



THE ROLE OF HUMANITARIAN ACTORS IN SAFEGUARDING ACCESS TO EDUCATION

WORKSHOP REPORT
GENEVA, 19–20 JUNE 2019



PEIC

PROTECT EDUCATION IN INSECURITY AND CONFLICT
حماية التعليم في ظروف النزاع وانعدام الأمن

A programme of **education above all**[™]

التعليم
فوق
الجميع | education
above
all



ICRC

THE ROLE OF HUMANITARIAN ACTORS IN SAFEGUARDING ACCESS TO EDUCATION

**WORKSHOP REPORT
GENEVA, 19–20 JUNE 2019**

BACKGROUND

This report summarizes discussions at a workshop entitled “The role of humanitarian actors in safeguarding access to education”, jointly organized by the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and Education Above All Foundation (EAA), through its Protect Education in Insecurity and Conflict (PEIC) programme.

The workshop was held at the ICRC’s headquarters in Geneva from 19 to 20 June 2019. It brought together 21 participants from the ICRC and other components of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, and 24 education experts, including donors, with experience in both the humanitarian and development fields.

The objective was to improve humanitarian support for the continuity of education in areas affected by armed conflict and violence, in line with the principles of neutrality, impartiality and independence, and in both the short and long term.

For the ICRC, this workshop supported efforts to make a greater contribution to the resumption and continuity of education, two years on from the adoption of its first Framework on Access to Education.¹

For EAA / PEIC, the workshop was part of long-standing efforts to support peer exchanges on legal, protection and operational challenges relating to the continuity of education in humanitarian settings and across the humanitarian–development nexus.

This report was compiled by ICRC policy adviser Filipa Schmitz Guinote and ICRC associate Felicia Fehrentz, in cooperation with EAA / PEIC and with input from workshop participants. The workshop was held under the Chatham House Rule, whereby information disclosed may be reported but the source may not be identified, to encourage an open exchange on challenges and lessons learned. Accordingly, contributions summarized in this report are not attributed to particular people or organizations. The footnotes make reference to documents that are publicly available and were referred to during the discussions or in background papers prepared in advance of the workshop.

Disclaimer: This report outlines the salient points that emerged in the workshop discussions and does not necessarily reflect the views of all participants nor of the ICRC or EAA / PEIC.

¹ ICRC, Framework for Access to Education, ICRC, Geneva, 2017: <https://www.icrc.org/en/document/framework-access-education>, all web addresses accessed October 2019.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	4
Education, conflict and violence: An overview of challenges for humanitarian and development agencies	5
Five “framing scenarios”	5
The challenge of politics in fragmented territories	6
The challenge of data.....	7
The challenge of planning and financing.....	8
Promising approaches to promoting the continuity of education during conflict and violence	9
Efforts to bridge short- and longer-term education support.....	9
Efforts to systematize and scale up risk-management measures in schools.....	9
Crisis-sensitive education	10
Overcoming the politics surrounding education through planning processes.....	11
Strengthening the resilience of education services and systems in crisis zones.....	11
Key learning points	12
1. Humanitarian and development agencies both face three main challenges when supporting education in areas affected by conflict and violence: weaknesses in education systems, poor security conditions and sensitive political dynamics	12
2. Ensuring the continuity of education in areas affected by conflict and violence requires engagement with a range of experts.....	12
3. More research is needed to determine the challenges to supporting education in areas beyond government control in conflict-affected countries	12
4. In complex and volatile situations, local partners can make a valuable contribution to needs and risk assessments as well as the implementation of projects	13
5. Building the resilience of education services and systems requires adjustments to be made to both humanitarian and development approaches.....	13
6. Measuring the impact of education activities is crucial for improving humanitarian and development responses and securing stronger political backing for education in emergencies	13
Annex – Workshop programme	14

INTRODUCTION

Over the past 15 years, education has become an integral aspect of the humanitarian response to conflict and disaster, alongside food, water, shelter and health.² Several factors have contributed to this, including the value that affected communities themselves place on education, the protective benefits of education for children and youth, and a growing consensus among donors, authorities and education practitioners that investing in education cannot wait until a situation stabilizes or conflict ends.

Yet there is no denying that conflict and violence disrupts the continuity required for education: teachers and students are displaced, school infrastructure is destroyed or damaged, access to schools is hampered by poor security conditions and direct attacks, and education resources diminish. The combination of these disruptions and general weaknesses in the education system in many crisis-affected areas has tremendous consequences for children, teachers, parents, the wider community and the country as a whole. It also poses operational and financial challenges for both humanitarian and development agencies.

Education is also at the centre of broader political and military dynamics in many conflict-affected areas – accessible to some and not to others, contested by some and accepted by others – and therefore has the potential to exacerbate existing tensions between different groups. The challenge for humanitarian and development agencies working in divided societies such as these is to make sure education programmes are impartial and inclusive.

