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There is global commitment to honor the Education 2020 Framework for Action call to foster improvements in education outcomes.

**Education 2030 Framework for Action, 2015**

Called on countries to establish “appropriate intermediate benchmarks (e.g., for 2020 and 2025)” for the SDG indicators, seeing them as “indispensable for addressing the accountability deficit associated with longer-term targets” (§28).

---

**Global Education Meeting, 2020**

“We request UNESCO and its partners, together with the SDG-Education 2030 Steering Committee, to ... accelerate the progress and propose relevant and realistic benchmarks of key SDG 4 indicators for subsequent monitoring” (§10).
Benchmarks will improve outcomes through enhanced...

Alignment
- On a focused set of global priority policy areas for education
- On regional benchmarks as a minimum for each policy area
- On national benchmarks for countries to achieve, aligned to regional 'minimum floors'

Commitment
- From countries at the political level to work towards the benchmarks
- From regional bodies to oversee country progress and peer learnings
- From donors to mobilize resources to support ongoing progress

Monitoring
- Country capability and capacity to regularly report results (e.g. via EMIS)
- Using dashboards to identify 'bright spots' and best-practices
- Support aimed at fixing low performance, bottlenecks, and cross-cutting issues

Accountability
- Focus on improvement through routine country reporting
- Based on country ownership to make improvements
- Of partners and donors for provision of targeted support based on evidence

Each component is underpinned by a focus on ensuring regular, reliable, and high-quality education data at global, regional and country-levels
Benchmarks provide focus on a small number of priority policy areas linked to the achievement of SDG4.

1. Basic education
2. Pre-primary
3. Teachers
4. Expenditure
5. Equity
Benchmark targets will be set at global, regional and national levels for each priority policy area.

### Priority Policy Areas

**Basic education**
- 4.1.1 Minimum proficiency in reading and mathematics
- 4.1.2 Completion rate
- 4.1.4 Out-of-school rate

**Pre-primary**
- 4.2.2 Participation in organized learning a year before primary education entry

**Teachers**
- 4.c.1 Qualified teachers

**Expenditure**
- 1.a. 2/FFA Education expenditure - (% GDP / % budget)

**Equity**
- Equity

### Definition of the regional minimum levels for global indicators

Indicators selected from regional frameworks:
- Africa – CESA Continental Framework
- Arab States
- Asia/Pacific
- Europe/North America
- Latin America/Caribbean
- EC/COE

### Definition of national commitment for global indicators

Indicators selected from National Frameworks
Regular monitoring against benchmarks will drive commitment and focus on where investments are needed.

**Policy Priority Areas**
- **SDG Global Targets**

**Regional Benchmarking approach**

**SDG 4 Benchmark Indicators**

**Policy gaps**
- National commitments

**Data gaps**
- National commitments

** Increased international commitment on education data**

**Alignment and coordination**

**Financial Resources**

**Global Public Goods**

**Solutions and means of implementation**

**Solutions**
- Cross-cutting analysis
- Education strategies
- Policies initiatives
- Support mechanisms
- Improved processes issues and challenges

**Means of implementation:**
- Funding
- Program design
- Implementation
- Results
- Investment in data systems
Regional Framework and Relevance of Regional benchmarks for Regional monitoring

Pacific Regional Education Framework (2018-2030)

SEAMEO Strategic Plan, 2021-2030

SAARC Framework of Action

• Aligned with the Technical and political processes of Regional bodies
• Streamlines advocacy and focus on key policy areas
• Mobilize resources
• Improve the monitoring
• Peer learning
Dashboards and regular monitoring reports will be used to visualize progress at country and regional levels

Indicative example of dashboard functionality

- **A global benchmark dashboard** visualizes progress at all levels
- Allows **comparison** and **identification** of ‘bright spots’
- **Intuitive, and usable** for stakeholders at all levels
- Countries are trained to **ensure effective-use**
- All stakeholders will have access, ensuring

