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Concept Note and Provisional Agenda

Background

Transforming our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development adopted by governments at the UN General Assembly in September 2015 is the most ambitious, aspirational and universal development agenda to date. Based on a shared global vision, the Agenda is a commitment to eradicate poverty and achieve sustainable development for all by 2030. The central principle of “leaving no-one behind” requires that the right to inclusive and equitable quality education and lifelong learning opportunities be realized for all children, youth and adults as per the collective commitments outlined in 2015 Incheon Declaration and the Education 2030 Framework for Action. As both a stand-alone goal (SDG4), as well as a set of education targets related to health, decent work, gender equality and to sustainable production and consumption, education is at the center of the 2030 agenda and is recognized as a catalyst for the achievement of all its goals. Since 2015, Member States in all regions of the world have made efforts to align their national education policies and strategies with the commitments of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. This has included efforts to strengthen policy focus on the most vulnerable populations, to ensure more effective and relevant learning both for the world of work as well as for citizenship, to adapt education sector coordination, management and monitoring, and to strengthen linkages with other development sectors.

Education is key to building and maintaining the kind of society in which we would like our children and grandchildren to live. Education should prepare for life as active citizens in democratic societies and for sustainable employment as well as further the personal development of learners and develop a broad, advanced knowledge base. Sustainable development requires the commitment of individual citizens and civil society as well as of public authorities and can therefore be fully achieved only in democratic societies. An essential goal of education is to develop the competences for democratic culture that enable democratic institutions and laws to function in practice. Our understanding of quality education must encompass the role of education in society as well as social inclusion: no education system can be considered of high quality unless it provides adequate opportunities for all learners.

The European Commission has been using the Europe 2020 strategy and the Education and Training 2020 strategic framework to measure progress towards the long-term objectives in the EU. This framework relies on seven quantitative benchmarks and a set of qualitative indicators. The progress of EU Member States on six of the benchmarks (early leavers from education and training; tertiary attainment; early childhood education and care; underachievement in basic skills; employment rate of recent graduates and adult learning) is systematically reported and published annually in the Commission’s flagship publication, the Education and Training Monitor. The 7th benchmark on learning mobility is being implemented progressively and has suffered from data constraints. On the European level, the European Commission has been using the same indicators and benchmarks to

---

1 Recommendation CM/Rec(2007)6 by the [Council of Europe’s] Committee of Ministers to member states on the public responsibility for higher education and research. The four major purposes of higher education as outlined in this Recommendation apply also to other levels and strands of education.

2 See the Council of Europe’s Reference Framework of Competences for Democratic Culture as well as Recommendation CM/Rec(2007)6 by the [Council of Europe’s] Committee of Ministers to member states on the Council of Europe Charter on Education for Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights Education.

3 Recommendation CM/Rec(2012)13 by the [Council of Europe’s] Committee of Ministers to member states on ensuring quality education.
measure EU’s progress towards the SDG 4 on education (see Eurostat’s annual SDGs monitoring report). A process is underway in the EU to adapt the monitoring framework after the current strategy has come to an end, i.e. past 2020. The SDGs will be duly taken into account in the EU post-2020 strategy.

The Global SDG Review Process

The global process of review of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) comprises a number of processes and mechanisms, including the following:

Voluntary National Reviews (VNRs): In reporting national progress against regional strategies and monitoring frameworks, many countries have prepared or are preparing Voluntary National Reviews (VNRs) of progress towards the implementation of the SDGs to be presented at the annual High Level Political Forum (HLPF) under the auspices of the UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) in New York. As the main UN platform on Sustainable Development, the HLPF has a central role in the follow-up and review of the SDGs at the global level. Under the auspices of ECOSOC, the HLPF examines a set of goals annually, as well as their two-way interlinkages - as appropriate. The 2019 HLPF Review will be devoted to the theme “Empowering people and ensuring inclusiveness and equality”. This includes an in-depth review of SDG 4 together with the following goals: SDG 8 (Decent work and economic growth); SDG 10 (Reduced inequalities); SDG 13 (Climate action); SDG 16 (Peace and justice); as well as SDG 17 (Partnerships) which is reviewed annually. This will also be the first four-year cycle against which SDG 4 and its interlinkages with other SDGs are reviewed comprehensively. This process aims to facilitate a more in-depth review on progress of all goals over the course of a four-year cycle.

The SDG-Education 2030 Steering Committee: As the main global multi-stakeholder mechanism for consultation and coordination for SDG4, the SDG-Education 2030 Steering Committee plays a key role in the HLPF 2019 Review process. As mandated by the Education 2030 Framework for Action, the Steering Committee “provides strategic guidance, reviews progress drawing on the GEM report, and makes recommendations to the education community on key priorities and catalytic actions to achieve the new agenda, monitors and advocates for adequate financing, and encourage coordination and harmonization of partner activities.” In 2018, the SDG-Education 2030 Steering Committee has engaged in global review, monitoring and reporting through the work of the UIS-led Technical Cooperation Group (TCG), and the Global Alliance to Monitor Learning (GAML), has followed up on the recommendations of the 2017/18 Global Education Monitoring Report relative to accountability and public reporting on education, and has provided input to the 2018 HLPF Review process.

The Global Education Meeting (Brussels, 3-5 December 2018): As stipulated in the Education 2030 Framework for Action, a Global Education Meeting will be organized 3-5 December 2018 in Brussels, Belgium aiming at achieving the following outcomes:

- An assessment of current progress towards the implementation of SDG4-Education 2030 targets and commitments, identification of bottlenecks impeding progress.

---

4 The forum was created at the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development in June 2012 (Rio+20) to provide high-level policy guidance and promote and review implementation of sustainable development

5 SDG 17 is reviewed annually.

6 In addition to the Council of Europe and the European Commission, the Steering Group includes Germany, Norway, Turkey as Member State representatives from Group I ( and Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, the Russian Federation). as Member State representatives from Group II (7 Education 2030 Framework for Action, Para 94.
- An identification of strategic areas requiring political guidance and/or intervention for the effective achievement of the global Education 2030 Agenda.
- An agreement reached on key messages to input into the global 2019 HLPF Review and UN General Assembly 2019.
- Strengthened coordination and support for implementation of SDG Education 2030.

Regional Education 2030 consultations: A series of regional Education 2030 consultations are being organized in 2018 in order to feed into the December 2018 Global Education Meeting and the 2019 HLPF Review. These include the Pan-African High-Level Conference on Education (Nairobi, 25-27 April 2018), the Asia-Pacific Education 2030 Consultation (Bangkok, 12-14 July 2018), the Latin American and Caribbean Ministerial Conference (Bolivia, 25-26 July 2018), and an Arab Education 2030 consultation planned for November 2018. The Strasbourg Education 2030 consultation on 24 October 2018 will be a unique opportunity to bring in insight from the Europe and North American regions as part of this global process of review of progress towards the implementation of key SDG4-Education 2030 commitments.

The Europe and North America Education 2030 Consultation

Aim and Objectives

It is within this overall framework of regional and global consultations on Education in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, that the Europe and North America consultation, hosted by the Council of Europe (Strasbourg, 24 October 2018) and convened by UNESCO in close cooperation with the Council of Europe and the European Commission, provides a platform to review progress and prepare input for the Global Education Meeting (Brussels, 3-5 December 2018) and the 2019 HLPF review. In line with regional education policy priorities, and building on existing regional coordination and mechanisms, the consultation will review national and regional strategies that aim:

1. To further inclusion and equity in education with a particular focus on ensuring the right to education for refugees, migrants and asylum seekers in a lifelong learning perspective.
2. To enhance the relevance of education and learning at all levels for democratic citizenship and inclusive social development in line with the SDG4 focus on education for global citizenship and sustainable development.
3. To improve the effectiveness and equity of both domestic financing and international aid with a focus on communities and countries most in need.
4. To strengthen the monitoring of equity and quality in education and the interlinkages between national, regional and global monitoring of education goals, targets and commitments.

Panels

Each of these topics will be examined in separate panels, each introduced through a background paper that provides a set of guiding questions for the debate. Each panel will consist of 4-5 short presentations from country and regional perspectives, followed by plenary debate. Each session will conclude with a set of 2 key policy recommendations.
Expected outcome

Endorsement and adoption of a European and North American statement to feed into the Global Education Meeting (Brussels, 3-5 December 2018) as part of the global 2019 review of education in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. The statement will focus on strengthening the articulation between national, regional and global efforts to implement 2030 commitments to further inclusion and equity in education, in particular for refugees and migrants, enhance citizenship education in a globalized world, improve financing of education, and strengthen the monitoring of equity and quality.

Participants

- Representatives of UNESCO Group I and Group II Member States
- UN co-convening agencies and affiliated organizations
- Bi-lateral development agencies
- Regional organizations
- The teaching profession, civil society organizations, youth and student representatives
- The private sector, foundations
- Academia

Working languages

English and French; simultaneous interpretation between them will be provided.