These are just some of the issues that were discussed by participants during the workshop, drawing on their respective experiences of navigating the operational, political, institutional and financial challenges of supporting the continuity of education in unstable environments.

NOTE ON TERMINOLOGY:

In this report, education activities described as “humanitarian” are those primarily geared towards communities affected by armed conflict, violence or disasters, and implemented at community level with a short- to medium-term focus. These activities broadly fall into the category of “education in emergencies” and include, for instance: temporary learning spaces, distribution of school materials, school feeding, provision of non-formal or alternative education, preparedness, safety and security measures in schools, and payment of incentives to teachers. Activities conducted under a humanitarian model are guided by the principles of neutrality, impartiality and independence.

Education activities conducted under a development model are primarily focused on strengthening systems and building the technical and financial capacities of education ministries to deliver, oversee and regulate education services across the country, in the medium to long term.

“[T]he very routine of schooling, however informal, can be a therapeutic source of continuity and stability for children facing traumatic situations. ... Education provides not just immediate relief but also long-term benefits for national economic and social development, perhaps representing a step towards preventing future conflicts.”

*United Nations Secretary-General
Report on Children and Armed Conflict,
A/55/163-S/2000/712, 2000, para. 44.*

² There have been three landmark decisions in this regard: the creation of an education cluster within the coordination structure of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee in 2007; the adoption of a resolution on the right to education in emergencies at the 2010 United Nations General Assembly, which gave political recognition to the issue (see A/RES/64/290); and the establishment of Education Cannot Wait, the first fund dedicated to education in emergencies, at the 2016 World Humanitarian Summit.

EDUCATION, CONFLICT AND VIOLENCE: AN OVERVIEW OF CHALLENGES FOR HUMANITARIAN AND DEVELOPMENT AGENCIES

FIVE “FRAMING SCENARIOS”

Five scenarios were used to frame a discussion about the main challenges that conflict and violence pose to education, from the perspective of humanitarian and development experts.

Scenario 1: Targeted attacks on – or security incidents affecting – education facilities, learners and education personnel

This scenario includes direct attacks and threats by armed groups towards students and teachers, and damage to or destruction of education facilities during the conduct of hostilities. These incidents may be attempts to contest the authority or vision for the country that the curriculum or school is perceived to represent. Alternatively, they may be part of efforts to forcibly recruit people or deny them access to services, or stem from a fighting strategy that prioritizes “soft targets”.

According to the Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack, between 2013 and 2017 there were more than 12,700 attacks on education in at least 70 countries. Reported attacks included the use of schools for military purposes (29 countries) and the targeting of schools as a result of their use as polling stations (10 countries).

Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack, *Education Under Attack 2018*, GCPEA, New York, 2018

Scenario 2: The use of education facilities by political or military entities

This scenario encompasses cases where school facilities are used by military or political entities, primarily out of convenience rather than with the intention of targeting the education authority or what it represents. These can include, for example, the use of schools as polling stations or for military purposes. While there may be no intention to put education at risk, the presence of military or political figures in schools located in conflict-affected areas can affect the way that these facilities are perceived by weapon bearers and therefore make them a target.³

Scenario 3: Unequal provision of education

This is a scenario where there is deliberate or unintentional discrimination in the provision of education. Deliberate discrimination can occur when access to education or the content and delivery of education is used to curry favour with or marginalize a particular community. Unintentional discrimination can happen when administrative, logistical or financial hurdles impede access to education for certain communities.

³ For an overview of the protection afforded to schools under international humanitarian law, see: ICRC, *International Humanitarian Law and the Challenges of Contemporary Armed Conflicts*, 31IC/11/5.1.2, ICRC, Geneva, 2019.

Scenario 4: Politicization of educational content

This is a scenario where educational content entrenches divisions within society. All education systems create or reinforce a certain vision for the country and society, but when conflict or violence shifts the dynamics between communities and authorities, this vision can start to polarize the nation.

Scenario 5: The degradation of education systems

In this scenario, conflict and violence – especially if protracted – put financial and material strain on education systems that may well already be under-resourced. The degradation of education systems may limit the impact of humanitarian support for education services, unless this is accompanied by substantial development-focused efforts to strengthen the State's capacity to deliver, oversee and regulate education services. This scenario is about the challenges of cooperation and coordination across the humanitarian-development nexus.

TEXT BOX 1: EDUCATION AND HUMANITARIAN PRINCIPLES

When education becomes caught up in the dynamics of conflict, not only are children less able to learn and stay safe, but humanitarian efforts to help become more complex, guided as they are by the principles of neutrality, impartiality and independence.

