

**CONSULTATION**  
**Education Data and Statistics Commission (EDSC) - 11th meeting**  
**27-28 February 2025**

We are pleased to invite you to participate in the online consultation following the EDSC 11th meeting held on 27 and 28 February 2025. As voting members of the EDSC, you are kindly requested to complete this Excel file and vote for each of the decision points.

**Please complete the 'Respondent information' sheet and then cast your vote in cell B32 of every sheet.**

**Please send us back the completed file by 15 April 2025 at [uis.tcg@unesco.org](mailto:uis.tcg@unesco.org) and do not hesitate to contact us if you have any questions or if you need any clarifications.**

***Please note that each Member State has one vote only.***

**Voting rules**

1. Decisions of the EDSC are made on the basis of consensus among its members.
2. If there is no consensus among EDSC members, a majority decision shall be taken based on the votes of all members.
3. Each Member State has one vote.
4. A majority of EDSC members present and voting shall be required as quorum for each specific decision.
5. Decisions of the EDSC shall be taken by a simple majority of the members present and voting, except where otherwise specified in these rules.
6. For decisions about addition or deletion of indicators, a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting is required.
7. For the purpose of determining the majority, only members casting an affirmative or negative vote shall be counted as "present and voting".
8. Members who abstain from voting shall be considered as not voting.
9. EDSC observers can express their views but may not vote.

## Respondent Information

Please provide information about the contact person who completed the consultation.

*Only one submission per country is expected.*

Name:	
Email address:	
Country:	

## 4.1.4 Out-of-school rates in emergencies and protracted crises

Variables	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
<b>Description</b>	Do not make any adjustments to out-of-school rates estimates in emergencies and protracted crises	Add MSNA as another source to the UIS-GEMR model if fit-for-purpose MSNA data are available (alignment, coverage, precision)  Adjust estimates, if there are significant changes in education access since MSNA administration, by weighting or excluding older observations in the UIS-GEMR model	Option 2 + Add OOS data to the UIS-GEMR model produced from school closures (and affected enrollment) reliable information if there is a non-fit-for-purpose MSNA or reports/grey literature used as a flag.  Adjust estimates as needed: develop a separate correction to the latest model estimates, for which assumptions and data sources are clearly documented
<b>Pros</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simplicity and consistency</li> <li>• No dependency on external inputs which may not always be available (e.g., REACH or MSNA)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leverages vetted, high-frequency data sources in crisis contexts, facilitating the extent to which the UIS-GEMR model can adequately capture education participation of crisis-affected children</li> <li>• Responsive and adaptive to the unique challenges of crisis-affected contexts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides more timely data in settings, including in settings where MSNA data is outdated</li> <li>• More reflective of the current state of education access</li> <li>• Outside of the model</li> </ul>
<b>Cons</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Misses the opportunity to reflect crisis-affected children, effectively excluding them from global monitoring.</li> </ul>	Requires metadata from <a href="#">REACH</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires more ad-hoc adjustments and verification of school closure data</li> <li>• May require calling on an expert group to validate</li> <li>• Intra-year volatility in school closures may not be critical for annual OOS estimates</li> </ul>
<b>Proposed decision</b>			
<b>Document</b>	<a href="#">Estimating out-of-school rates (OOSR) in protracted crises: Options for improving measurement</a> <a href="#">Introducing Multi-Sector Needs Assessments (MSNA)</a>		

Links to document/presentation:

[Estimating out-of-school rates \(OOSR\) in protracted crises: Options for improving measurement](#)  
[Introducing Multi-Sector Needs Assessments \(MSNA\)](#)