Working documents

- Concept note/agenda
- Background papers for the 4 panel sessions [with guiding/focus questions and proposed recommendations to be examined]
- Draft outcome document as input into the Global Education Meeting (Brussels, 3-5 December 2018)
### Provisional Agenda
**Wednesday, 24 October 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08:30 – 09:00</td>
<td>Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:00 – 09:30</td>
<td><strong>Opening Remarks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Chair: Director of Democratic Participation, Council of Europe</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Mr Matjaž Gruden, Director of Democratic Participation, Council of Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Ms Stefania Giannini, Assistant Director-General for Education, UNESCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:30 – 10:15</td>
<td><strong>Education 2030 in Europe and North America</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Chair: Director Education 2030 Support and Coordination, UNESCO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Presentation of agenda / expected outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Jordan Naidoo, Director Education 2030 Support and Coordination, UNESCO (5 min).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Overview of SDG4 global indicators in Europe and North America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Friedrich Huebler, Head of Section, Education Standards and Methodology, UNESCO Institute for Statistics (10 min).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Country perspectives on SDG4 commitments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Manos Antoninis, Director, Global Education Monitoring Report, UNESCO (10 min).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Plenary discussion (20 min).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15 – 11:15</td>
<td><strong>Panel 1: Inclusion and equity with a focus on the right to education of migrants and refugees</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education 2030 posits inclusion and equity as the central policy lens for education policy and planning. In the European region, ensuring the right to education and training of migrants, refugees, and asylum seekers constitutes a strategic policy dimension of ensuring equity and inclusion in education, contributing to more inclusive social development. The panel will examine national challenges and achievements referring to such experiences as language provision for refugees and recognition of qualifications of refugees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Moderation: UNESCO Assistant Director-General for Education</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Panelists: Canada, Greece, Italy, Turkey, UNHCR, UNICEF</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15 – 11:30</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30 – 12:30</td>
<td><strong>Panel 2: Education for democratic citizenship and inclusive social development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The SDG4 focus on social and civic learning for citizenship in an interconnected, interdependent and plural world (SDG 4.7) is arguably one of the most innovative aspects of the new global agenda. How to strengthen the interlinkages between efforts to promote democratic citizenship education in the European context with global efforts to promote citizenship in a context of increasing globalization?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Moderation: Head of Education Department, Directorate of Democratic Participation / DG Democracy, Council of Europe</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Panelists: Andorra, European Wergeland Center, CDPPE Chair, Education International,</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30 – 14:00</td>
<td>Lunch break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00 – 15:00</td>
<td><strong>Panel 3: Improving domestic and international financing for education</strong>  &lt;br&gt; Financing our shared ambitions to ensure equitable and inclusive quality education and lifelong learning opportunities for all not only requires higher levels of funding, but also more efficient and equitable use of these resources. The Education 2030 Framework for Action sets out a number of benchmarks for domestic financing and many countries in the North have also made commitments relative to the volume and share of ODA to be allocated for education as part of both development and humanitarian assistance. The panel will address both international development and humanitarian aid to education and trends in equity in domestic financing of education.  &lt;br&gt; <strong>Moderation:</strong> Director for People and Peace (DG DEVCO), European Commission  &lt;br&gt; <strong>Panelists:</strong> Aga Khan Foundation, European Commission (Directorate-General for Education, Youth, Sport, Culture), European Commission (European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations), Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation, Open Society Foundation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00 – 15:30</td>
<td>Coffee/Tea break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:30 – 16:30</td>
<td><strong>Panel 4: Monitoring equity and quality in education - Strengthening interlinkages between national–regional–global monitoring</strong>  &lt;br&gt; Monitoring progress in the implementation of regional and global education goals, targets and commitments, is key both for effective policy implementation, as well as for public accountability at national, regional, and global levels. Strengthening monitoring at country, regional and global levels is therefore critical to meet our collective commitments. In doing so, it is important to ensure greater coherence between monitoring frameworks at these three levels.  &lt;br&gt; <strong>Moderation:</strong> Director Education 2030 Support and Coordination, UNESCO  &lt;br&gt; <strong>Panelists:</strong> Belgium, Georgia, OECD, European Commission, UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS), Council of Europe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:30 – 17:15</td>
<td><strong>Conclusion and adoption of outcome document</strong>  &lt;br&gt; <strong>Chair:</strong> UNESCO Assistant Director-General for Education  &lt;br&gt; - Presentation of key recommendations from the panel discussions (5 min.)  &lt;br&gt; - Plenary discussion on recommendations and endorsement of outcome document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:15 – 17:30</td>
<td><strong>Closing remarks</strong>  &lt;br&gt; <strong>Chair:</strong> Head, Education Department, Council of Europe  &lt;br&gt; - Mr Sjur Bergan, Head, Education Department, Council of Europe  &lt;br&gt; - Mr Jan Pakulski, Head of Unit at the Directorate-General for Education, Youth, Sport and Culture, European Commission  &lt;br&gt; - Ms Stefania Giannini, Assistant Director-General for Education, UNESCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:30</td>
<td><strong>Cocktail</strong> (at the Foyer du Comité des Ministres) offered by the Delegation of Belgium to the Council of Europe, the Flemish and the French Community of Belgium, host country of the Global Education Meeting 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Questionnaire: National perceptions of Sustainable Development Goal 4**

We invite you to fill out this questionnaire to reflect on your country’s experience with the SDG 4 implementation process.

**Sustainable Development Goal 4** (SDG 4), which aims to “ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all”, is the global education goal to which all countries have committed.

The **Education 2030 Framework for Action** proposed a roadmap for SDG 4 implementation, especially at national level. It stressed the need to align national education policy and planning to the Agenda 2030 targets and priorities.

However, SDG 4 covers a very wide range of education policy issues. Therefore:

- It may be difficult to distinguish what are the new elements that SDG 4 is bringing to national education policies and debates. This prioritization is likely to differ across countries.

- It is not always clear which education policies countries may decide to change in light of SDG 4.

These issues are important as we reach 2019, the year when the **High Level Political Forum** (HLPF), the main global follow-up and review process of Agenda 2030, will carry out a thematic review of progress towards SDG 4.

The Global Education Monitoring Report, which has the mandate not only to monitor SDG 4 but also to “report on the implementation of national and international strategies”, is preparing a **special publication to mark the occasion of the 2019 HLPF** in collaboration with UNESCO’s Education 2030 coordination team, regional bureaus and institutes and the SDG – Education 2030 Steering Committee.

This questionnaire aims to inform this publication. It has two objectives:

1. Collect your perceptions about the ways in which the SDG 4 agenda is influencing education policy planning and implementation in your country compared to what was happening before 2015.

2. Collect information on education policies and programmes, which best demonstrate the commitment of your country to SDG 4:
   - across SDG 4 in general
   - in six specific areas

Thank you for your time.
Information on the respondent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>e.g. Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>e.g. Director Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perceptions of SDG 4

Specify three ways in which the SDG 4 agenda is influencing education policy planning and implementation in your country?

a. 

b. 

c. 

Key policies and programmes related to SDG 4

Please name and describe the policy or programme, which in your opinion best reflects the commitment of your government to achieving SDG 4.

Name of policy or programme:
Year:
Short description:

Link to SDG 4:
Document(s) for more information:
Apart from this policies or programme, please name and describe a key policy or programme in each of the following areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring learning outcomes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of policy or programme:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short description:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document(s) for more information:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targeting vulnerable groups</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of policy or programme:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short description:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document(s) for more information:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broadening the content of education</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy / programme or programme:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short description:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document(s) for more information:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lifelong learning opportunities</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy / programme or programme:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short description:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document(s) for more information:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collaborating with other sectors</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy / programme or programme:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short description:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document(s) for more information:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Panel 1: Inclusion and equity with a focus on the right to education of migrants and refugees

Abstract

Inclusion is at the core of 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development aim to ‘leave no one behind’ and Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 4 principle to ‘ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all’. The paper begins by defining inclusive education recalling the different areas, dimensions, degrees of exclusion which need to be considered. It then outlines components of education systems that support inclusion, such as: national legal frameworks and policies; governance and finance; school curricula and learning materials; teachers, school leaders and education support personnel; school infrastructure; and community norms, beliefs and expectations. Barriers faced by learners with overlapping characteristics may make them particularly vulnerable to exclusion. This is the case for migrants and displaced people in many countries constraining in practice the right to education. The panel provides an opportunity for a selection of countries to present their specific successes and challenges in ensuring the right to education of migrants and refugees.

Guiding questions

- What are the key challenges your country is facing to include migrants and refugees in the national education system?
- What measures has your country taken to ensure the right to education for migrants and refugees?

Defining inclusive education

Inclusion is at the core of 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development aim to ‘leave no one behind’ and Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 4 principle to ‘ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all’. It also appears in specific targets, notably in target 4.5, to eliminate ‘gender disparities in education and ensure access to all levels of education and vocational training for the vulnerable’ and in target 4.a, to provide ‘safe, non-violent, inclusive and effective learning environments for all’.

The global dialogue on inclusive education has changed over time. Originally, the concept was focused on students with disabilities and the need to include them in education systems as a human right. Over time, especially since the 1994 Salamanca Statement, inclusive education has taken on a broader meaning, encompassing all learners and focusing on policies to provide quality education to all to overcome structural inequalities.

Exclusion is a universal phenomenon, even if its various forms are context-specific. However, consensus on this broader conception of inclusive education is not firmly established. Inclusive education has been criticized as lacking a tight conceptual focus and being too vague. This, at times, has led to tension and the re-emergence of special interest groups advocating for specific groups of children.

Moreover, while the goal of removing barriers for the education of all children has nearly universal support, policies and local practices differ across regions and countries. The broad view, focused on all students and ensuring that students with special needs are included in mainstream classes, requires the system to change to suit the child – but this is rarely done. Instead, most countries
adopt some form of integration where the child must adapt to the system into which they are placed. It is helpful to consider different areas, dimensions, degrees and elements of inclusion. Areas of inclusion include the different communities with which a student interacts, whether in interpersonal relationships, informal or formal groups, like classrooms, schools and community centres. Within each area, individuals can be included or excluded across different dimensions: physical; social; psychological; and systemic. The degree of inclusion felt by an individual can also vary across time, but also across different areas.