A lack of robustness or resources in education systems adds another layer of complexity to the humanitarian response: humanitarian agencies must find a way to strengthen the capacity of education authorities in conflict-affected areas without seeming to favour or side with one party to the conflict. The involvement of education authorities in assessment, planning and coordination processes is of paramount importance, but in polarized or divided societies it is important to ensure that this approach does not create a State-bias in the education response. In these situations, support for education must be granted according to need rather than any particular characteristic or affiliation of the individuals or groups in question.

THE CHALLENGE OF POLITICS IN FRAGMENTED TERRITORIES

Many conflict-affected countries are fragmented, with some parts under the control of an internationally recognized government and others under the control of one or several non-State armed groups or de facto authorities, sometimes with parallel governance and administration systems.

Non-State armed groups commonly provide, regulate or facilitate the provision of education in the geographical areas that they control.⁴ This situation can create a number of challenges for the continuity of education:

- The group may only provide education to a certain level.
- Education received under the control of an armed group may not be recognized by or transferrable to the national education system (e.g. owing to differences in curriculum or the language of instruction).
- Communities who used to – but no longer – live under the control of an armed group may struggle to access education (and other public services) owing to stigma and discrimination. For example, they may face administrative barriers such as the non-recognition of personal documentation issued by the armed group.

4 For a range of examples of education activities carried out by non-State armed groups, see:
 - Geneva Call, In their Words: Armed Non-State Actors Share their Policies and Practice with regards to Education in Armed Conflict, Geneva Call, Geneva, 2017:
<https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/GC-research-on-education.pdf>
 - PEIC/Geneva Call, Report on the Workshop "Education and Armed Non-State Actors: Towards a Comprehensive Agenda", PEIC/Geneva Call, Geneva, 2015:
https://www.genevacall.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Geneva_Call_Paper1.pdf

Supporting the resumption or continuity of education in areas beyond government control is crucial for ensuring an impartial and inclusive education response. However, humanitarian and development agencies face a number of challenges in this endeavour: not only is access restricted by poor security conditions, but issues such as the payment of teachers and curriculum content can become particularly sensitive. The question of who holds responsibility for education services is also delicate and can affect the relationship between humanitarian / development agencies and the government.

Participants discussed a wide range of experiences of, and approaches to dealing with, political dynamics in fragmented territories:

- choosing not to engage with issues that are too politically sensitive (e.g. the curriculum)
- reverting to informal community-based education in areas that are beyond government control but are accessible
- using mediation to facilitate an agreement between parties to the conflict regarding the continuity of education services.

These experiences varied from context to context, agency to agency and even period to period, but participants stressed the comparative advantage of neutral, impartial and independent actors (such as the ICRC) in addressing education challenges in such fragmented territories. Some participants pointed out that the scope for supporting education in areas beyond government control often depended on the type of armed group controlling the area. Some noted a de facto differentiation between various non-State armed groups, in the eyes of international agencies and donors, with some groups being perceived as more “acceptable” than others.

THE CHALLENGE OF DATA

Participants discussed the many challenges of gathering and collating data on education needs and responses in crisis settings, and of measuring the impact of education initiatives on the resilience, protection and well-being of communities.

A substantial amount of data is collected on attacks and threats against educational facilities, staff and students in areas affected by conflict and violence. While this type of data is valuable for protection-related advocacy and accountability, it is less so for programming, as it only offers a partial view of educational needs and the issues undermining access to and quality of education. For instance, an isolated attack on a school may lead to school closures across an entire region; the intensity of violence is therefore not necessarily a good measure of its impact on education. Likewise, focusing on attacks or threats towards schools may obscure the more complex reasons for issues such as poor attendance (e.g. economic pressures on families or the prevalence of peer violence and corporal punishment within the schools themselves).

Agencies involved in raising awareness of and addressing attacks on education acknowledge these shortcomings and are moving towards an “all-hazards approach”. This entails taking into account all external, internal and environmental risks affecting the educational setting. Efforts are also being made to document the impact that actual and threatened attacks on education have on affected communities, and not only their incidence, prevalence and scale.

On the programming side, recent research conducted by FHI 360 and Social Impact in Iraq, Syria and Yemen highlighted: the differences between education data collected by humanitarian responders and by development workers; the need to make education data more accessible and usable; and the need to build the capacity of humanitarian and development agencies to use this data (see Text Box 2 on page 8).

