



United Nations  
Educational, Scientific and  
Cultural Organization



UNESCO  
INSTITUTE  
FOR  
STATISTICS



GLOBAL  
ALLIANCE  
TO MONITOR  
LEARNING



# Sixth Meeting of the Global Alliance to Monitor Learning (GAML 6):

Results of the Consultation on GAML6 Items for  
Endorsement

6 December 2019



## Introduction

The Global Alliance to Monitor Learning (GAML) for Indicators for SDG 4 – Education 2030 held its sixth meeting on 27-28 August 2019 in Yerevan, Armenia. The meeting discussed and agreed on a work plan to be shared with the Technical Cooperation Group. Following the meeting, the participants were invited to complete an online questionnaire.

The decisions on the endorsement of indicators by the GAML are taken during GAML meetings and through online consultations. Based on the general voting rule, only one representative per organization counted as a vote, and by rule consensus is aimed with the annotation of the different opinions.

This consultation gathers input on the GAML 6, which are related to the development of indicators 4.1.1 (reading and mathematics in basic education), 4.4.2 (achieving minimum proficiency levels in digital learning), 4.6.1 (achieving fixed level of proficiency in literacy and numeracy), 4.7.4 (global citizenship and sustainability), 4.7.5 (proficiency in knowledge of environmental science and geoscience), a new indicator on breadth of skills, monitoring progress (benchmarking), and the replacement of global indicators.

The GAML 6 online consultation was answered by 20 respondents all from different organizations. The outcomes of the consultation are presented in this document.



## Indicator 4.1.1 Proportion of children and young people achieving MPL in reading and in math

The UIS, through the GAML, successfully upgraded indicator 4.1.1a from Tier III to Tier II. The reclassification request depended on UIS' proposal of a portfolio linking approach, which provides countries with several options to link their results of learning assessments to an international scale. Reference documents: [REF/1](#), [REF/2](#), [REF/3](#), [REF/7](#), WD/2 ([EN/FR](#))

As expected, the GAML reached an agreement on the protocol for alternative linking strategies and for reporting on indicator 4.1.1.

2	Do you agree on the use policy linking as an option to align national assessments to a global scale?	YES
3	Do you agree to the use of policy linking as an alternative option for the regional assessments that are not psychometrically linked?	YES
4	Do you understand the processes of policy linking and empirical linking as options for reporting indicator 4.1.1?	YES
5	Do you agree to pilot the policy linking toolkit?	YES
6	Do you support the criteria embedded in the protocol for reporting indicator 4.1.1?	YES

## Indicator 4.4.2 Measuring digital literacy skills

Recent meetings between UIS and PIX discussed a UNESCO-PIX partnership for the international assessment and development of digital skills in the context of indicator 4.4.2. In particular, the partnership seeks to conduct a survey for the "global indicator on digital skills" under the umbrella of the GAML for strengthening indicator 4.4.2.

Reference documents: WD/3 ([EN/FR](#))

The consultation with the GAML supports the continued exploration of a partnership between UIS and PIX.

7	Do you understand how the PIX platform might be used to report against indicator 4.4.2?	YES
8	Do you endorse continued exploration of a partnership between UNESCO and PIX in order to provide an appropriate option for reporting against indicator 4.4.2?	YES



## Indicator 4.6.1 Adult functional literacy and numeracy

The 4.6 Task Force:

- proposes definitions associated with literacy and numeracy in the context of SDG indicator 4.6.1
- presents existing skills assessment surveys of youth and adult populations around the world
- addresses the implications of the new approach for ‘fixing’ the minimum proficiency levels (MPLs) which will be reported for Indicator 4.6.1; and
- provides a broad sketch of a tentative strategy for 2030.