<b>Vote</b>	
<b>Comments</b>	

### 4.3.3 TVET participation indicator – and multiple data sources

	Option 1	Option 2
<b>Description</b>	Use household/LFS survey data and administrative data for reporting.	Continue using only administrative data for reporting
<b>Pros</b>	Combines strengths of multiple data sources, improving overall accuracy and coverage.	Simplifies data collection and reporting process.
<b>Cons</b>	Require extra effort for collecting HHS data May involve longer preparation time to ensure metadata completeness.	May lead to incomplete or less reliable coverage of TVET participation. Could limit the ability to produce accurate trends over time. Lacks emphasis on cross-national comparability, which is crucial for UIS education indicators.
<b>Proposed decision</b>	Option 1: Use household/LFS survey data and administrative data for reporting.	
<b>Document</b>	Revised Metadata SDG 4.3.3 SDG indicator 4.3.3 Participation rate in technical and vocational programmes (15- to 24-year-olds) TVET	

Links to document/presentation:

[Proposed metadata for SDG indicator 4.3.3](#)

[SDG indicator 4.3.3 - Participation rate in technical and vocational programmes \(TVET\) \(15- to 24-year-olds\)](#)

<b>Vote</b>	
<b>Comments</b>	

## 4.a.4 School meals indicator

	Option 1	Option 2
<b>Description</b>	Endorse the proposed school meals indicator methodology.	Request improvements and clarifications to the indicator methodology to be presented in the EDSC 12.
<b>Pros</b>	The proposed indicator and its related methodology are sufficiently robust to initiate reporting and monitoring of school meal programmes within the SDG 4 framework.	Address the weaknesses of Option 1
<b>Cons</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data sources are not sufficiently harmonized to be used for monitoring.</li> <li>The indicator focuses on coverage and does not reflect quality or nutritional value of school meals.</li> </ul>	A range of challenges make it difficult to ensure consistent and comparable data, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>different school meal policies across countries</li> <li>different funding policies and data sources</li> <li>different reporting capacities</li> </ul>
<b>Proposed decision</b>	Option 2: Request improvements and clarifications to the indicator methodology to be presented in the EDSC 12.	
<b>Document</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">Metadata: Proportion of primary school children receiving school meals (coverage)</a></li> <li><a href="#">Methodological note: Proportion of primary school children receiving school meals (coverage)</a></li> </ul>	

Links to document/presentation:

[Metadata: Proportion of primary school children receiving school meals \(coverage\)](#)  
[Methodological note: Proportion of primary school children receiving school meals \(coverage\)](#)

<b>Vote</b>	
<b>Comments</b>	

## Use of national population: Data submission protocol and workflow

	Option 1	Option 2
<b>Description</b>	Endorse the proposal for an improved standardized data submission protocol and streamlined workflow.	Do not change the current data submission protocol.
<b>Pros</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduced data reporting burden on countries and streamlined workflow, data review and validation efforts for UIS.</li> <li>Enhanced consistency and reliability of time series population data used for calculating education indicators.</li> <li>More effective administration of national population data collection and validation.</li> </ul>	Status quo.
<b>Cons</b>	Projecting population data one year forward requires the availability of a suitable projection model and relevant demographic parameters at the national level, which may not be readily available in some countries.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unclear data submission and validation workflows and associated deadlines.</li> <li>Potential data reporting burdens on countries.</li> </ul>
<b>Proposed decision</b>	Option 1: Endorse the proposal for an improved standardized data submission protocol and streamlined workflow.	
<b>Document</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">Improvements to the implementation of UIS hybrid approach to the use of Population data for education indicators (see Annex 2).</a></li> </ul>	

Links to document/presentation:

[Improvements to the implementation of UIS hybrid approach to the use of Population data for education indicators \(see Annex 2\).](#)

<b>Vote</b>	
<b>Comments</b>	

## Use of national population: Amendment of criterion 3

	Option 1	Option 2
<b>Description</b>	Amend criterion 3:  From current version: "Data is compiled and disseminated by recognized international <u>organisations</u> , or is publicly available".  To proposed version: "Data are compiled, used, and disseminated by the national statistical office and international organizations, and are publicly available for cross-national comparability."	Keep criterion 3 unchanged.
<b>Pros</b>	Support public availability, credibility, and quality data reporting. Prevent multiple and different datasets submission during the same UIS data collection round.	Status quo.
<b>Cons</b>	Stricter criteria which may exclude some national data sources that are publicly available but not widely used by international organizations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The terms "compiled and disseminated" do not explicitly state that the data is used by international organizations, which may weaken the credibility requirement.</li> <li>The term "or" suggests that public availability alone is sufficient, potentially allowing data that are not vetted by the NSO and international organizations.</li> <li>Lacks emphasis on cross-national comparability, which is crucial for UIS education indicators.</li> </ul>
<b>Proposed decision</b>		
<b>Document</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">Improvements to the implementation of UIS hybrid approach to the use of Population data for education indicators (see Annex 2).</a></li> </ul>	