TEXT BOX 2: MAPPING EDUCATION DATA IN CRISIS SITUATIONS

As part of a four-year project funded by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID)⁵ and implemented in partnership with Social Impact, FHI 360 recently mapped out education data gathered in Iraq, Syria and Yemen. They found that the collection of system-wide development data tends to break down in a crisis, as it relies on government sources. Development data is also collected less regularly in a crisis, so can fail to capture changing needs and population movements. Though collected with greater frequency, humanitarian data is difficult to navigate as it is gathered by different agencies, from various sources and using a range of tools and formats. It is also more focused on supply (response) than demand (needs) and lacks consistent indicators and quality control. Overall, this mapping exercise highlighted the need to improve the quality, accessibility and interoperability of data collected by humanitarian and development agencies, and to build a community of practice across the two sectors.⁶

THE CHALLENGE OF PLANNING AND FINANCING

Systemic weaknesses in the education sector (Scenario 5) have significant financial and programming implications for both the humanitarian and development sectors. Practitioners highlighted that even short-term measures to address education needs take time to implement. “Education emergencies” cannot be remedied by a quick fix or injection of funds, but rather call for a sustained investment of time and resources. This is not only for logistical reasons but also because basic quality-assurance measures (e.g. classroom observation) take time.

The need to support education over a longer timeframe than other aspects of the humanitarian response goes some way in explaining the persistent under-funding of education. Participants agreed that, in fundraising appeals, education still struggles to compete with activities that generate quicker “wins”, despite the increased attention given to education in the humanitarian sector in recent years. One participant stressed that education is even more severely under-funded than it appears, as fundraising appeals only feature a portion of the education needs that agencies believe they can realistically meet. In short, there is not only a gap between funding and needs, but also between planning and needs.

Participants noted that efforts to synchronize the assessment and planning processes of humanitarian and development agencies would help to bridge the gap between planning and needs. Agencies would gain a more comprehensive overview of the support needed at the community and systemic levels and therefore be able to make more informed decisions about the sequencing and / or simultaneous implementation of education programmes under humanitarian and development models. Participants stressed that the synchronization of humanitarian and development processes was to be understood as an effort to build coherence, rather than to merge processes that may have distinct features for legitimate operational reasons (e.g. to ensure the independence of education in emergencies).

⁵ Under its programme for Middle East Education Research, Training and Support (MEERS).

⁶ The challenges and opportunities for humanitarian and development agencies regarding data on education in emergencies were further explored at the Education in Emergencies Data Summit in Geneva, 20–21 June 2019. The summit was co-hosted by NORRAG (a network for international policies and cooperation in education and training), the USAID MEERS programme and the Inter-agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE). For more information, visit: <https://www.norrags.org/20-21-june-2019-geneva-switzerland-education-in-emergencies-data-summit/>

PROMISING APPROACHES TO PROMOTING THE CONTINUITY OF EDUCATION DURING CONFLICT AND VIOLENCE

EFFORTS TO BRIDGE SHORT- AND LONGER-TERM EDUCATION SUPPORT

Participants discussed how humanitarian and development structures for funding and programmes could sometimes limit flexibility and reduce the quality, effectiveness and impact of responses to education needs among conflict-affected populations. While participants acknowledged the rationale for maintaining certain structures in situations where political power is fragmented and societies are polarized, they also welcomed progress made in recent years in making funding for education more predictable and flexible within the humanitarian and development sectors.

Several donors had developed funding policies aiming to address both urgent and systemic needs in education and to build better synergies between humanitarian and development expertise and planning tools. The creation of Education Cannot Wait in 2016 – the first dedicated multi-donor trust fund for education in emergencies – was another step in the right direction. This had an “emergency window” fund for quick action in sudden-onset emergencies and escalations of violence, as well as a multi-year funding mechanism for countries facing protracted crises and deeper systemic needs in education.

Besides funding, there had also been efforts to identify differences and possible synergies in data collection, planning tools and ways of working across the humanitarian and development sectors (e.g. see Text Box 2). Analyses such as these create an important evidence base for enhancing coherence between humanitarian and development approaches to education in fragile settings.

Participants heard about research commissioned by USAID on education and humanitarian-development coherence.⁷ The research outlined several ways in which coherence could be enhanced, specifically with regard to norms, capacities and operations. This includes, for instance, encouraging closer cooperation between humanitarian and development coordination structures (e.g. through education clusters and local education groups) and establishing multi-year planning and crisis-sensitive funding mechanisms (e.g. “crisis modifiers”). The research also pointed to the need for better evidence of the contribution that education makes to communities’ overall resilience. Several participants agreed that such evidence would prompt greater coherence between humanitarian and development approaches to education and thus improve the education response in crisis settings.

EFFORTS TO SYSTEMATIZE AND SCALE UP RISK-MANAGEMENT MEASURES IN SCHOOLS

Participants learned how security-related risks in schools could be managed to help minimize the disruption of education in areas affected by conflict and violence.⁸ Risk reduction often involves a combination of building infrastructure (e.g. protective walls and shelters), promoting safe behaviour (e.g. awareness of unexploded ordnance and evacuation protocols) and advocating for the protection of education among weapon bearers and authorities.