Reference documents: WD/4 ([EN](#)/[FR](#))

9	Do you agree on defining the ‘fixed level of proficiency’ in functional literacy and numeracy for indicator 4.6.1 as the equivalent to proficiency levels found at the end of lower secondary education for young adults and investigate its implications and limitations for older adults?	YES
10	Do you agree on aligning indicator 4.6.1 with indicator 4.1.1c?	NO
11	Do you agree that the 4.6. Task Force continues exploring policy linking as an option for monitoring indicator 4.6.1?	YES
12	Do you agree that the UIS continues trialing the mini-LAMP tool in countries in order to obtain empirical data to assess its relevance for indicator 4.6.1?	YES
13	Based on the assumption that about one half of countries will not be able to produce data from direct assessments until 2030, do you agree that the 4.6 task force continues exploring indirect measurement tools for estimating the baseline and monitoring the progress against SDG target 4.6?	YES



## SDG 4.7: Development of thematic indicators 4.7.4 and 4.7.5

Previous measurement solutions were developed to address the challenge of monitoring Indicators 4.7.1, 4.7.4, and 4.7.5 to propose a measurement strategy based on existing international large scale assessments (ILSA) in education. Therefore, in the development of a conceptual framework for a measurement strategy for Indicators 4.7.4 and 4.7.5, a global content framework was first defined, followed by a mapping exercise of the seven categories specified in the framework to ILSAs.

Reference documents: WD/5 ([EN/FR](#)), WD/6 ([EN/FR](#)), [WD/7](#), [WD/8](#), [WD/9](#), [REF/9](#)

The results of the consultation indicate an agreement in majority in general but did mention the benefits of refining the proposed definitions of minimum proficiency levels for both indicators 4.7.4 and 4.7.5.

<b>Indicator 4.7.4 Percentage of students showing adequate understanding of issues relating to global citizenship and sustainability</b>		
14	Do you agree with the proposed Global Content Framework for Indicator 4.7.4?	YES
15	Do you agree that UIS elaborates a methodology and standards to report on indicator 4.7.4?	YES
16	Do you agree on reporting both cognitive and non-cognitive dimensions for indicator SDG 4.7.4?	YES
17	Do you agree with the proposed definitions of minimum proficiency levels for SDG indicator 4.7.4?	
18	Do you agree the UIS pursues with estimating the non-cognitive dimension based on publicly available data and requests country's approval for their publication?	YES

<b>Indicator 4.7.5 Percentage of students showing proficiency in knowledge of environmental science and geoscience</b>		
19	Do you agree that UIS elaborates a methodology and standards to report on indicator 4.7.5?	YES
20	Do you agree with reporting both cognitive and non-cognitive dimensions for indicator SDG 4.7.5?	YES
21	Do you agree with the proposed definitions of minimum proficiency levels for SDG indicator 4.7.5?	
22	Do you agree the UIS pursues with estimating the non-cognitive dimension based on publicly available data and requests country's approval for their publication?	YES



## New indicator on creativity and breadth of skills (Target 4.7)

While the results indicate an agreement with the working plan proposed, some respondents mentioned how they would like to see a more elaborated strategy of measurement in the future to endorse unanimously the strategy.

23	Do you endorse the working plan presented for indicator on breadth of skills?	YES
24	Do you agree with the measurement strategy presented by the 4.7 task force of breadth of Skills?	YES <sup>1</sup>

## Monitoring progress (benchmarking)

The proposed methodology for setting benchmarks for indicator 4.1.1, which included

- the periodicity to measure progress for monitoring's objective,
- the establishment of intermediate goals,
- the use of a rate of progress between measurement points, and
- the use of thresholds by region common to reading and math.

was agreed by the majority of the consultation respondents.

Reference documents: REF/12 ([EN/FR](#)), [REF/13](#)

25	Do you agree on the proposed periodicity to measure progress for monitoring the objective?	YES
26	Do you agree on the need for establishing intermediate and 2030 goals?	YES
27	Do members agree with using a rate progress between measurement points?	YES
28	Do members agree with using a threshold by region common to reading and math?	YES

## Global Indicator Replacement

The consultation shows that the GAML does not support the replacement of indicator 4.6.1 by indicator 4.1.1, nor Target 4.1.

29	Do you think that Indicator 4.6.1 informs on indicator 4.1.1 and Target 4.1?	NO
30	Should Indicator 4.6.1 replace indicator 4.1.1?	NO

<sup>1</sup> Respondents requested more information regarding the measurement strategy presented by the 4.7 task force of breadth of Skills.