



# 11<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Education Data and Statistics Commission

## Proposed decisions

27 and 28 February 2025 – Paris, France

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

Variables	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Description	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
Pros	<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. <a href="#">REACH</a> 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• Provides more timely data in settings, including in settings where MSNA data is outdated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>
Cons	<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>
Proposed decision			
Document	<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>		

## 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>	<p>Require extra effort for collecting HHS data</p> <p>May involve longer preparation time to ensure metadata completeness.</p>	<p>May lead to incomplete or less reliable coverage of TVET participation.</p> <p>Could limit the ability to produce accurate trends over time.</p> <p>Lacks emphasis on cross-national comparability, which is crucial for UIS education indicators.</p>
<b>Proposed decision</b>	Option 1: Use household/LFS survey data and administrative data for reporting.	
<b>Document</b>	<a href="#">Revised Metadata SDG 4.3.3</a> <a href="#">SDG indicator 4.3.3 Participation rate in technical and vocational programmes (15- to 24-year-olds) TVET</a>	

## 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>	<p>A range of challenges make it difficult to ensure consistent and comparable data, including:</p> <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>	

# 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>	

## Use of national population: Amendment of criterion 3

	Option 1	Option 2
<b>Description</b>	<p>Amend criterion 3:</p> <p>From current version: “Data is compiled and disseminated by recognized international organisations, or is publicly available”.</p> <p>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.”</p>	<p>Keep criterion 3 unchanged.</p>
<b>Pros</b>	<p>Support public availability, credibility, and quality data reporting.</p> <p>Prevent multiple and different datasets submission during the same UIS data collection round.</p>	<p>Status quo.</p>
<b>Cons</b>	<p>Stricter criteria which may exclude some national data sources that are publicly available but not widely used by international organizations.</p>	<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>	

# Implementation changes to ISCED

	Option 1	Option 2
Description	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>
Pros	<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>
Cons	<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>
Proposed decision	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>	
Document	<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>	

# 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>	



---

THANK YOU

Learn more:

[uis.unesco.org](https://uis.unesco.org)

[databrowser.uis.unesco.org](https://databrowser.uis.unesco.org)

[@UNESCOstat](https://twitter.com/UNESCOstat)

***#25YearsOfDataInsights***