7 USAID, White Paper: Education and Humanitarian-Development Coherence, USAID, Washington, D.C., 2019: https://www.eccnetwork.net/sites/default/files/media/file/Education-and-Humanitarian-Development_April-2019-A.pdf

8 See, in particular:

- Save the Children, Project Guidance: Schools as Zones of Peace (Version 1), Save the Children Norway, 2017: https://resourcecentre.savethechildren.net/node/12201/pdf/szop_guidance_version_1.pdf (More resources available at: <https://resourcecentre.savethechildren.net/document-collections/safe-schools-common-approach>)
- ICRC, Safer Access to Essential Public Services, ICRC, Geneva, 2018: <https://www.icrc.org/en/publication/safer-access-public-essential-services-report>

Two factors were highlighted as keys to success in systematizing and scaling up risk-reduction measures in schools:

- The involvement of school communities (students, teachers, administrators and parents) in the design and implementation of activities and, in some cases, in advocacy efforts with the authorities. This is also important from a “do no harm” perspective, ensuring that risk-reduction measures do not create a false sense of security or prompt a premature re-opening of schools.
- The evidence that risk-reduction efforts can generate about how conflict and violence disrupts access to education and affects the learning environment and well-being of students and staff.

Participants also pointed to the crucial role that local initiatives can play in creating momentum and building a critical mass of experience and evidence, which can facilitate the scaling-up process.

CRISIS-SENSITIVE EDUCATION

Participants discussed approaches and tools used by education practitioners in the humanitarian and development sectors to ensure that planning and programming is “crisis-sensitive” (in other words, sensitive to the causes and triggers of conflict and the potential for natural hazards). These approaches ranged from engaging with education ministries and partners for centralized planning processes to liaising with local authorities and communities for programmes implemented at a more local level. Some focused on conflict-related risks only (see Text Box 3) while others addressed both conflict- and disaster-related risks.⁹ Experts highlighted that local people and organizations can make a crucial contribution to the analysis stage of crisis-sensitive programmes, informing both central planning processes and smaller-scale initiatives at the local level.

Questions raised during the discussion included when and how often crisis-sensitive assessments of education were carried out and the extent to which adjustments were made to multi-year plans and funding as the situation evolved. Participants pointed to crisis modifiers and emergency-window funds as useful financial mechanisms for ensuring sufficient flexibility in education plans and programmes to be able to respond to crises. While these mechanisms are already embedded in education funding structures, it is not easy to identify evidence-based triggers for activating them, as one donor participant noted.

⁹ See, for example:

- Education Above All, Conflict-Sensitive Education Policy – A Preliminary Review, EAA, Doha, 2012: http://protectingeducation.org/sites/default/files/documents/eea_conflict_sensitive_education_policy.pdf
- UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning, Integrating conflict and disaster risk reduction into education sector planning: Guidance notes for educational planners, UNESCO/IIEP, Paris, 2011: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/4,8223/pf0000228650>
- INEE, Guiding Principles on Integrating Conflict-Sensitivity in Education Policy and Programming in Conflict-Affected and Fragile Contexts, INEE, New York, 2013: https://www.humanitarianresponse.info/sites/www.humanitarianresponse.info/files/documents/files/inee_guiding_principles_a3_english.pdf
- INEE, Guidance Note on Conflict-Sensitive Education, INEE, New York, 2013: https://s3.amazonaws.com/inee-assets/resources/INEE_CSE_Guidance_Note_EN.pdf
- USAID Education in Crisis and Conflict Network, Safer Learning Environments (SLE) Assessment Toolkit, USAID / ECCN, Washington, D.C., 2018: https://www.edu-links.org/sites/default/files/media/file/SLE-toolkit_050119_mainV2-A.pdf

TEXT BOX 3: A THREE-STEP PROCESS TO DEVELOPING CONFLICT-SENSITIVE EDUCATION**Understand the context**

Collect and analyse information about the conflict – including the history, root causes and parties to the conflict – and the broader economic and political environment.

Analyse the two-way interaction between the context and education programmes and policies

Examine how each aspect of the education programme or policy may influence conflict dynamics and vice versa. Questions to ask in this step include: Who is benefiting from the programme? Are different groups benefiting equally or is one group privileged over another? What is covered by the curriculum? Does it address or ignore the conflict? Who was involved in developing the policy or programme?

Act to minimize negative impacts and maximize positive impacts of education policies and programming on conflict

Design, deliver, monitor and evaluate education programmes and policies in such a way to ensure that these do not contribute to or exacerbate existing conflict, in line with the principle of “do no harm”.¹⁰

INEE, *Guidance Note on Conflict-Sensitive Education*, 2013

OVERCOMING THE POLITICS SURROUNDING EDUCATION THROUGH PLANNING PROCESSES

Participants heard about instances where national education planning helped to ensure the resumption or continuity of education in the midst of conflict: with the support of a trusted and neutral intermediary, political divisions in the education sector had been addressed and the education services of different providers coordinated.

