate

In an online consultation in December 2018, the TCG approved the use of estimations for reporting on indicator 4.1.4. The GEM Report team carried out additional research after the meeting that will be presented at TCG 6 (see document TCG6/REF/13). The TCG is expected to make recommendations on the type of estimations that can be used for reporting on indicator 4.1.4.

Question		Answer	
		Yes	No
1	Should model-based estimations of the completion rate be used to reconcile data for multiple cohorts, potentially from multiple surveys?		

4.1.5: Out-of-school rate

TCG 5 approved a change in the calculation method of indicator 4.1.5. Children of primary school age in pre-primary education are no longer considered out of school. In September 2019, the UIS will disseminate the first national, regional and global out-of-school figures generated with the revised calculation method. The TCG is expected to make recommendations on the addition of an out-of-school rate for children aged one year before the official primary entry age.

Question		Answer	
		Yes	No
1	Should the out-of-school rate (indicator 4.1.5) also be calculated and reported for children aged one year before the official primary entry age?		

4.3.1: Participation rate of youth and adults in formal and non-formal education and training in the previous 12 months

The UIS obtained data from labour force surveys from the International Labour Organization to calculate indicator 4.3.1. The additional data will be disseminated with the September 2019 data release by the UIS. The analysis of the data revealed that reference periods for questions on participation in education in LFS are typically shorter than 12 months, which leads to smaller indicator values. The reference ages also vary across surveys. The TCG is expected to make recommendations on the use of such data for reporting on indicator 4.3.1.

Question		Answer	
		Yes	No
1	Can data from labour force surveys and other sources be used for reporting on indicator 4.3.1 even if the reference period for participation in formal and non-formal education is less than 12 months?		
2	Can data from labour force surveys and other sources be used for reporting on indicator 4.3.1 even if the age group surveyed for participation in formal and non-formal education does include all youth and adults?		

4.4.3: Youth/adult educational attainment rates

The TCG had previously recommended to simplify indicator 4.4.3. At TCG 5, agreement was reached to remove “programme orientation” as one of the dimensions of disaggregation. The results of a consultation on “economic activity status” in May 2019 could not be used because the response rate was too low. The TCG is expected to make recommendations on “economic activity status” as a dimension of disaggregation for indicator 4.4.3.

Question		Answer	
		Yes	No
1	Should economic activity status be removed as a dimension of disaggregation for reporting on indicator 4.4.3?		

4.5.2: Percentage of students in primary education whose first or home language is language of instruction

In an online consultation in December 2018, the TCG approved a change of the indicator so that it no longer refers to the “*the* language of instruction”. The new definition is “percentage of students in primary education who have their first or home language as language of instruction”. An additional online consultation in May 2019 on using data collected with reference to “language of test” instead of “language of instruction” was inconclusive because the response rate was too low. The TCG is expected to make recommendations on collection and reporting of data for indicator 4.5.2.

	Question	Answer	
		Yes	No
1	Can data collected with reference to “language of test” be used for reporting on indicator 4.5.2 until data collected with reference to “language of instruction” become available?		
2	Should indicator 4.5.2 be dropped from the list of indicators for SDG 4?		
3	Do you agree that the UIS develops a methodology and standards for reporting of indicator 4.5.2 for future approval by the TCG?		

4.5.3: Extent to which explicit formula-based policies reallocate education resources to disadvantaged populations

There is no approved methodology for indicator 4.5.3. The GEM Report conducted research on this indicator after TCG 5 that will be presented at TCG 6 (see document TCG6/REF/1). The TCG is expected to make recommendations on the next steps for indicator 4.5.3.

	Question	Answer	
		Yes	No
1	Should the formulation of indicator 4.5.3 be revised to capture the wider financing policies that target disadvantaged schools and students?		
2	Should the relevant information (on targeting criteria, volume, coverage and depth of policies) be collected through the addition of questions to the annual UIS/OECD/Eurostat education survey?		

4.7.1: Extent to which (i) global citizenship education and (ii) education for sustainable development, including gender equality and human rights, are mainstreamed at all levels in: (a) national education policies, (b) curricula, (c) teacher education and (d) student assessment

In December 2018, the IAEG-SDGs rejected a request for reclassification of indicator 4.7.1 from tier 3 to tier 2. UNESCO, with input from other agencies, has revised the proposed questionnaire for a next attempt at reclassification and the revised methodology will be discussed at TCG 6. Two additional methodological proposals will be submitted to the TCG for consideration. The TCG is expected to recommend one proposal for measurement of indicator 4.7.1 for submission to the IAEG-SDGs (see documents TCG6/REF/2, TCG6/REF/3, TCG6/REF/4, TCG6/REF/14, TCG6/REF/15).

