

TCG 7 POST-MEETING CONSULTATION DECISION BOOKLET

The 7th annual meeting of the Technical Cooperation Group on the Indicators for SDG 4-Education 2030 (TCG 7) was held online on 27-28-29 October 2020.

For more information, see the event's webpage: <http://tcg.uis.unesco.org/seventh-meeting-of-the-tcg/>

This **Post-TCG7 Consultation** focuses only on topics presented during the TCG plenary meeting and for which supporting documentation is currently available.¹ All items raised during discussions which do not currently have any supporting documentation will be included in the TCG 7 Meeting Report and in the work programmes of each respective working groups. We will also ensure that they are included in discussions next year (2021).

The consultation is available online by accessing the following link: [Post-TCG7 Consultation](#)²

Decisions	Number of decisions (19 in total)
Household surveys	4
Learning Assessments / GAML	11
Teacher Personnel	3
Education Expenditure / Finance	1

TCG Voting Rules

As a general rule, only one representative per Member State or organization can be counted as a vote and by rule, consensus is aimed. For more information, please consult the [TCG Voting Rules](#) document.

1 See all TCG 7 documentation: <http://tcg.uis.unesco.org/tcg7-documents/> and presentations: <http://tcg.uis.unesco.org/tcg7-presentations/>.

2 Available in English

Decisions related to Household Surveys (H)

Decision point H1		
Disability and education indicators in household surveys – UNICEF		
	Option 1	Option 2
Description	Leave definitions as they are	Adopt series of recommendations, e.g.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The default module is Child Functioning Module (5-17 years) with 13 functional domains • Always clarify which functional domains were used etc.
Pros		Recommendations clarify range of issues
Cons		May not be straightforward
Proposed decision	Option 2	
Documentation	WG/HHS/6	

Decision point H2		
Proposals for completion rate model specification – GEM Report		
	Option 1	Option 2
Description	Leave specifications as they are	Adopt specifications to improve model <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long-term trend breaks • No long-term decline • Gender disaggregation
Pros		Recommendations clarify range of issues
Cons	Model may not converge in some extreme cases	
Proposed decision	Option 2	
Documentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation on Completion Rates: Proposals for model specification • WG/HHS/3 	

Decision point H3		
Introduce ranges for household survey-based regional averages		
	Option 1	Option 2
Description	No changes	Publish ranges for regional aggregates based on household surveys, to reflect uncertainty due to sampling and imputation
Pros		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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
Cons		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less straightforward to communicate • Less straightforward to compare over time
Proposed decision	Option 2	
Documentation	Regional aggregation of HHS data: Some issues for discussion (Presentation)	

Decision point H4		
Weights for household survey-based regional averages		
	Option 1	Option 2
Description	Size of three cohorts enters calculation (=individual attainment)	Size of school-age population of each level (=system quality)
Pros	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unaffected by differences in level duration between countries. • Follows principle of weighting by denominator 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sensitive to differences in population in different levels • Approach already used in some indicators (e.g. expected years of schooling) • Weights consistent with OOS
Cons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ignores differences in population exposed to different levels • Weights inconsistent with out-of-school (OOS) • Single-year population data for non-standard age brackets almost always interpolated estimates 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ignores the cohort perspective.
Proposed decision	Option 2	
Documentation	Regional aggregation of household survey data (Presentation)	

Decisions related to Learning Assessments / Global Alliance to Monitor Learning

Decision point L1		
Minimum Proficiency Levels (MPL)		
	Option 1	Option 2
Description	Adopt clarifying revisions on minimum proficiency level for target 4.1.1	Keep definitions as put forward in 2018
Pros	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent across mathematics and reading • Key elements of each learning area explicitly represented in descriptions • Progression in learning across the MPLs, from (a) to (b) to (c), evident in descriptions • Unambiguous descriptions without repetition of elements across levels 	No changes to be communicated
Cons	None	
Proposed decision	Option 1	
Documentation	WG/GAML/ 6; Minimum Proficiency Levels : Revisions (2020)	