The discussion highlighted that education becomes especially politically sensitive when the government’s legitimacy is contested. In these situations, external agencies can sometimes have an advantage over local agencies when it comes to facilitating dialogue between different parties. However, participants noted that while mediation is a promising approach it could not necessarily be universally replicated. To be effective, it has to take place within a specific political timeframe and use an intermediary that is trusted – even liked – by both parties; this combination of factors is not always easy to secure.

STRENGTHENING THE RESILIENCE OF EDUCATION SERVICES AND SYSTEMS IN CRISIS ZONES

Participants discussed means of building the resilience of education services and systems so that they remain functional and flexible enough to accommodate new needs in the face of conflict and violence.

It emerged that political commitment to these efforts was crucial to their success. One example given was the adoption of the Global Compact on Refugees in 2018, which had helped to unlock development and private funding for building the resilience of education in crisis zones and enabled refugee learners to better integrate into host education systems.

Participants highlighted that it was also good practice for education authorities and practitioners to switch quickly from formal to community-based education models in order to foster greater resilience in education services and systems. This switch would be facilitated by turning to alternative means of education delivery (e.g. radio), accelerated education programmes and other tried-and-tested approaches, and by flexible funding.

¹⁰ Mary Anderson’s seminal text, *Do No Harm: How Aid Can Support Peace—or War*, written in 1999, drew attention to the unintended consequences of humanitarian and development work, which can sometimes exacerbate rather than mitigate the causes and symptoms of conflict.

KEY LEARNING POINTS



1. Humanitarian and development agencies both face three main challenges when supporting education in areas affected by conflict and violence: weaknesses in education systems, poor security conditions and sensitive political dynamics.

Weak education systems are less able to absorb and adapt to the shocks of conflict and other crises, making it difficult both to create sustainable “education in emergencies” (humanitarian) programmes and to maintain the progress of development. Meanwhile, poor security conditions and sensitive political dynamics both limit the reach of humanitarian-led education programmes and complicate development efforts with education authorities. These shared challenges make a compelling case for cooperation between humanitarian and development experts working in education.

2. Ensuring the continuity of education in areas affected by conflict and violence requires engagement with a range of experts.

Disruptions to education in areas affected by conflict and violence cannot be solved with education expertise alone. Experience shows that dialogue and advocacy with political stakeholders (e.g. defence and interior ministries) and weapon bearers are central to some of the most promising approaches to education in emergencies. Engaging with the diplomatic community and leveraging the skills and knowledge of protection and child protection experts are also important measures.

3. More research is needed to determine the challenges to supporting education in areas beyond government control in conflict-affected countries.

Despite efforts in recent years to explore the challenges of supporting education in areas beyond government control, there is still little understanding of these among humanitarian and development agencies.

This is largely due to the fact that access restrictions limit the depth and breadth of operations in areas beyond government control. As humanitarian and development agencies strive for greater coherence between their approaches to education in conflict-affected areas, they should aim to get a better understanding of:

- how authorities, education experts and donors address the issue of parallel or competing education systems, including in countries where control over certain areas has changed hands
- the legal obligations of non-State armed groups with regard to education and what this means for humanitarian / development education interventions in conflict-affected areas.

4. In complex and volatile situations, local partners can make a valuable contribution to needs and risk assessments as well as the implementation of projects.

Community-based organizations, National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, teachers, parents and school administrators are all key contributors to the education response. Not only do they have a presence in or access to conflict-affected areas, but they also hold invaluable knowledge about the local context and needs, which is essential for conflict-sensitive planning. Local people and organizations should be involved in the analysis and design stages of education programmes. This is especially true for community-level initiatives with replication potential, as local communities are often well placed to secure the political backing necessary for scaling up initiatives. Local organizations working as implementing partners must be given organizational support as well as support with implementing the activities themselves.

5. Building the resilience of education services and systems requires adjustments to be made to both humanitarian and development approaches.

Humanitarian agencies need to adopt longer-term strategies for supporting education beyond the immediate crisis, and development agencies need to build more robust contingency plans to account for the possibility of conflict and violence becoming protracted and / or coming in waves. Efforts are already being made to ensure that humanitarian crisis responses (and related data) are transferable to longer-term education programmes and well anchored in national systems. But within the development sector, measures must be taken to ensure that education authorities are equipped – from a financial, technical and political point of view – to manage isolated or chronic pressures and to secure equal access to education even in polarized societies (either directly or through cooperation with humanitarian agencies).

6. Measuring the impact of education activities is crucial for improving humanitarian and development responses and securing stronger political backing for education in emergencies.