Finally, there are elements of education systems that support inclusion: laws and policies, governance and finance, school curricula, personnel, and infrastructure, and community norms, beliefs, and expectations. In addition, barriers faced by learners with overlapping characteristics may make them particularly vulnerable to exclusion. This is the case for migrants and displaced people in many countries constraining in practice the right to education.

**National legal frameworks and policies**

Legal tools are essential in the development of an inclusive education system. International declarations represent important commitments to inclusion. However, their impact is limited if they are not supported by national frameworks or if educational stakeholders are not aware of them.

- Across countries, laws and policies establish procedures that can support inclusion and lay out mandates leading to different school practices.
- Making the right to education conditional on citizenship and/or legal residency status is perhaps the most common explicit exclusion in constitutions or education legislation. Enrolment may require national identification papers, proof of residency, birth certificates or prior education credentials. In some countries, laws explicitly deny rights for undocumented migrants.
- Vague or contradictory language in legal frameworks can hinder inclusion. An inclusive national legal framework does not necessarily prevent regional or local discriminatory practices in many countries. School heads are key gatekeepers, deciding who gets through the door. Official clarification and reassurance can be helpful in overcoming such misinterpretations.
- Students without documentation may encounter difficulties to have their prior learning recognized to benefit from available education opportunities, particularly when they lack proof of their qualifications.
- Education for migrants and refugees need to be approached from a lifelong learning perspective, ensuring they are targeted with interventions at the crucial early childhood level and following through with counselling and support for technical, vocational and post-secondary education.

**Governance and finance**

Persistent gaps remain between inclusive education policy and practice. Weak governance can prevent the implementation of inclusive policies. Absent accountability mechanisms may put the rights of learners at risk. Inclusive education can only work if different sectors collaborate effectively. This is especially important as many learners vulnerable to exclusion face overlapping challenges, related to health, security, poverty or remoteness.
To clarify responsibilities and push toward common goals, national education planning and governance should mainstream inclusion, involve stakeholders from different sectors, and include the voices of those at risk of exclusion as well as their parents or guardians. Members of groups vulnerable to exclusion are often under-represented in education policy-making. Cities can play a lead role in inclusion by taking the lead in non-formal education initiatives.

The issue of funding is crucial in ensuring education for all. Funding formulas need to recognize the additional costs associated with the education of vulnerable children, including for accessibility in transport and buildings. Resource allocation that supports inclusion involves coordination mechanisms across ministries and tiers of government. It also needs to be taken into account that some funding mechanisms encourage the labelling of some learners as requiring special needs, because that means additional support for schools.

- Schools with high numbers of immigrant or refugee students are more likely to have higher funding needs to address barriers affecting their integration and academic performance.
- Few countries explicitly immigrant status as a factor in school funding allocations although a number use other factors such as poverty or language, which are linked to immigration.
- Additional support linked to migrant and refugee students may overlook structural school and administration challenges.

Curricula and learning materials

The curricula used in schools can play an important role in whether students feel included or excluded. In following the principles of inclusion, curriculum development should involve different stakeholders, inclusion experts and communities, as well as those vulnerable to exclusion. There is more than one approach to learning: the same curriculum needs to be flexible enough to be taught to learners with different backgrounds and abilities. Using inclusive curriculum requires diverse modes of instruction and learner-centred approaches to learning.

Discriminatory or stereotypical content in learning materials can increase exclusion. Lack of diversity in content is another obstacle to building a culture of inclusion.

- Curricula and textbooks need to be adapted and be flexible for diverse learning needs. Countries are increasingly modifying curricula to reflect growing social diversity, but multi- or inter-culturalism is fully-integrated only in a few, whether as a stand-alone subject or integrated it into the curriculum.
- Although migrants and migration discussions tend to be included in some textbooks, mentions of migration are commonly limited to historical accounts of settlement and ideas of nation-building and population expansion.
- Textbooks continue to omit contentious migration-related issues such as undocumented migrants, xenophobic attitudes or discrimination

Teachers, school leaders and education support personnel

Teachers, head teachers and support staff need to be prepared to accommodate students of all abilities and backgrounds in increasingly diverse schools.
• Such investment to address diversity is necessary both to facilitate individual learning and to foster a welcoming and more understanding community. Preparedness to teach students who are not proficient in the language of instruction is crucial.

• Appropriate, effective and respectful interaction between teachers and immigrants and refugees requires cultural competences, which must be taught and learned. Practical pedagogy to prepare teachers to anticipate and resolve intercultural conflicts or be familiar with psychological treatment and referral options for students in need is rarely emphasized.

• Activities that promote openness to multiple perspectives need to be embedded in teaching practices. Freedom to explore sensitive issues in an inclusive and non-discriminatory way is essential to developing critical thinking skills and understanding how beliefs are constructed.

• Teacher education programmes for diversity are included at varying degree across countries but completing such courses is usually optional. Teachers themselves often feel ill-prepared for teaching in diverse classrooms.

Alongside knowledge and skills, school leaders’ and teachers’ motivation for and commitment to inclusive education are essential, even in systems where teacher training for inclusion exists. Staff motivation can be curtailed by structural barriers, such as lack of autonomy in adapting curricula. To ensure all feel welcome and included in a school, the diversity of the student population should be reflected in diversity among education staff, including teachers, school leaders and support staff. Education personnel can be important role models and can help overcome discriminatory views among all students.

**Schools**

School selection may lead to exclusion. Vulnerable groups may be disproportionately concentrated in particular schools, leading to segregation.

• Immigrant students often end up segregated from natives in schools with lower academic standards and performance levels, which negatively affects their educational achievement. Conversely, immigrants attending schools with a majority of native students have higher education aspirations, even if these effects are often mediated by their socio-economic status or the socio-economic context of the school.

• Low achievers may be streamed away from academic courses and into technical or vocational tracks at key transition points.

• Language support programmes are necessary to help students who speak a different language integrate into the education system. But extending the duration of preparatory classes too long can keeps immigrant and native students apart, which contributes to segregation and has negative effects, which are more severe for older children.

• Native students circumvent administrative rules and schools offer ways to attract native students and better teachers (such as separate classes based on parent choice of religious or foreign language instruction), fostering segregation.

**Communities, parents and students**

Communities with discriminatory beliefs and attitudes can prevent learners from accessing education opportunities. Discriminatory community views concerning gender, disability, ethnicity, race or religion, can diminish learners’ safety and outcomes while in school. Many initiatives focus on involving parents and community members in school management and collecting data to ensure
that schools and authorities are held accountable for education for all. Parent preferences are also important when considering inclusive education. Some parents may feel like a separate or special school will provide their children with a sense of belonging, or meet their physical or intellectual needs.

- Lack of connection with immigrant communities may cause immigrant parents not feeling as welcome to engage with schools as native-born parents and perceiving they have little influence on how their children are treated or taught in schools.
- Disconnection from the communities may also erode the sense of belonging to the host country

Learners’ social and emotional well-being in school should not be undervalued. Bullying and cyber-bullying can lead to exclusion from education opportunities, but it also targets students who are already particularly vulnerable to exclusion. Policies are sometimes limited to integration efforts that start by labelling groups, with immigrants expected to integrate into host communities that need not change.

**Recommendations**

Legal, structural and process factors can deny migrant children the right to education. The implicit rights afforded by general non-discrimination provisions do not guarantee their right to education in practice. This is especially true where national legislation explicitly excludes non-citizens or undocumented migrants from education rights. Even absent such explicit discrimination, rigid documentation requirements, whether legally required or arbitrarily-imposed by local gatekeepers, can prevent access.

1. It is therefore important to review and amend or strengthen national or sub-national legislation - that is consistent with global conventions and agreements - in order to ensure the right to education for migrants, including the undocumented in order to respond to the recent changes resulting from migration and refugee flows.

Revised legislative measures should inform strengthening or development and implementation of targeted policies and strategies.

2. Local authorities, schools, higher education institutions, other lifelong learning providers and civil society should work together to motivate young people from disadvantaged backgrounds to aim for educational success as well as help them develop the requisite competences required for life and work.

**References**

Concept note for the 2030 Global Education Monitoring Report on inclusion

UNESCO (2027) A Guide for ensuring inclusion and equity in education

UNESCO (2017) Protecting the right to education for refugees.
http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0025/002510/251076E.pdf
Panel 2: Education for democratic citizenship and inclusive social development

Abstract

Education is essential to developing and maintaining sustainable societies founded on democratic culture: attitudes and behaviours that seek to resolve conflicts peacefully; recognize that while majorities decide, minorities have rights; are respectful of diversity and mindful of our physical environment; and include all members of society. This paper outlines the major purposes of education before focusing on the role of education in preparing students for life as active citizens in democratic societies. By developing competences for democratic culture, education prepares for democratic citizenship, counteracts tendencies towards populism, and helps build resilience to violent extremism.

Education can further democratic culture and social inclusion provided that it is recognized as an important element in assessing the quality of education. Quality education systems and institutions model the democratic principles that they seek to promote in students, help students develop their full potential, provide them with the means to overcome the barriers to their development that are rooted in their socio-economic backgrounds. They remove or compensate for obstacles that stem from students’ backgrounds and may prevent individuals from fulfilling their aspirations.

Guiding questions

1. Taking account of current and future opportunities and challenges, how can education best help build sustainable, democratic societies?
2. How can education systems, institutions, and individual education actors best build competences for democratic culture and promote them throughout the different educational curricula?
3. How can a focus on education for democracy and citizenship also be part of a strategy to promote equity in and through education?