Decision point L2		
Endorse the use of the Global Proficiency Framework (GPF) as a common scale that defines global minimum proficiency for linking results to SDG 4.1.1		
	Option 1	Option 2
Description	No action	Endorse the use of the Global Proficiency Framework (GPF) as a common scale that defines global minimum proficiency for linking results to SDG 4.1.1
Pros		Provides for a more detailed scale to which countries and assessment organizations can link their assessments, which improves comparability between all assessments linked to SDG 4.1.1 through the GPF
Cons	No guidance on how a balanced proficiency level scale is framed.	May restrict option to some levels of proficiency in a given programme (national or international) are not represented in the scale
Proposed decision	Option 2	
Documentation	Global Proficiency Framework for Reading Global Proficiency Framework for Mathematics GAML/5 Policy Linking for Measuring Global Learning Outcomes Toolkit <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive summary/Updates 	

Decision point L3		
Create a 4.1.1 Review Panel to review the reliability and validity of outcomes reported to UIS for SDG 4.1.1		
	Option 1	Option 2
Description	No action	Create a 4.1.1 Review Panel to review the reliability and validity of outcomes reported to UIS for SDG 4.1.1
Pros		Generates a quality reassurance mechanism about definitions and procedures to be comparable from an impartial point of view. It will improve the comparability of results reported to SDG 4.1.1 while still allowing most countries to report and helping some to improve the quality and rigor of their assessments
Cons	May make it easier for countries to report inaccurate results; reduces comparability of results between countries	May slightly reduce the number of countries reporting to SDG 4.1.1 if the minimum threshold of comparability have not been achieved.
Proposed decision	Option 2	
Documentation	Criteria for Policy Linking Validity (draft)	

Decision point L4		
Refine indicator 4.5.2		
	Option 1	Option 2
Description	Percentage of students <u>in primary education</u> who have their first or home language as language of instruction.	Percentage of students <u>in a) early grades, b) at the end of primary, and c) at the end of lower secondary education</u> who have their first or home language as language of instruction
Pros		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use information from learning assessments at other levels • Different degree of policy relevance by level
Cons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are multiple data points for the same level and for different levels • There is not full use of all the available information 	None
Proposed decision	Option 2	
Documentation	Methodological Note ; Metadata Note ; Database: SDG Data Book (worksheets 440/449)	

Decision point L5		
Refine Indicator 4.a.2		
	Option 1	Option 2
Description	Keep as it is: Percentage of students experiencing bullying in the last 12 months	Refine: Percentage of students experiencing bullying in the last 12 months in a) <u>primary and</u> b) <u>lower secondary education</u>
Pros		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Takes full advantage of available information from WHO surveys and from international learning assessments • Provides a better picture of bullying in basic education • Estimation methodology and publication of multiple data points had been proposed as well as choice to a unique source for comparison over time
Cons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not make full use of information • Obliges arbitrary selection of data points 	
Proposed decision	Option 2	
Documentation	Methodological Note ; Database: SDG4 Data Book (worksheets 576/582)	

Decision point L6		
Use learning assessments to report on indicator 4.c.7		
	Option 1	Option 2
Description	Keep as it is	Refine (providing proper annotation of metadata points) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extend the use of TALIS to report for all participating countries (TCG63 approved use of TALIS only for OECD countries (TCG6, p.5)) Add data from learning assessments' teacher questionnaires
Pros		Increased coverage
Cons	5 years into the agenda, reporting is limited only to OECD countries	Populations differ by assessment Time period of recent professional development Differences in questionnaire items across cross-national assessments (CNAs)
Proposed decision	Option 2	
Documentation	WG/GAML/12 Methodological note with proposed metadata proposal UIS will make database available during consultation with annotated metadata points and disaggregation proposed	

³TCG6: 6th TCG Meeting

Decision point L7		
Use learning assessments to fill data gaps for Indicator 4.a.1		
	Option 1	Option 2
Description	Restrict information used to UIS questionnaires	Use learning assessments as secondary source to fill data gaps for the following sub-indicators of SDG 4.a.1: (a) electricity; (b) the Internet; (c) computers for educational purposes; and (e) basic drinking water.
Pros	Consistency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ LLECE 2013 and PASEC 2014: data on drinking water and electricity ▪ LLECE 2013 and PISA 2018: data on computers and internet ▪ TIMSS 2015: data on computers used in science and math instruction Information for TIMSS 2019, PASEC 2019, ERCE 2019 may be used
Cons	Low coverage	Not every survey collects all indicator dimensions
Proposed decision	Option 2	
Documentation	WG/GAML/11 Methodological Note with proposed metadata proposal	