http://tcg.uis.unesco.org/benchmarks-dashboard/benchmarks-asia-pacific/
### Possible Additional Indicators for the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>SDG4 Indicators</th>
<th>Regional Relevance</th>
<th>Data point last 5 years</th>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>Relevancy</th>
<th>Data availability</th>
<th>Assessment of the indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Participation rate of youth and adults in formal and non-formal education and training in the previous 12 months</td>
<td>Lifelong learning</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>Relevant for all the sub region</td>
<td>Lack of data, can be improved</td>
<td>Some difficulty in setting national benchmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>GER for Tertiary</td>
<td>Growing emphasis in higher education in the region</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>Relevant for the region</td>
<td>Data available, further improved through advocacy/capacity development</td>
<td>Can easily set benchmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Participation rate in Technical and Vocational education (15-24 years) and 15+</td>
<td>Skills has been a focus for ASEAN Framework, SEAMEO Priority and PacREF</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>Relevant for all sub regions,</td>
<td>Good coverage of data</td>
<td>Can easily set benchmarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Education attainment</td>
<td>Human Capital</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>Do not directly link with regional frameworks</td>
<td>Medium coverage of data</td>
<td>Can set benchmarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Youth and adult literacy</td>
<td>Many countries, adult literacy is still a priority and Asia has the highest illiterate population</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>Priority for South and west Asia and some South East Asian countries, but doesn't reflect the true measurement of levels of literacy skills</td>
<td>Data available</td>
<td>Can set benchmarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Proportion of population in the given age group achieving at least a fixed level of proficiency in functional literacy</td>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Highly appropriate and provide true measurement.</td>
<td>Data coverage is very limited.</td>
<td>Probably difficult to establish benchmarks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### National Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>National Indicators</th>
<th>Data point last 5 years</th>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>Relevancy</th>
<th>Data availability</th>
<th>Possibility of Benchmarking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>% of Graduate from STEM fields (Tertiary)</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>Relevant for all the regions</td>
<td>Good coverage of data,</td>
<td>Can easily set benchmarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>% NEET</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>Relevant for region.</td>
<td>There is availability for data.</td>
<td>Possible to set benchmarks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regional Processes of Benchmarking exercise

**Preparatory and Advocacy phase**
- **Regional Consultation** – 22 October 2020
- Mapping of Regional Frameworks - 23-27 October
- Discussed the benchmark processes in SOMED, PACIFIC 2020/2021

**Technical Processes**
- Technical team established Nov 2020
- Technical Team meeting Nov 2020
- Scenario preparation (Nov 2020-March 2021)

**Finalization of benchmarks**
- May 2021
- Country Feedback and inputs March- April 2021
- Sub-regional Consultation meetings March/April 2021

**Political Processes**
- June 2021
- Global Education Meeting (GEM) July 2021
- 2nd Asia Pacific Regional Education Ministerial Conference (APREMC-II Sept-Oct, 2021)

Endorsement of Regional Benchmarks in General Conference, November 2021

**SEAMEC, June 2021**
**FEDMM, April 2021**
Questions & Clarification
Discussions/Consultation

• How do you think the relevancy and usefulness of the proposed 7 global benchmark indicators for the monitoring of education agenda in the region and the countries?

• Do you have additional suggestions for the proposed process of setting Regional benchmarks?

• Apart from 7 benchmarks, could you please choose 2/3 additional indicators that could be useful and relevant for the region. Please provide your choice through poll. (launch the poll)
## Possible Additional Indicators for the Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>SDG4 Indicators</th>
<th>Data coverage</th>
<th>Assessment of the indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Participation rate of youth and adults in formal and non-formal education and training in the previous 12 months</td>
<td>Lifelong learning</td>
<td>Relevant for all the sub region, lack of data, can be improved, some difficulty in setting national benchmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>GER for Tertiary</td>
<td>Growing emphasis in higher education in the region</td>
<td>Relevant for the region, Data available, further improved through advocacy/capacity development, can easily set benchmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Participation rate in Technical and Vocational education (15-24 years) and 15+</td>
<td>Skills has been a focus for ASEAN Framework, SEAMEO Priority and PacREF</td>
<td>Relevant for all sub regions, Good coverage of data, can easily set benchmarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Education attainment</td>
<td>Human Capital</td>
<td>Do not directly link with regional frameworks, Medium coverage of data, Can set benchmarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Youth and adult literacy</td>
<td>Many countries, adult literacy is still a priority and Asia has the highest illiterate population</td>
<td>Priority for South and west Asia and some South East Asian countries, but doesn’t reflect the true measurement of levels of literacy skills, Data available, Can set benchmarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Proportion of population in the given age group achieving at least a fixed level of proficiency in functional literacy</td>
<td>6% 0%</td>
<td>Highly appropriate and provide true measurement, Data coverage is very limited, Probably difficult to establish benchmarks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### National Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>National Indicators</th>
<th>Data coverage</th>
<th>Assessment of the indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>% of Graduate from STEM fields (Tertiary)</td>
<td>STEM has been priority for many of the countries and also in ASEAN, SEAMEO and PacREF</td>
<td>Relevant for all the regions, Good coverage of data, can easily set benchmarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>% NEET</td>
<td>Measure both education and labor participation</td>
<td>Relevant for region, There is availability for data, Possible to set benchmarks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank you.

Learn more [http://uis.unesco.org/](http://uis.unesco.org/)
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