4.a.1(d): Adapted infrastructure and materials for students with disabilities

In an online consultation in December 2018, the TCG approved the definitions of “adapted infrastructure” and “adapted materials” that were proposed at TCG 5. The TCG also approved the questions that were proposed at TCG 5 for data collection in national school censuses. There was no consensus on which schools should be counted as “schools with access to adapted infrastructure and materials for students with disabilities”; the TCG must be consulted on this issue again.

Question		Answer	
		Yes	No
1.	Which schools should be counted as “schools with access to adapted infrastructure and materials for students with disabilities”?	-	-
a)	Schools where infrastructure and materials are accessible to students with at least one kind of disability (some students with disabilities may not have access to adapted infrastructure and materials)?		
b)	Schools where infrastructure and materials are accessible to all students with any kind of disability?		

4.b.2: Number of higher education scholarships awarded by beneficiary country

There is no approved methodology for indicator 4.b.2. The TCG is expected to make recommendations on the future of this indicator.

Question		Answer	
		Yes	No
1	Should indicator 4.b.2 be dropped from the list of indicators for SDG 4?		

4.c.1, 4.c.3: Proportion of teachers who have received at least the minimum organized teacher training; percentage of teachers qualified according to national standards

The UIS commissioned research related to measurement of indicators 4.c.1 and 4.c.3. The results will be presented at TCG 6 (see documents TCG6/REF/5, TCG6/REF/6). The TCG is expected to make recommendations on the next steps for indicators 4.c.1 and 4.c.3.

4.c.5: Average teacher salary relative to other professions requiring a comparable level of education

The UIS commissioned research on options for measurement of indicator 4.c.5. The results will be presented at TCG 6 (see document TCG6/REF/7). The TCG is expected to make recommendations on the next steps for indicator 4.c.5.

Session 6: Regional and global monitoring: Aligning frameworks and expectations

- Endorsement of an approach of the type proposed by the EC
- Endorsement of a reduced numbers of indicators for benchmarking

Session 7: Monitoring progress

The aim of session 7 is to decide if and how to adopt benchmarks for a selected number of indicators. Endorsement will proceed in three stages:

1. A general agreement on indicators and their periodicity for monitoring progress
2. For specific indicators:
 - a. A yes or no option if adopting a benchmark or not
 - b. An agreement about the option to be taken for benchmarking

1. DEFINING PERIODICITY

Refer to table and go one by one

2. INDICATOR BY INDICATOR

Indicator 4.1.1 Minimum Proficiency Levels in Reading and Math		Yes	No
a.	In agreement of adopting benchmark for indicator?		
b.	Which option is best for benchmarking?		
1	Different 2030 targets for low income regions		
2	Simplified regional targets: one target for reading and math to facilitate monitoring		
3	Vary targets by income levels		
Indicator 4.1.4 Increased completion rates for primary and secondary		Yes	No
a.	In agreement of adopting benchmark for indicator?		
b.	Which option is best for benchmarking?		
1	Keep the flexible definition of 2030 targets		
2	Use middle-income countries as models for 2030 targets		
3	Use different targets for low and middle-income countries but with a minimum completion rate		

Indicator 4.2.2 Universal access to early childhood education of good quality		Yes	No
a.	In agreement of adopting benchmark for indicator?		
b.	Which option is best for benchmarking?		
1	Keep current definition and targets		
2	Keep definition but lower levels by 10% points		
3	Modify the definition and keep target levels		
Indicator 4.3.3 Equitable access to TVET		Yes	No
a.	In agreement of adopting benchmark for indicator?		
b.	Which option is best for benchmarking?		
1	Keep a flexible definition of targets		
2	Use Europe and N. America as reference for 2030 targets		
3	Define different targets for low-rates regions		
Indicator 4.5.1 Equitable educational access for vulnerable students		Yes	No
a.	In agreement of adopting benchmark for indicator?		
b.	Which option is best for benchmarking?		
1	Keep current definition and targets		
2	Keep the definition but reduce targets by 20% points		
3	Select fewer issues and focus efforts. Poverty is a good start.		
Indicator 4.c.1 Increased supply of qualified teachers		Yes	No
a.	In agreement of adopting benchmark for indicator?		
b.	Which option is best for benchmarking?		
1	Define the 2030 targets		
2	Reduce the target for lowest-income countries		
3	Leave 2030 targets undefined		
Indicator 4.e Educational expenditures		Yes	No
a.	In agreement of adopting benchmark for indicator?		
b.	Which option is best for benchmarking?		
1	Define the 2030 targets		
2	Increase expenditures by 2.5% points of GDP by 2030		
3	Leave 2030 target undefined		



Session 8: Conclusions and way forward

To be determined