LLECE: El Laboratorio Latinoamericano de Evaluación de la Calidad de la Educación

ERCE: Regional Comparative and Explanatory Study

TIMSS: Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study

PISA: Programme for International Student Assessment

PASEC: Programme d'analyse des systèmes éducatifs de la confemen

Decision point L8		
Approve new Indicator 4.7.6		
	Option 1	Option 2
Description	Reject new indicator	Adopt new indicator
Pros		<p>Covers aspect of target 4.7 that no other indicator does</p> <p>The indicator provides a framework for 'breadth of skills' opportunity to learn across 1) Teaching and Learning, 2) Assessment and Accountability, and 3) Enabling Environment, rather than being limited by definitional issues associated with classification of transferable skills.</p> <p>The indicator provides opportunity to link with instructional practices data derived from TALIS, so strengthening knowledge about how the Teaching and Learning aspect is supported</p> <p>The indicator constitutes a global good to support countries as they shift to integrate 'breadth of skills' or 'holistic' models of education into their systems</p> <p>Indicator can be completed by countries, as demonstrated in pilot phase</p>
Cons	No indicator covers these aspects of target 4.7 and no international guidance is provided	More piloting will help to refine the tool.
Proposed decision	Option 2	
Documentation	WG/GAML/15	

Decision point L9		
Adopt indicator that combines Indicator 4.1.1 and 4.1.2		
	Option 1	Option 2
Description	No action	Adopt indicator that combines global indicators 4.1.1 (minimum proficiency) and 4.1.2 (completion rate)
Pros		Offers a clear picture of the learning achievement of an entire cohort and not just the students who were in school Based on existing global indicators without requiring additional calculation or data collection efforts
Cons		None
Proposed decision	Option 2	
Documentation	WG/GAML/3	

Decision point L10		
Generate modules for measuring SDG4 learning outcome indicators in household surveys (joint initiative World Bank/UIS/UNICEF and OECD)		
	Option 1	Option 2
Description	No action	Endorse and promote the joint initiative on developing modules
Pros		Collaboration Generation of global public goods Liaison with donors Integration and building upon existing approaches
Cons		None
Proposed decision	Option 2	
Documentation	WG/GAML/14	

Decision point L11		
Adopt integrated strategy to address data coverage gaps for Indicator 4.6.1		
	Option 1	Option 2
Description	No action	Endorse (1) <u>Interim strategy</u> : Revise existing literacy measures in household surveys and include these in the next survey rounds of countries which have not fielded any direct measures of literacy and numeracy (2) <u>Mid-term strategy</u> : Recommend to countries to field mini-LAMP to generate data for monitoring and reporting on 4.6.1
Pros		Large number of countries unlikely to field direct assessment before 2030 but current proxy measures of literacy are unreliable Opportunity to produce accurate and comparable data with a tool that could be included in household surveys
Cons		Will not cover full range of skills Operationally demanding (but offers menu of options for countries)
Proposed decision	Option 2	
Documentation	WG/GAML/13	

Decisions related to Teacher Personnel Data

Decision point T1		
Support methodological developments for indicator 4.c.6		
	Option 1	Option 2
Description	<p>Support OECD/NESLI efforts to improve measurement of teacher attrition rate by two alternative models as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Indirect estimation (using estimated number of teachers leaving the profession based on number of teachers entering the profession) - Direct estimation (using actual number of teachers leaving the profession) 	No action
Pros	<p>Data on number of teachers entering the profession available in more countries (relative to number of teachers leaving the profession)</p> <p>Direct approach more relevant but potentially more demanding</p>	
Cons	<p>Different over- and under-estimation bias (teachers on temporary leave, teachers moving between ISCED levels, retiring teachers...)</p> <p>If interested in attrition level by age group (for future development), different age grouping is needed</p>	
Proposed decision	Option 1	
Documentation	WG/T/3	