The context of the Regional Consultation

Target 4.7 of the Sustainable Development Goal 4 on Quality Education asks member States to ensure that all learners “acquire values, attitudes and behaviors to promote sustainable development ... human rights, gender equality, promotion of a culture of peace and non-violence, global citizenship, and appreciation of cultural diversity and of culture’s contribution to sustainable development”. It seeks to address – through education – the major global challenges faced by democratic societies, such as respect for human rights and minorities, acceptance of diversity, peaceful conflict resolution, and societal and environmental sustainability. The Regional Consultation provides countries in the European and North American region with the opportunity to review how they are addressing these challenges in their specific context.

Democratic culture

When we think of democracy, the images that come to mind are often those of parliaments, city councils, constitutions, and elections. However, these institutions and laws will not function unless people and society have developed a democratic culture rooted in the principle of the rule of law. This designates attitudes and behaviours that characterize democratic citizenship and seek to resolve conflicts peacefully and through debate; recognize that while majorities decide, minorities have rights; are respectful of diversity; are conscious of and concerned about our physical
environment; and seek to include all members of society. It also implies promoting the notion that states are accountable to laws that are publicly promulgated, equally enforced and independently adjudicated and which are consistent with international human rights norms and standards. Ultimately, these values, attitudes, and behaviours help make our societies sustainable.

Education at all levels and of all strands plays an essential role in developing and maintaining democratic culture. It is also critical to bringing up engaged citizens by learning and teaching fundamental values and civic rights and obligations. Education can further social inclusion by combating hostile attitudes towards vulnerable groups. It should help young people exercise their democratic rights, learn to cooperate with their fellow citizens, assess the media critically and strengthen their sense of belonging. Education is therefore also important to strengthening the cohesion of European societies.

Attitudes and behaviours must be developed anew in each generation and maintained throughout life. Formal education, through education systems and institutions, plays a particularly important role in this regard. In the European region, education is one of the few areas of which virtually all citizens have direct personal experience for much of their lives: as students, as parents, as education professionals, as representatives of public authorities or NGOs, or in other capacities. Many citizens will play several of these roles simultaneously or in the course of their lives.

A culture of democracy should also be a culture of environmental responsibility and conscience of the importance of sustainability. Education should develop the ability of individuals as well as societies to weigh long term and short term goals and to accept personal sacrifices with a view to future sustainability and societal benefit.

**Purposes, inclusion, and quality**

*Education is not a single-purpose undertaking. Rather, education systems and institutions should address all major purposes of education:*

- preparation for sustainable employment;
- preparation for life as active citizens in democratic societies;
- personal development throughout life;
- the development and maintenance, through teaching, learning and research, of a broad, advanced knowledge base.

*These purposes are complementary rather than contradictory.* Many of the competences that make individuals attractive on the labour market also help them be active citizens and further their personal development. In addition to offering a competitive advantage on the labour market, higher levels of education attainment have notably been associated with higher levels of civic engagement and active participation in society. Nevertheless, public debate on education tends to emphasize preparation for the labour market over the other main purposes. This discourse, and the policy and budget priorities that emanate from it, needs to evolve to make our societies sustainable politically, socially, and culturally as well as financially.

**Competences for democracy**

Education is, among other things, a process to develop a set of competences in students. This is true for all levels and all strands of education, even if the exact competences will vary considerably. The view policy makers take of the purposes of education generally and of specific strands or
programmes will to a considerable extent determine the competences and learning outcomes aimed for.

For education to play an important role in developing the democratic culture without which societies will not be democratic, regardless of their institutional and legal framework, education programmes and systems should model democratic principles and aim to develop competences that support this goal. The Council of Europe has developed a framework based on 20 competences organized around four categories – the Reference Framework of Competences for Democratic Culture (RFCDC):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Attitudes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valuing human dignity and human rights</td>
<td>Openness to cultural otherness and other beliefs, word views and practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuing cultural diversity</td>
<td>Respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuing democracy, justice, fairness, equality and the rule of law</td>
<td>Civic-mindedness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even if different competences may be developed at different levels of education and in different learners, education systems should aim to develop all competences in all learners. A democratically competent individual will demonstrate all competences to some extent. Knowledge is accompanied by critical understanding and cannot be seen in isolation from skills, values, and attitudes.

The development of the model demonstrated that some concepts may require clarification. For example, “critical understanding” – often also referred to as “critical thinking” – involves questioning established understanding and practice but is not limited to questioning. Critical understanding also requires developing viable alternatives.

The CDC Framework builds on the proposition that values are developed rather than innate. Values are therefore an integral part of education. This view is expressed through many national laws, which specify the values that the national education system should aim to develop. The CDC Framework outlines values that arise from the European Convention on Human Rights and that are therefore important to all European societies. While grounded in European experiences and standards, the CDC also echoes global commitments to promote Global Citizenship and Human Rights Education in
In accordance with the 1974 Recommendation concerning Education for International Understanding, Co-operation and Peace and Education relating to Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms.

All competences in the CDC Framework can be taught, learned and assessed: in other words they can and should be developed through education. While they can also be developed through non-formal and informal learning, formal education systems and programmes should take the leading role in developing competences for democratic culture in all citizens. Teacher education and pedagogical approaches as well as assessment may vary from one set of competences to another as well as between settings and education traditions.

**Democratic citizenship**

*Competences for democratic culture cannot just be taught theoretically; they need to be practiced.* Democratic citizenship relies on putting theory into practice: it combines knowledge and understanding with the ability and will to act. These competences must therefore be developed through education practice as well as through theoretical learning. Schools that are run in authoritarian ways and/or that do not encourage student participation in the learning process and in the daily life of the school will not develop a culture of democracy in its students and will, in the worst of cases, lead students to become cynical of democracy as a system in which discourse and principles are contradicted by action.

*Education institutions and systems should promote a culture of democracy through whole-school (or whole-institution, in the case of higher education) approaches.* Schools and higher education institutions should encourage student and staff participation in the learning process as well as in institutional governance, adapted to the age of the students.

In the same way, *policy makers should take a whole-system approach: developing democratic citizenship is an important mission for all of education:* the mission includes pre-school education and vocational education and training as well as higher education.

**Global Citizenship Education**

Education for democratic citizenship is part of and in line with UNESCO’s approach to Global Citizenship Education (GCED). GCED is a global approach that aims to empower learners to assume active roles to face and resolve global challenges and to contribute to a more peaceful, tolerant, inclusive and secure world. UNESCO has defined GCED learning outcomes based on the three core conceptual dimensions of learning (cognitive, socio-emotional and behavioural). These learning outcomes need to be locally adapted based on local (or regional) contexts and needs. In the European context, education for democratic citizenship is an example of GCED contextualization that fully supports the achievement of SDG Target 4.7. Thus, the Europe 2020 Strategy and the Education and Training 2020 Strategic Framework are fully aligned with this global approach.

**Education for Sustainable Development**

Education for Sustainable Development (ESD), part and parcel of the Target 4.7, empowers learners to take informed decisions and responsible actions for environmental integrity, economic viability, and a just society for present and future generations, while respecting cultural diversity. ESD with its emphasis on competences such as critical thinking and problem-solving, related to empathy, solidarity and action-taking, can help prepare learners to become empowered citizens for a sustainable future.
In today’s world of complex challenges and rapid changes, people must learn to understand individual issues in a holistic way and cooperate with other people of diverse opinion towards a sustainable solution. People must be equipped with knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes to drive such a change.

Acting for sustainable development requires citizenship engagement. Empowered individuals can engage constructively in socio-political processes and contribute to move society in a more sustainable direction. This can already start at schools with more opportunities for community engagement and action learning. Citizen action is especially important to addressing structural sustainability challenges. Democratic citizenship requires knowledge, skills, values and attitudes to collectively take action for the overarching goal of a sustainable future. This is why ESD is recognized by UN General Assembly as “an integral element of the SDG on quality education and a key enabler of all the other SDGs.”

Quality education

Most education systems and institutions aim for the highest possible quality but there is surprisingly little public debate about what quality actually means. The degree to which education is successful cannot be divorced from consideration of the goals societies seek to achieve through education. The purposes of education as well as the ability of education to further democratic culture and social inclusion should therefore be important elements in assessing the quality of education systems, institutions, and programmes. Among other things, a high quality education system must provide adequate opportunities for all learners, and it must successfully address all major purposes of education.

Social inclusion

Good education systems and institutions, then, help students overcome barriers rooted in their socio-economic backgrounds, help them develop their full potential and favour upward social mobility. They recognize that providing equal opportunities may require special measures and incentives aimed at disadvantaged groups. They go beyond removing formal barriers to access and aim to provide equal opportunities for all students. They aim to remove or compensate for obstacles that stem from students’ backgrounds and that may prevent individuals from enjoying their formal rights.

Education should further social inclusion by enabling all students to fulfil their potential and make full use of their talents. This requires high quality teaching as well as guidance, and it requires working with parents and communities as well as within education institutions. Through outreach and community programmes schools and higher education institutions can help build a culture of education success in communities in which there are few role models and little incentive for children and young people to undertake education.

To be socially inclusive, therefore, education systems and institutions need to provide students with opportunities, including financial aid, and to develop an understanding of the role and importance of education in communities. Education must make it possible for all students to develop and fulfil their aspirations as long as these are commensurate with their potential. In many cases, this involves not only removing obstacles but also developing the aspirations of students and parents. In communities and social settings that undervalue education, limited aspirations may combine with financial and other barriers to make education a vehicle for exclusion rather than play its role in furthering social inclusion.
Populism

In the European region, the past few years have seen a rise in populism. While definitions of populism vary, and while populism may be of the political right as well as of the political left, it tends to champion simple “solutions” to complex problems and to polarize society into “them” and “us”. In its ultimate consequence, populists would do away with democracy: since they claim to represent the “people”, albeit in their own understanding of the term, elections are either unnecessary since they would only confirm what populists already “know” - that they represent the majority – or “anti-democratic” by giving results that do not correspond to the “will of the people” as populists see it. The increase in the number of people seeking refuge in many European countries since summer 2015 has been challenging in terms of logistics but also in the way many citizens and political parties have used refugees in a precarious situation to stir up a populist backlash.