Links to document/presentation:

[Improvements to the implementation of UIS hybrid approach to the use of Population data for education indicators \(see Annex 2\).](#)

<b>Vote</b>	
<b>Comments</b>	

## Implementation changes to ISCED

	Option 1	Option 2
<b>Description</b>	Take note of the 17 ISCED Review Panel recommendations and request the UIS to <b>develop specific proposals for implementing changes to ISCED, including establishing task forces to address recommendations on ISCED's definitions and scope (#1, #2, #10, #11, #12, and #14).</b>	Take note of the 17 ISCED Review Panel recommendations and request the UIS to <b>present the revised ISCED once finished.</b>
<b>Pros</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Compliance with ISCED governance requirements (2011 Manual, p.23).</li> <li>Updated ISCED 2011 (ISCED-P and ISCED-A) and revised ISCED-F 2013 improving the classifications' accuracy and relevance as they will stay aligned with evolving education systems, reduce misclassification, and increase cross-national comparability of education statistics.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintains flexibility by allowing UIS and the ISCED Review Panel to finalize the revised ISCED based on expert input before presenting it for broader consideration.</li> <li>Supports expert-driven revisions, keeping the technical process within the scope of the ISCED Review Panel and specific external experts.</li> </ul>
<b>Cons</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Resource-intensive for countries and stakeholders.</li> <li>Potential for early implementation pressure, even before countries are ready or fully understand the implications of the changes.</li> <li>May lead to disruptions in time series, as updated classifications could result in breaks or inconsistencies in historical data.</li> <li>Complexity in managing multiple task forces, which could slow progress if coordination is not well-structured.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lacks immediate follow-up mechanisms (e.g., EDSC task forces) to oversee implementation and planning.</li> </ul>
<b>Proposed decision</b>	Option 1: Take note of the 17 ISCED Review Panel recommendations and request the UIS to <b>develop specific proposals for implementing changes to ISCED, including establishing task forces to address recommendations on ISCED's definitions and scope (#1, #2, #10, #11, #12, and #14).</b>	
<b>Document</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">ISCED Review Panel Recommendations</a></li> <li><a href="#">Proposed decision points on ISCED Review Panel Recommendations</a></li> </ul>	

Links to document/presentation: [ISCED Review Panel Recommendations](#)  
[Proposed decision points on ISCED Review Panel Recommendations](#)

<b>Vote</b>	
<b>Comments</b>	



## Policy indicator to measure teacher qualifications

	Option 1	Option 2
<b>Description</b>	Request the UIS to propose a policy-level indicator.	Do not adopt a policy-level indicator on teacher qualification frameworks.
<b>Pros</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enables cross-country comparability.</li> <li>Aligns with established research on teacher qualifications.</li> <li>Reflects elements of Global Framework for Teaching Standards.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retains the existing methodology without introducing new complexities.</li> <li>Avoids additional data collection burden on countries.</li> <li>Keeps focus on improving data coverage and quality.</li> </ul>
<b>Cons</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requires detailed data collection and verification.</li> <li>Relies on official qualification frameworks, which may not always reflect current teaching practices.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of measurement of policy characteristics of official teacher qualification.</li> <li>Limits cross-country comparability and policy-driven insights.</li> </ul>
<b>Proposed decision</b>	Option 1: Request the UIS to propose a policy-level indicator.	
<b>Document</b>	<a href="#">Proposal on revising SDG 4.c.1 Trained teachers</a>	

Links to document/presentation: [Proposal on revising SDG 4.c.1: Trained teachers](#)

<b>Vote</b>	
<b>Comments</b>	