Decision point T2				
Adopt methodology for Indicator 4.c.5 on teacher salaries				
	Option 1: Statutory teacher salaries	Option 2: Labor force surveys	Option 3: International learnings assessments	Option 4: Teaching staff compensation
Description	Ratio of annual statutory salary for a teacher with typical qualifications and 15 years' experience by level taught (UIS questionnaire) to annual earnings of professionals (ILOSTAT)	Ratio of teacher salaries to others controlling for education and other relevant covariates ("Mincerian earnings model")	Ratio of estimated teacher salaries to annual earnings of professionals (ILOSTAT)	Ratio of annual total teacher compensation per full-time equivalent teacher (computed from various UIS questionnaire items) to annual earnings of professionals (ILOSTAT)
Pros	Statutory teacher salaries are normally easy for governments to report; monthly earnings of professionals available for many countries on ILOSTAT; similar approach to OECD Education at a Glance see Proposed Metadata	Most closely matches the definition of the SDG indicator by controlling for education, experience and other indicators of qualification	Would include public and private providers (as sampled in assessments) and provide an estimate of the average of teachers	Generally easy to provide expenditure and teacher counts; provides an average for teachers
Cons	Does not conform exactly to the SDG definition ("comparable level of qualification"), may exclude teachers at private schools, requires aggregation if statutory salaries vary within countries / levels	Requires analysis of LFS data; small sample of teachers may limit comparability (i.e.: too large confidence intervals to make a conclusion about whether salaries are higher or lower than others)	Restricted to teachers of the assessment's target student population; may have large confidence intervals	Overestimates earnings collected by ILOSTAT as it would include employer pension contributions, payroll taxes, etc.; need data on full-time equivalent teachers; among others
Availability	Salaries available for 51% SSA, 54% in LAC, 39% E./SEA	A few published studies, primarily in Latin America and U.S.A.	Just PASEC 2014 so far (10 countries)	Ratio at primary level was calculated for 22 countries

Decision point T2				
Country ownership	Yes, as teacher salaries reported by countries through UIS questionnaire; however, UIS would most likely calculate the ratio	Depends who estimates it: if done by national statistical offices (e.g.: unemployment rates reported to ILOSTAT) then countries would have ownership.	Depends on who provides the estimates	Yes, as with statutory salaries
Proposed decision	<p>Proposed decision:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Adopt option 1 as interim reporting strategy until further methodological work is done; <u>OECD countries will report Education at a Glance data.</u> 2. Endorse the collaboration between UIS and ILO in order to advance in the definition of indicator guidelines for a long-term approach to report on indicator 4.c.5 			
Documentation	WG/T/8 Proposed Metadata for Interim Reporting of SDG Indicator 4.c.5			

Decision point T3		
ISCED-T: Scope of classification		
	Option 1	Option 2
Description	Limited number of dimensions for classification of teacher training programmes: Use only the 4 dimensions mentioned in UIS proposal	Expanded number of dimensions for classification of teacher training programmes
Pros	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work limited to drafting of text and coding scheme. • If no delays, ISCED-T could be completed for 2021 General Conference. 	Additional dimensions of classification, e.g. pathways to qualification (concurrent, consecutive, alternative), certificate earned at completion, induction period
Cons		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need more research and consultations • ISCED-T cannot be completed in 2021
Proposed decision	Option 1	
Documentation	WG/T/3	

Decisions related to Education Expenditure / Finance

Decision point F1		
Approve proposal for a methodology for indicator 4.5.3		
	Option 1	Option 2
Description	Not reported	Develop qualitative indicator with three-point scale
Pros		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Opens scope for qualitative indicator with potential for peer learning ▪ Questions are standardized and could become part of a questionnaire
Cons	5 years have passed without a methodology	<p>Information collection requires use of national policy and planning documents</p> <p>Assessment of country efforts for equity potentially involves subjective judgement</p>
Proposed decision	Option 2	
Documentation	Presentation Equity in financing, a proposal for thematic indicator 4.5.3 WG/F/4: Proposed Methodology for SDG Thematic Indicator 4.5.3	