Ascribing populism solely to lack of education would be an oversimplification. Relevant education of good quality can be a powerful antidote to populism. It requires developing multi-perspectivity: the ability and will to see different sides of an issue as well as respect for others and openness to other beliefs, convictions, and practices. Multi-perspectivity does not imply that all views are equally valid or that one is obliged to change one’s views to fit those of others. Multi-perspectivity does, however, imply an obligation to give due consideration to views that differ from one’s own and to be open to the possibility of changing one’s mind.

Multilingualism can help develop this ability by opening doors to other cultures and by allowing learners to realize that the same reality can be described and approached in different ways.

Building resilience to violent extremism

At most periods in European history, some individuals and groups have been prepared to use violence to obtain political and other goals they were unable to obtain through democratic means. Most recently, this has been exemplified by terrorist attacks in several European cities, which gave rise to political declarations recognizing the key role of education in building resilience to violent extremism as well as to education policy and practice initiatives nationally and at European level.

The role of education is particularly important to create the conditions that build the defenses, within learners, against violent extremism and strengthen their commitment to non-violence and peace. De-radicalization programmes – usually conducted outside of the framework of formal education – are also important. Schools and other education institutions should be places where students feel free to speak and safe to learn, where even extremist opinions can be voiced but where such opinions are met by arguments and confronted by peers rather than driven into closed subcultures underground or dark corners of cyberspace.

Recommendations

1. In their criteria for assessing the role and quality of schools and higher education institutions, as well as in their funding practices, public authorities should take due account of the contribution of education to developing and maintaining sustainable, democratic societies.

2. Schools and higher education institutions, supported by public authorities, should work to develop competences for democratic culture in all their students and play an active role in their societies by contributing to their social, political, cultural, and environmental sustainability.
References

Council of Europe

Reference Framework of Competences for Democratic Culture (CDC)
https://www.coe.int/en/web/education/competences-for-democratic-culture

Recommendation Rec (2012) 13 of the Committee of Ministers to member states on Ensuring Quality Education
https://search.coe.int/cm/Pages/result_details.aspx?ObjectId=09000016805c94fb

Recommendation Rec (2010) 7 of the Committee of Ministers to member states on the Council of Europe Charter on Education for Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights Education
https://search.coe.int/cm/Pages/result_details.aspx?ObjectId=09000016805cf01f

Recommendation Rec (2007) 6 of the Committee of Ministers to member states on the Public Responsibility for Higher Education and Research
https://search.coe.int/cm/Pages/result_details.aspx?ObjectId=09000016805d5dae

Recommendation Rec (2007) 6 of the Committee of Ministers to member states on history teaching in twenty-first-century Europe
https://search.coe.int/cm/Pages/result_details.aspx?ObjectId=09000016805e2c31

Campaign “Free to Learn, Safe to Speak: Democratic Schools for All”

World Forum for Democracy

2017 edition on “Is Populism a problem?”

Council of Europe and UNESCO

Council of Europe/UNESCO Convention on the Recognition of Qualifications concerning Higher Education in the European Region (Lisbon Recognition Convention)
https://www.coe.int/en/web/conventions/full-list/-/conventions/treaty/165

Recommendation on Recognition of Qualifications held by Refugees, Displaced Persons and Persons in a Refugee-like Situation

European Commission

Declaration on Promoting citizenship and the common values of freedom, tolerance and non-discrimination through education (Paris Declaration 17 March 2015):
UNESCO


http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0023/002329/232993e.pdf

http://www.unesco.org/ulis/cgi-bin/ulis.pl?catno=247764&set=005A7318E1_1_57&gp=1&lin=1&ll=1

A Teacher’s guide on the prevention of violent extremism (2016)
http://www.unesco.org/ulis/cgi-bin/ulis.pl?catno=244676&set=005A7318E1_1_57&gp=1&lin=1&ll=1

Education about the Holocaust and preventing genocide: a policy guide (2017)
http://www.unesco.org/ulis/cgi-bin/ulis.pl?catno=248071&gp=1&lin=1&ll=1

Addressing Anti-Semitism through Education: Guidelines for Policymakers (2018)
http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0026/002637/263702e.pdf

Global Citizenship Education and the rise of nationalist perspectives: Reflections and possible ways forward (2018)
http://www.unesco.org/ulis/cgi-bin/ulis.pl?catno=265414&set=005B61C6D8_3_452&gp=1&lin=1&ll=1

http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0024/002474/247444e.pdf

Issues and trends in Education for Sustainable Development (2018)
http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0026/002614/261445e.pdf
Panel 3: Improving domestic and international financing for education

Abstract

The share of expenditure on education in the EU Member states and in Official Development Assistance has remained relatively stable during the last decade, while overall “social expenditure” has been increased. Reversing this trend and improving funding for education is crucial to meet the targets of SDG 4 worldwide. It is all more pertinent as 264 million children and young people are not in school and 617 million are in school but not achieving minimum learning levels, in line with expected growth in school-age cohorts, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa. On the other hand, effective action to strengthen domestic resource mobilisation and the use of funding is necessary to improve the effectiveness of the resources devoted to education and thus increase domestic efforts to achieve SDG4 by 2030. In terms of making progress towards SDG4, support for basic education is critical. Basic education is understood as covering pre-primary, primary and secondary education levels, as reflected in SDG4 targets 4.1 and 4.2. Strong policy choices need to be made to reflect that education is prioritized among key sectors for sustainable development.

Guiding questions

1. How to increase commitments and ODA level for education?
2. How to ensure a more equitable distribution of available resources to address historical as well as newly emerging disparities in access to education and lifelong learning and in their outcomes?
3. How to improve effectiveness in the use of available resources?

Investing in education in the EU Member States

In 2016, average general government expenditure on education in the EU-28 represented 4.7% of the EU GDP, i.e. around EUR 705 billion in current prices. This ratio remained relatively stable between 2002 and 2016, decreasing by 0.3 pps since 2002.

Expenditure on education as a percentage of GDP or of total public expenditure reflects changes in the level and composition of public expenditure itself, which in turn are linked to the economic cycle and to growth. Spending per student offers a better indicator of the resources available to teachers and students and implicitly takes into account the evolution of the student population. In the past 10 years, the total number of students increased slightly from around 108 million in 2006 to almost 111 million in 2016. The evolution of the average EU expenditure in education per student shows that spending per student remained broadly constant, though with some cyclical variation.
The EU-28 average share of expenditure on education in total expenditure in 2016 was stable at 10.2%. This represents a slight decline from 11.1% in 2002, though against a background of an overall increase in government expenditure, notably on ‘health’ and ‘social protection’ (+2.7 pps as a ratio to GDP compared with 2002). Taking education’s share of public expenditure as an indication of a government’s financial commitment to the sector, we can see that in almost two thirds of Member States this share is above the EU weighted average. The latter is pulled down, however, by large economies such as Germany, France and Italy who invest relatively less public money in education.

The breakdown of expenditure by level of education shows that the bulk of public expenditure is devoted to the school level (pre-primary to post-secondary). This is not surprising since this level
covers all of compulsory schooling and around two thirds of the number of years typically spent in education. It also accounts for 60% or more of total education expenditure in all Member States, with a peak of over 80% in Italy. Tertiary education accounts for more than 15% of the total in 20 countries, reaching around 30% in Finland. In Italy and in the UK this share is below 10%. ‘Other expenditure’ includes various items such as education not classified by level, ‘ancillary services’ to education (such as school transport, meals etc.), and R&D on education. Its share varies hugely, from around 4% in the Netherlands to above 25% in Slovakia.

Figure 3: Total general government expenditure by level, 2016

Spending figures per se cannot be directly linked to performance of the education system. The context, such as the social background of students and the choice of policies, can markedly influence the spending level and its efficiency and effectiveness. Policymakers struggle to identify relevant indicators to orient spending decisions and to monitor their implementation in order to improve the education system’s performance.

**European and Northern American investment in education in low and lower middle income countries**

Achieving SDG4 by 2030 will require increased spending in education. In 2015, the Global Education Monitoring Report team estimated that low and lower middle income countries faced an annual financing gap of USD 39 billion over 2015–2030. This analysis was confirmed by the International Commission on Financing Global Education Opportunity, which estimated an annual funding gap of approximately USD 44 billion.

---

Some countries have recorded the bulk of expenditure on R&D under COFOG function education, instead of spreading it across function (i.e. industry, health, environment, etc.). The different treatment of this item might lead to an overestimate of ‘other expenditure’.
In most low and lower-middle income countries, most funding for education is provided domestically, primarily through government budgetary allocations and parental and community contributions. In many countries this is supplemented by ODA and other forms of international support. All of these sources of funding need to be increased if SDG4 is to be achieved.

Governments have the primary responsibility for the adequate funding of education. While globally public expenditure accounts for 79% of the total cost of education, in low-income countries this figure is 59%. The Education 2030 Framework for Action and the 2016 Addis Ababa Action Agenda, specify two critical targets for the public financing of education, that is, at least 4%-6% of GDP and at least 15%-20% of total government expenditure. On average, low-income countries devote about 3.7% of GDP to education.

Action to increase domestic public resources needs to be complemented by action to strengthen domestic resource mobilisation through, for example, reforms to increase the tax base (by reducing tax incentives and exemptions, and combatting tax evasion and avoidance) and effective measures to combat corruption (including illicit capital flows to tax havens) and wastage and inefficient use of resources.