Education practitioners should invest in monitoring and evidencing the “quick wins” that education programmes can have in terms of protection, psychosocial support, health and nutrition, in addition to longer-term academic outcomes. Framing these successes within the paradigm of “social and emotional learning” is a helpful way to ensure a more holistic view of the impact of education efforts. Stronger evidence of the contribution that education activities make to the general resilience of communities affected by conflict and violence would also help to secure greater political and financial support for education in emergencies.

ANNEX – WORKSHOP PROGRAMME

DAY 1: WEDNESDAY, 19 JUNE 2019 EDUCATION, CONFLICT AND VIOLENCE: CHALLENGES, POLICY AND PRACTICE	
09:00 – 09:15	Welcome remarks Dominik Stillhart, Director of Operations for the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC)
09:15 – 10:15	Introductions and overview of the workshop Peter Klanduch, Education Above All Foundation Filipa Schmitz Guinote, ICRC
10:15 – 11:00 Facilitator: Prof. Alan Smith, Ulster University	Session 1 (part 1) – Education, conflict and violence: The challenges Objective: To cover a range of conflict- and violence-related barriers to the provision and continuation of education, setting a framework for discussion. Consideration will be given to the challenges that these pose to agencies required to uphold the principles of neutrality, impartiality and independence. This session will also outline some of the gaps in evidence and data collection regarding the impact of conflict and violence on education. Format: Interactive dialogue Key questions: 1. What do we know about how conflict / violence affects access to education and the quality of the learning environment in schools? 2. What are the main gaps in data and evidence regarding the impact of conflict / violence on education? Speakers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marika Tsolakis, Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack • Tyler Arnot, Independent consultant • Abdirahman Ismail, ICRC Delegation in Iraq
11:00 – 11:20	Break
11:20 – 13:00 Facilitator: Tyler Arnot, Independent consultant	Session 1 (part 2) – Education, conflict and violence: Programme and funding structures Objective: To outline the main hurdles and good practices in developing, delivering and funding programmes to improve access to education in fragile and conflict-affected countries, contrasting humanitarian and development perspectives. This session will also explore conflict-sensitive planning and strategies for building resilience in the education sector; challenges and solutions to education provision in hard-to-reach areas and displaced communities; and the role of legal, political, financial and programmatic accountability in ensuring that education systems function properly in fragile and conflict-affected countries. Format: Double panel discussion and Q&A session Panel 1: Donor perspectives on the main hurdles and good practices in funding education activities in fragile and conflict-affected countries. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Judit Barna, European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations (ECHO) • Emma Gremley, Department for International Development (DFID), UK Government • Christian Stoff, Education Cannot Wait Panel 2: Practitioners' perspectives on the main hurdles and good practice in building resilience to ensure the continuity of education in fragile and conflict-affected countries. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anna Seeger, International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP), United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) • Karla Hoover, ICRC Delegation in South Sudan • Anthony Nolan, Global Education Cluster • Sian Long, Save the Children • Benoît d'Asembourg, United Nations Refugee Agency (UNHCR)
13:00 – 14:15	Break

DAY 1: WEDNESDAY, 19 JUNE 2019**EDUCATION, CONFLICT AND VIOLENCE: CHALLENGES, POLICY AND PRACTICE**

<p>14:15 – 15:15 Facilitator: Eva Svoboda, ICRC</p>	<p>Session 2 – Enabling education to continue in spite of attacks and instability: Experiences from the field</p> <p>Objective: To discuss good practice and lessons learned from a range of programmes and initiatives that have enabled education to continue in spite of attacks, conflict and instability. Specifically, the session will explore which factors led to breakthroughs or success, and the extent to which agencies can depoliticize education in highly polarized societies without jeopardizing their neutrality and impartiality in the eyes of authorities or others.</p> <p>Format: Panel discussion and Q&A session</p> <p>Speakers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Francesca Bonomo, United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) – Access to education in conflict and instability: Lessons learned from West and Central Africa. • Elyse Leonard and Denis Puzhalin, Save the Children – The “Safe Schools” programme and its implementation in Ukraine. • Filipe Costa Galo Tomé de Carvalho, ICRC – The “Safer Access Framework” and its implementation in Brazil.
<p>15:15 – 15:30</p>	<p>Break</p>
<p>15:30 – 16:30 Facilitator: Geoff Loane, ICRC</p>	<p>Session 3 (practice) – Continuity of education in areas beyond State control</p> <p>Objective: To identify the challenges of working with informal or non-recognized authorities to deliver a service that is governed by the State.</p> <p>Format: Interactive dialogue</p> <p>Speakers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ezequiel Heffes, Geneva Call • Danijel Cuturic, ICRC Delegation in Ukraine • Risto Ihalainen, Norwegian Refugee Council • Christian Stoff, Education Cannot Wait
<p>16:30 – 17:00 Facilitator: Filipa Schmitz Guinote, ICRC</p>	<p>Collective wrap-up Participants will identify key challenges, effective solutions and areas requiring further discussion or policy work.</p>