However, as the Global Education Monitoring Report9 indicates, even if low and lower middle income countries increase their domestic revenue raising capacities, public expenditure will be unlikely insufficient to bring the transformational change required to achieve SDG 4. For these countries, official development assistance (ODA) remains a crucial source of education finance as well as of technical support. In low-income countries, ODA accounts for 12% of total education costs (or 18% if household spending is excluded). In lower middle-income countries, it represents only 2% of total education spending (or 3% if household spending is excluded). However, the shares are unequally distributed with support being far more important in some countries than others with similar or greater needs.

In low-income countries, the annual funding gap is the equivalent to 42% of the total cost of achieving universal pre-primary, primary and secondary completion by 203010. In lower middle-income countries, it is the equivalent of 6% of the total education cost of achieving these targets. ODA to education in low and lower middle income countries would need to be six times the 2012 levels to secure SDG4 by 2030.

However, donors have largely shifted their priorities away from education. Despite global ODA increasing by 24% between 2010 and 2015, ODA for education, at US$12 billion, was 4% below 2010 levels. The share of ODA dedicated to education decreased for six years in a row, from 10% in 2009 to 6.9% in 2015 (excluding debt relief).

---

In 2016, bilateral DAC donors disbursed approximately 62% of their total ODA for education to basic education. In the same year, multilateral donors, such as the World Bank-IDA, EU institutions, UN organisations, the IMF, and the regional development banks, disbursed approximately 33% of their total aid for education to basic education. For non-DAC countries the figure was 5%. These percentages have remained broadly consistent over the last 10 years or so.

In 2016 aid to basic education ranged from 82% (the United States) to 8% (France). As a share of gross national income the percentage varied from 7.5% (Norway) to 0.2% (Italy). Changes over time indicate that, for example, Norway and the United States have increased the share of their aid for education going to basic education. In contrast, the EU has reduced its share for basic education in favour of post-secondary education, while France and Germany maintain their traditionally low allocations to basic education in favour of post-secondary education.
**Figure 5:** Top bilateral and multilateral aid and basic education, 2016.

**Figure 6:** Share of Total Aid to basic education disbursement by selected regions, 2002-2016

Sources: Policy paper 36, Aid to education, a return to growth? P.5.
In order to enable low and lower middle income countries to achieve SDG4 by 2030, European and North American countries need to address three factors:

- **Ensure adequate overall ODA - The commitment to provide 0.7% GNI for ODA**, originally based on the UN resolution of 24 October 1970, **should be honoured**. In 2015, DAC countries collectively provided 0.3% of their national income for ODA, with only six countries meeting the 0.7% commitment. Most DAC countries invest less than 10% of ODA in education. In humanitarian situations, donors need to increase support from the 2017 average of 2.1% of GNI for education. The EU (DG ECHO) has allocated 8% of humanitarian funding for education in 2018 (amounting to over EUR 89 million), with the intention of reaching 10% in 2019.

- **Target aid for education where it is most needed.** As the graph above indicates, ODA for basic education has declined quite dramatically in Sub-Saharan Africa with a drop from 50% to 26%. This is the area with the highest numbers of out-of-school children and the highest population growth. The overall decline in the share of ODA for basic education to low income countries was 14 percentage points between 2002 and 2016.

- **Ensure ODA for education is provided in the most effective manner** – that is in line with the five principles of aid effectiveness\(^1\), ensuring reduced fragmentation and transaction costs, transparent reporting, and reversal of recent declines in aid predictability. Budget support, the EU’s preferred modality, is an important vehicle to promote these principles. Furthermore, given the increasing funding by humanitarian aid to address critical gaps in crises-affected contexts, effective aid delivery also needs to entail closer cooperation, including needs assessments, analysis and planning between humanitarian and development actors.

There are no indications of an international financing increase in the short to medium term. Recent efforts to leverage private sector resources for education need to ensure that any forthcoming are truly additional and are focused on contributing to SDG4 by addressing the needs of the poorest countries and their most disadvantaged citizens. Future discussions need to focus on how to improve the efficiency and quality of use of available international resources, including those via global education initiatives such as the Global Partnership for Education, Education Cannot Wait and the International Financing Facility for Education. At the same time, European and North American countries need to strengthen their efforts in helping low and lower middle countries to increase their domestic resources, and the amounts devoted to education.

**Higher Education Mobility**

Between 2014 and 2020, the Erasmus+ programme will have supported the mobility of 4 million people (students and staff). With a more important enrollment in post-secondary education, the number of students studying abroad has more than doubled from 2.1 million to 4.7 million in the last 15 years. International student’s mobility benefits host and home countries alike through collaboration on global issues. It facilitates a ‘brain gain’ by creating a global pool of highly-skilled human capital. The EU encourages the harmonization of education systems and the recognition of qualifications to facilitate access to education for international students and promotes inclusive policies to ensure that all groups have access to quality education and lifelong learning.

---

\(^1\) As agreed at the 2005 High-Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Paris ie national ownership of education policies, donor alignment with government policies and operational procedures, harmonisation of donor support, managing for results and sustained impact, and mutual accountability.
Recommendations

1. Support low and lower middle income countries to:
   - Achieve at least 4%-6% of GDP and 15%-20% of total government expenditure for education.
   - Strengthen domestic resource mobilisation - through tax reforms, anti-corruption actions and other measures.
   - Strengthen capacities to monitor and communicate key information about education, including progress towards SDG4.
   - Ensure public spending is efficient and equitable - by better aligning plans and budgets with key priorities, strengthening financial management capacities, investing resources in line with needs, monitoring spending, and improving openness and accountability.

2. Improve ODA to education by:
   - Increasing the share of ODA to education to 10% as in 2009.
   - Better targeting education aid to countries and populations with the greatest needs, especially children and youth out of school and children and youth in school but not learning.
   - Increasing humanitarian aid to education.
   - Track and appraise progress of all SDG4 targets systematically.
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Panel 4: Monitoring equity and quality in education

Abstract

SDG 4 is a collective commitment to ensure equitable and inclusive quality education and to promote lifelong learning opportunities for all. Monitoring progress towards this collective commitment is key for effective policy implementation, as well as for public accountability at national, regional, and global levels. Monitoring the equity and quality dimensions of the right to education and lifelong learning provides data on patterns of exclusion from quality education and training, which, in turn, is critical to informing more effective equitable policies and strategies. Strengthening monitoring at country, regional and global levels is therefore critical to meet our collective commitments. In doing so, it is important to ensure greater coherence between monitoring frameworks at these three levels. One opportunity to seize for greater synergy between regional and global monitoring frameworks is the current formulation, by the European Union, of a new set of educational development targets, benchmarks and indicators for the period post-2020. The development of a coherent set of regional and global indicators will only facilitate and help strengthen national monitoring and reporting efforts, in particular on the two key dimension of equity and quality of education.

Section 1 provides a brief overview of some patterns of equity, and of gender equality in education in particular, and of quality of education in Europe and North America. Section 2 summarizes current monitoring efforts in Europe and North America, with an emphasis on the Education and Training 2020 (ET 2020) framework used in the European Union. This framework is then compared to the monitoring framework for Sustainable Development Goal 4 - Education 2030. Section 3 concludes the paper with recommendations for monitoring of equity and quality in education for the period from 2020 to 2030.

Guiding questions

1. Taking into account recent demographic, social and technological changes, what are some of the national measures to strengthen the monitoring of both equity and quality in education in line with both global SDG4 and regional commitments?

2. How do countries collect, analyse and report data against multiple monitoring frameworks?

3. How can regional and international organizations take advantage of the reformulation of EU targets and benchmarks for the period post 2020, as well as the upcoming review of the SDGs at the High Level Political Forum and UN General Assembly in 2019, to strengthen coherence between global and regional frameworks?

Patterns of equity and quality in education in Europe and North America

According to the 2017 Education and Training Monitor (European Commission 2017), disparities in education and training remain a challenge in many countries in the European Union. This is also

---

12 The state of equity can be examined through the ET 2020 benchmarks, especially in relation to underachievement in basic skills and early leavers from education and training (ELET). In addition, the ET 2020 benchmarks allow for analysis of equity in education through available breakdown (by sex, migrant status, and socioeconomic background where applicable. Common equity dimensions such as gender, wealth, and migration status can be monitored using parity indices, i.e. indicator 4.5.1 of the SDG 4 monitoring framework (UIS 2017a). Parity indices measure the level of disparity between two subpopulations with regard to a given indicator. For example, the gender parity index is calculated by dividing the female value of an indicator by the male value. More information on parity indices is available in the UIS online glossary at [http://uis.unesco.org/en/glossary](http://uis.unesco.org/en/glossary).
true for other European countries as well for North America where disparities are observed within countries related to residence, wealth, disability, migration status and other personal and household characteristics. Effective monitoring through regional and global initiatives provides data that helps identify these patterns in terms of attendance, out-of-school, and completion rates, as well as in results of learning assessments.

**Educational disparities based on gender**

Gender is an essential dimension of equity. Since 2000, there is virtually no gender disparity observed in participation in early childhood education in the European Union.\(^{13}\) This is also true more broadly for the entire Europe and North America region where, according to 2017 UIS data, there is no gender disparity in participation rates in organized learning one year before the official primary entry age. Similarly, according to the latest UIS estimates, there is gender parity in adult literacy rates in Europe and North America. When it comes to higher education, we observe higher female enrolment in the Europe and North America region. The 2017 Education and Training Monitoring by the European Commission, for instance, reveals gender disparities in favour of women in the European Union Member States. In Europe and North America, gross enrolment ratios for tertiary education and educational attainment levels in tertiary education (UIS 2016; ET 2017) are higher for women. It should nevertheless be recalled that these regional averages mask differences across individual countries.

Despite higher levels of female enrolment in higher education, men continue to have an advantage in terms of the employment rate of recent graduates, at least in Europe. A report by the European Commission, EACEA, and Eurydice (2018), provides further insight on participation in tertiary education in Europe. More men than women are enrolled in doctoral programmes, while more women are enrolled in bachelor’s and especially master’s programmes. This illustrates that, in spite of their higher enrolment rates in tertiary education as a whole, women face hurdles in pursuing academic and research-oriented careers. Another important aspect of gender disparity is enrolment by field of study. While female participation tends to be higher in fields of study such as “education”, and “health and welfare”, men are predominant in fields such as “engineering, manufacturing and construction” and “information and communication technologies”.

**Disparities on the basis of ethnic and migration status**

Ethnic and migration status are also important dimensions of equity in education. The European Commission provides useful data on levels of educational attainment linked to migration status. The Early Leavers from Education and Training parity index\(^ {14}\) linked to migration status was 1.51 in the European Union in 2017, indicating acute disparity to the disadvantage of immigrants. Similarly, the tertiary educational attainment parity index was 0.89 in 2017, indicating that migrants are less likely to have attained tertiary education than the native-born population.\(^ {15}\)

In the United States, recent studies by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) based on an analysis of data from 2005 to 2015 show persistent disparities in upper secondary education enrolment rates across different racial and ethnic groups of the population of the United States. Disparity across these groups can also be observed in completion rates and in rates of early leavers from upper secondary education. It is nevertheless interesting to note that, in the United States,

---


\(^{14}\) Early leavers among the foreign-born population divided by early leavers among the native-born population.

\(^{15}\) Educational attainment of the foreign-born population divided by educational attainment of the native-born population.
female upper secondary completion rates were greater than male completion rates across all racial and ethnic groups in 2014 (Musu-Gillette et al. 2017; McFarland et al. 2018). Canada’s most recent review of implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (Government of Canada 2018) highlights inequality – in particular that related to gender and indigenous status, but also to age (youth vs. elderly population), migration status, sexual identity, and disability – as a persistent challenge despite progress over the past decades. Educational attainment and learning outcomes are also lower among certain groups of the population, including those from low-income households, the indigenous population, and refugees (Statistics Canada 2017).

**Rising average levels of learning achievement**

Learning assessment data are key sources to monitor quality of education. The results of decades of studies from a range of assessments (TIMSS, PIRLS, PISA and regional assessments) reveal important findings in the Europe and North America region. The majority of countries have registered increases in average levels of student achievement, with gains in 4th grade reading and mathematics, as well as in 8th grade mathematics and science. Gender gaps in student achievement are decreasing while additional gains, such as improved school environments (e.g. safer schools), better educated teachers, more support for teachers’ professional development and better curriculum coverage accompany the process (Mullis, Martin and Loveless 2016).

**Educational achievement at lower secondary level**

The results of learning assessments show that the proportion of children and adolescents not achieving minimum proficiency levels in reading and mathematics in Europe and North America is well below global proportions (UIS 2017b). For primary education, 8% of males and 6% of females in Europe and North America are not achieving minimum proficiency levels, compared to global values of 57% and 55%, respectively. At the lower secondary level, however, Europe and North America performs less well, with 29% of males and 21% of females not achieving minimum proficiency levels. To better understand whether the problem lies inside or outside of school, an analysis of out-of-school children and adolescents as a proportion of those not achieving minimum proficiency levels is useful. Of the 7% of primary-age children not learning in Europe and North America, 59% are out-of-school. This is a clear indication that in this region the problem at primary level is more a result of non-enrolment than of the low quality of education. At the lower secondary level, however, the majority (61%) of the 25% of adolescents not learning are in school, raising serious concerns about the quality of education being offered.

**Secondary completion**

Data from the World Inequality Database on Education (WIDE) show high average completion rates for lower secondary education of 97% in Europe and North America. Upper secondary completion rates are 85% for Europe and North America and 63% for the Caucasus and Central Asia. In all cases, youth from rural areas and from the poorest households are less likely to complete a given level of education than their peers from urban areas and wealthier households.

**Disparities in teacher qualification**

Differences in teacher qualifications across the Europe and North America region are common. For example, while all teachers in Poland hold a master’s degree, only 60% of teachers do so in the US, and only 25% of teachers in Spain, Ireland and Slovenia. Poor learning among most children results

---

16 See the work on Teacher Education by the International Task Force on Teachers for Education 2030, [http://www.teachersforefa.unesco.org](http://www.teachersforefa.unesco.org).
from a set of circumstances; children from disadvantaged backgrounds often attend lower-quality schools and perform less well within a school than their more advantaged peers.

**Review of current monitoring frameworks for Europe and North America**

Strengthening monitoring at country, regional and global levels is critical to meet our collective commitments. In doing so, it is important to ensure greater coherence between monitoring frameworks at regional and global levels.

The indicators in the global SDG 4 monitoring framework and those in the ET 2020 framework and other monitoring frameworks in Europe and North America aim at similar goals but are constructed differently. Regional and global aggregates for early leavers from education and training (ELET), educational attainment, adult participation in learning, and the employment rate of recent graduates, for example, the currently valid EU indicators on education and training, are not available in the UIS database of globally comparable data on SDG 4. For many SDG 4 indicators with data, only disaggregation by sex is available in the UIS database.

What are the commonalities and differences in the monitoring frameworks for ET 2020 and SDG 4?

**The Education and Training (ET) 2020 monitoring framework**

The Education and Training (ET) 2020 Framework for the European Union covers all 28 EU Member States. A comparison of ET 2020 with the global framework for SDG 4 - Education 2030 can yield important insights in view of greater complementarity between both monitoring frameworks.

In 2009, ET 2020 specified four objectives for EU countries for the period until 2020 to foster economic growth and decent employment:

1. Make lifelong learning and mobility a reality.
2. Improve the quality and efficiency of education and training.
3. Promote equity, social cohesion, and active citizenship.
4. Enhance creativity and innovation, including entrepreneurship, at all levels of education and training.

As part of this initiative, the following seven benchmarks were set and are monitored on an annual basis:

1. The rate of early leavers from education and training aged 18-24 should be below 10%.
2. At least 40% of people aged 30-34 should have completed tertiary education at the level of at least ISCED-5 level.
3. At least 95% of children (from 4 to compulsory school age) should participate in early childhood education.
4. Fewer than 15% of 15-year-olds should be under-skilled in reading, mathematics and science.
5. The share of employed graduates (aged 20-34 with at least upper secondary education attainment and having left education 1-3 years ago) should be at least 82%.
6. At least 15% of adults should participate in formal or non-formal learning.
7. At least 20% of higher education graduates and 6% of 18- to 34-year-olds with an initial vocational qualification should have spent some time studying or training abroad.

The global SDG 4 monitoring framework

By comparison, SDG 4 calls for “inclusive and equitable quality education and lifelong learning opportunities for all” by 2030. SDG 4 has 10 targets, monitored with a set of 43 indicators (see Annex 1). Because it is a global framework, SDG 4 targets and indicators were defined to be relevant for countries at all levels of development, while monitoring mechanisms in Europe and North America focus on priority issues considered of high policy relevance for the regions.

Mapping ET 2020 benchmarks to SDG 4 targets

Not all SDG 4 targets have a corresponding benchmark in the ET 2020 strategic framework (see Annex 1).

Only four SDG targets: 4.1 (primary and secondary education), 4.2 (early childhood), 4.3 (technical, vocational and tertiary education) and 4.4 (skills for employment) – can be mapped to the seven quantitative ET 2020 benchmarks. Equity (target 4.5) is covered in the ET 2020 framework through proxy indicators (underachievement in basic skills) and available breakdowns (LFS data by sex and migrant status). SDG 4 targets missing from the ET 2020 framework are 4.6 (literacy and numeracy), 4.7 (global citizenship), 4.a (school environment), 4.b (scholarships), and 4.c (teachers).

Monitoring education in Europe and North America beyond ET 2020 benchmarks in EU Member States include a range of other quantitative and qualitative sources, including Eurostat data, OECD studies and surveys, analyses of education systems undertaken by the Eurydice network, and other studies of national education statistics. For SDG 4 monitoring with Europe and North America, additional data sources may be required.

The current preparations by the European Union of a new set of benchmarks and indicators beyond 2020 might offer an opportunity to aim for a certain alignment between regional and global monitoring frameworks. It has to be taken into account, though, that the process of establishing new indicators and benchmarks follows the so-called Open Method of Coordination, which gives EU Member States strong influence and a final say over the process. The potential development of a coherent set of regional and global indicators could also facilitate and help strengthen national monitoring and reporting efforts, in particular on the two key dimensions of equity and quality of education.

To increase the policy impact of monitoring in Europe and North America with SDG 4, selected SDG 4 indicators may be adopted, specifically indicators related to equity, resource allocation to disadvantaged populations, and mainstreaming of global citizenship education and sustainable development. Efforts by European and North American countries in these areas would also support the continued development of the global indicator framework for SDG 4.

Measures of equity in national education planning

National education plans are the main tool for governments to implement their policy priorities in the education sector. As such, they should always include monitoring of subgroups of the population and their relative performance over time with regard to access, completion, learning outcomes and other indicators. Moreover, monitoring of equity and quality in education should go beyond

17 This is only partially true as literacy and numeracy skills are part of the low achievers benchmark.
disaggregation by sex and consider dimensions such as location, wealth, disability, migration status and other personal and household characteristics, to ensure that no one is left behind.