DAY 2: THURSDAY, 20 JUNE 2019**ADDRESSING EDUCATION NEEDS WITH IMPARTIALITY AND INDEPENDENCE: WHAT TOOLS DO WE HAVE AND ARE THEY FIT FOR PURPOSE?**

<p>09:00 – 10:30 Facilitator: Dr Kelsey Shanks, Ulster University / Global Challenges Research Fund</p>	<p>Session 4 – Reflections on Day 1: Identifying key areas for cooperation and coherence between agencies with different mandates and approaches to education</p> <p>Objective: To provide space for participants to share their reflections on the discussions of the previous day. Participants will be invited to identify the main conceptual and practical issues shaping cooperation between humanitarian and development agencies in the field of education and to begin designing a new “business model” for ensuring the continuity of education in unstable environments. The aim will be to identify the stages of education planning where close cooperation between agencies with different mandates and approaches will improve access to and the quality and continuity of education amidst conflict and violence.</p> <p>Format: Panel discussion and Q&A session</p> <p>Speakers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Susan Nicolai, Overseas Development Institute (via video link) – Opportunities to build coherence between humanitarian and development approaches to education. • Cecile Aptel, International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies – The role of local actors in bridging the evidence gap in the area of education. • Francesca Bonomo, UNICEF – Reflections on resilient education and education for resilience.
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

DAY 2: THURSDAY, 20 JUNE 2019**ADDRESSING EDUCATION NEEDS WITH IMPARTIALITY AND INDEPENDENCE: WHAT TOOLS DO WE HAVE AND ARE THEY FIT FOR PURPOSE?**

10:30 – 11:00	Break
11:00 – 12:00 Facilitator: Laura Davison, Inter-agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE)	<p>Session 5 – Multi-year planning and financing tools in the area of education</p> <p>Objective: To discuss how agencies and donors have been adapting to the need to plan education activities in fragile and conflict-affected countries over longer timeframes than before. This session will explore the main areas of progress and gaps in multi-year programming and funding in the field of education. There will also be discussion of the role of the State in steering or arbitrating multi-year humanitarian programmes and funding and the possible implications of this, in terms of the prioritization of needs, and the independence or impartiality of the humanitarian agencies involved.</p> <p>Format: Panel discussion and Q&A session</p> <p>Speakers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Judit Barna, ECHO – A humanitarian donor's perspective on multi-year financing for education. • Maria Agnese Giordano, Global Education Cluster – Multi-year planning for education and the question of coordination: A global perspective. • Hollyn Romeyn, Norwegian Capacity (NORCAP) / NRC – Multi-year planning for education and the question of coordination: A field-level perspective.
12:00 – 13:30	Break
13:30 – 14:30 Facilitator: Dean Brooks, INEE	<p>Session 6 – Taking a closer look at data and analysis tools in the area of education</p> <p>Objective: To build on the framing discussions of Day 1, by looking at the tools available for collecting data on the impact of conflict and violence on access to and quality of education, and for drawing on that data to inform programmes and policies. In particular, the session will explore the question of conflict-risk analysis and conflict-sensitivity in education programmes.</p> <p>Format: Panel discussion and Q&A session</p> <p>Speakers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paul Frisoli, FHI 360 – How is the impact of conflict and violence on access to and quality of education assessed and measured? Are the tools we have in the education and humanitarian community fit for purpose? • Laura Davison, INEE – INEE's guidance on conflict-sensitive education: Origins and implementation.
14:30 – 15:30	Break and poster walk
15:30 – 16:45	<p>Semi-public debrief and closure of the workshop</p> <p>Objective: To share key learning points from the workshop with a broader audience (staff from the ICRC and permanent missions in Geneva).</p>

MISSION

The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) is an impartial, neutral and independent organization whose exclusively humanitarian mission is to protect the lives and dignity of victims of armed conflict and other situations of violence and to provide them with assistance. The ICRC also endeavours to prevent suffering by promoting and strengthening humanitarian law and universal humanitarian principles. Established in 1863, the ICRC is at the origin of the Geneva Conventions and the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement. It directs and coordinates the international activities conducted by the Movement in armed conflicts and other situations of violence.

 [facebook.com/icrc](https://www.facebook.com/icrc)
 twitter.com/icrc
 [instagram.com/icrc](https://www.instagram.com/icrc)



ICRC

International Committee of the Red Cross
19, avenue de la Paix
1202 Geneva, Switzerland
T +41 22 734 60 01
shop.icrc.org
© ICRC, December 2019