A key indicator in the global SDG monitoring framework is indicator 4.5.1, “parity indices (female/male, rural/urban, bottom/top wealth quintiles and others such as disability status, indigenous peoples and conflict-affected, as data become available) for all education indicators on this list that can be disaggregated”.

Other measures of equity can also be considered, for example the Gini coefficient, which can be used to measure the distribution of years of schooling in a population (UIS 2018). Parity indices and similar measures can be integrated in national education plans and could be applied to all levels of education, from pre-primary to tertiary education and adult learning. The use of appropriate indicators to track equity and quality in education is a prerequisite for identification of gaps and enables effective planning of interventions to reduce those gaps.

**Recommendations**

**Recommendation 1: Using more disaggregated data to monitor educational participation and outcomes for newly excluded groups**

Although education systems in Europe and North America are overall more equitable than those in other regions, certain groups of the population are disadvantaged. The recent influx of migrants and refugees to Europe and North America is likely to increase the extent of disparities. Accordingly, we call on Member States to address changing demands on the collection, analysis and use of relevant disaggregated data on newly excluded groups.

**Recommendation 2: Strengthen coherence between global SDG4 and regional monitoring frameworks**

Taking full advantage of the upcoming 2019 of review of SDG4 at HLPF and of the SDGs more generally, as well as the current formulation of a new generation of EU targets and benchmarks for 2030, UNESCO and regional partners are called on to ensure greater coherence between the different monitoring frameworks and reporting processes.
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Annex 1: Mapping of ET 2020 benchmarks to SDG 4 targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SDG 4 targets</th>
<th>SDG 4 indicators</th>
<th>ET 2020 benchmarks</th>
<th>ET 2020 benchmarks: monitoring indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1. Primary and secondary education: By 2030, ensure that all girls and boys complete free, equitable and quality primary and secondary education leading to relevant and effective learning outcomes</td>
<td>Learning 4.1.1 Proportion of children and young people (a) in Grade 2 or 3; (b) at the end of primary education; and (c) at the end of lower secondary education achieving at least a minimum proficiency level in (i) reading and (ii) mathematics, by sex</td>
<td>Underachievement in reading, math and science</td>
<td>Low achievers in reading, maths and science: Share of 15-year-old pupils who are below proficiency level 2 on the PISA scales for reading, maths and science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1.2 Administration of a nationally-representative learning assessment (a) in Grade 2 or 3; (b) at the end of primary education; and (c) at the end of lower secondary education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completion 4.1.3 Gross intake ratio to the last grade (primary education, lower secondary education)</td>
<td>Early leavers from education and training</td>
<td>% of the population aged 18-24 with at most lower secondary education and not in further education or training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1.4 Completion rate (primary education, lower secondary education, upper secondary education)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participation 4.1.5 Out-of-school rate (primary education, lower secondary education, upper secondary education)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1.6 Percentage of children over-age for grade (primary education, lower secondary education)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provision 4.1.7 Number of years of (a) free and (b) compulsory primary and secondary education guaranteed in legal frameworks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG 4 targets</td>
<td>SDG 4 indicators</td>
<td>ET 2020 benchmarks</td>
<td>ET 2020 benchmarks: monitoring indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.2 Early Childhood:</strong> By 2030, ensure that all girls and boys have access to quality early childhood development, care and pre-primary education so that they are ready for primary education</td>
<td>Readiness for primary school</td>
<td>4.2.1 Proportion of children under 5 years of age who are developmentally on track in health, learning and psychosocial well-being, by sex</td>
<td>Early childhood education and care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>4.2.2 Participation rate in organized learning (one year before the official primary entry age), by sex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Readiness for primary school</td>
<td>4.2.3 Percentage of children under 5 years experiencing positive and stimulating home learning environments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>4.2.4 Gross early childhood education enrolment ratio in (a) pre-primary education and (b) early childhood educational development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provision</td>
<td>4.2.5 Number of years of (a) free and (b) compulsory pre-primary education guaranteed in legal frameworks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.3 TVET and Higher Education:</strong> By 2030, ensure equal access for all women and men to affordable quality technical, vocational and tertiary education, including university</td>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>4.3.1 Participation rate of youth and adults in formal and non-formal education and training in the previous 12 months, by sex</td>
<td>Adult participation in learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3.2 Gross enrolment ratio for tertiary education, by sex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3.3 Participation rate in technical-vocational programmes (15- to 24-year-olds), by sex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.4 Skills for work:</strong> By 2030, substantially increase the number of youth and adults who have relevant skills, including technical and vocational skills, for employment, decent jobs and entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>4.4.1 Proportion of youth and adults with information and communications technology (ICT) skills, by type of skill</td>
<td>SDG 4 indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.4.2 Percentage of youth/adults who have achieved at least a minimum level of proficiency in digital literacy skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.4.2 Percentage of youth/adults who have achieved at least a minimum level of proficiency in digital literacy skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG 4 targets</td>
<td>SDG 4 indicators</td>
<td>ET 2020 benchmarks</td>
<td>ET 2020 benchmarks: monitoring indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4.3 Youth/adult educational attainment rates by age group, economic activity status, levels of education and programme orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tertiary educational attainment</td>
<td>% of the population aged 30-34 with completed tertiary education (by sex) % of the population aged 25-34 with completed tertiary education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Equity: By 2030, eliminate gender disparities in education and ensure equal access to all levels of education and vocational training for the vulnerable, including persons with disabilities, indigenous peoples and children in vulnerable situations.</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>4.5.1 Parity indices (female/male, rural/urban, bottom/top wealth quintile and others such as disability status, indigenous peoples and conflict-affected, as data become available) for all education indicators on this list that can be disaggregated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.5.2 Percentage of students in primary education whose first or home language is the language of instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.5.3 Extent to which explicit formula-based policies reallocate education resources to disadvantaged populations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.5.4 Education expenditure per student by level of education and source of funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.5.5 Percentage of total aid to education allocated to least developed countries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Literacy and numeracy: By 2030, ensure that all youth and a substantial proportion of adults, both men and women, achieve literacy and numeracy.</td>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>4.6.1 Proportion of population in a given age group achieving at least a fixed level of proficiency in functional (a) literacy and (b) numeracy skills, by sex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.6.2 Youth/adult literacy rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>4.6.3 Participation rate of illiterate youth/adults in literacy programmes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG 4 targets</td>
<td>SDG 4 indicators</td>
<td>ET 2020 benchmarks</td>
<td>ET 2020 benchmarks: monitoring indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.7 Global citizenship:</strong> By 2030, ensure that all learners acquire the knowledge and skills needed to promote sustainable development, including, among others, through education for sustainable development and sustainable lifestyles, human rights, gender equality, promotion of a culture of peace and non-violence, global citizenship and appreciation of cultural diversity and of culture’s contribution to sustainable development.</td>
<td>Provision</td>
<td>4.7.1 Extent to which (i) global citizenship education and (ii) education for sustainable development, including gender equality and human rights, are mainstreamed at all levels in: (a) national education policies, (b) curricula, (c) teacher education and (d) student assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.7.2 Percentage of schools that provide life skills-based HIV and sexuality education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.7.3 Extent to which the framework on the World Programme on Human Rights Education is implemented nationally (as per the UNGA Resolution 59/113)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>4.7.4 Percentage of students by age group (or education level) showing adequate understanding of issues relating to global citizenship and sustainability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.7.5 Percentage of 15-year-old students showing proficiency in knowledge of environmental science and geoscience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.a School environment:</strong> Build and upgrade education facilities that are child, disability and gender sensitive and provide safe, non-violent, inclusive and effective learning environments for all.</td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>4.a.1 - Proportion of schools with access to: (a) electricity; (b) Internet for pedagogical purposes; and (c) computers for pedagogical purposes - Proportion of schools with access to: (d) adapted infrastructure and materials for students with disabilities - Proportion of schools with access to: (e) basic drinking water; (f) single-sex basic sanitation facilities; and (g) basic handwashing facilities (as per the WASH indicator definitions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>4.a.2 Percentage of students experiencing bullying, corporal punishment, harassment, violence, sexual discrimination and abuse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.a.3 Number of attacks on students, personnel and institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG 4 targets</td>
<td>SDG 4 indicators</td>
<td>ET 2020 benchmarks</td>
<td>ET 2020 benchmarks: monitoring indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.b Scholarships:</strong> By 2020, substantially expand globally the number of scholarships available to developing countries, in particular least developed countries, small island developing States and African countries, for enrolment in higher education, including vocational</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>4.b.1 Volume of official development assistance flows for scholarships by sector and type of study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.b.2 Number of higher education scholarships awarded by beneficiary country</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.c Teachers:</strong> By 2030, substantially increase the supply of qualified teachers, including through international cooperation for teacher training in developing countries, especially least developed countries and small island developing States.</td>
<td>Trained</td>
<td>4.c.1 Proportion of teachers in: (a) pre-primary education; (b) primary education; (c) lower secondary education; and (d) upper secondary education who have received at least the minimum organized teacher training (e.g., pedagogical training) pre-service or in-service required for teaching at the relevant level in a given country, by sex</td>
<td>4.c.2 Pupil-trained teacher ratio by education level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.c.3 Percentage of teachers qualified according to national standards by education level and type of institution</td>
<td>4.c.4 Pupil-qualified teacher ratio by education level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.c.5 Average teacher salary relative to other professions requiring a comparable level of qualification</td>
<td>4.c.6 Teacher attrition rate by education level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.c.7 Percentage of teachers who received in-service training in the last 12 months by type of training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** Grey shading: global indicator. **Red font:** no equivalent