

## Global Coalition to **Protect Education from Attack**

# **SECTION 3.** GUIDE TO USING THE INDICATORS ON ATTACKS ON EDUCATION AND THE *TOOLKIT*

Toolkit for Collecting and Analyzing Data on Attacks on Education

### **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Section 3. Guide to using the Indicators on Attacks on Education and the <i>Toolkit</i>	
a . Note Departing Discoursestion and Analysis	_
3.1. Note Regarding Disaggregation and Analysis	3
3.2. What the <i>Toolkit</i> does not include	3
3.3. Integrating data on attacks on education into education sector planning	3

## **SECTION 3.** GUIDE TO USING THE INDICATORS ON ATTACKS ON EDUCATION AND THE *TOOLKIT*

We encourage organizations to read the Guidelines on Collecting Data and the definitions of attacks on education and other key terms (Appendix A) before reading through the Indicators on Attacks on Education section. Considering the context, needs, and patterns of attacks on education *first* will guide an informed reading of the Indicators section and support in selecting the most relevant indicators for integration into monitoring and reporting activities.

This *Toolkit* also includes a Codebook (with detailed instructions for data entry) and a Data Template (for recording and analyzing incidents of attacks).

Some of these indicators and suggested disaggregations may not be feasible in every context. The Indicators on Attacks on Education section provides notes on limitations and feasibility for each indicator. Together with the Codebook and Data Template, users can pick and choose the most useful components from the Indicators on Attacks on Education section, treating the *Toolkit* as both an inspirational and aspirational guide. A first step could be collecting data on a handful of indicators or subdomains including some suggested disaggregations.

The following Diagnostic Tool serves as a guide for using the *Toolkit*. Once users situate themselves in the table based on their current capacities and resources, as well as the context and data landscape, the Diagnostic Tool suggests next steps to improve data collection, analysis, and report sharing.

#### Table 2 Diagnostic Tool for using the Toolkit

	Context	Current data collection and reporting	Suggested next steps
1	Emerging conflicts; organizations or government ministries beginning to collect data or starting to systematize efforts	Limited incident-level data on attacks on education may exist; reports may not align with GCPEA definitions of attacks and military use; no systematized reporting in place; limited capacity for information management	<ul> <li>Identify one or two accessible data sources (see Step 1 in the Guidance); assess the data collection landscape and context</li> <li>Review GCPEA definitions of attacks and military use</li> <li>Review sample data collection sheets (see Appendix B)</li> <li>Begin to input data on selected Standard Indicators into a basic datasheet (see Datasheet and Codebook)</li> <li>Release short reports or infographics if possible</li> </ul>

JANUARY 2023

	Context	Current data collection and reporting	Suggested next steps
2	Established conflicts or crises; NGO, government, or other mechanism with experience collecting and reporting on attacks; MRM or coordination structure may exist	Collection of incident- level data on attacks on education and regular reporting; categories of attacks may not fully align with GCPEA's categories or suggested disaggregations	<ul> <li>Harmonize attack definitions with GCPEA, expanding to additional categories of attack which may be less common or less frequently reported (e.g. Domains 3, 4, and 5)</li> <li>Identify new indicators or disaggregations from the Indicators on Attacks on Education</li> <li>Revise data collection tools and spreadsheets to accommodate new indicators and disaggregations</li> <li>Identify and incorporate additional data sources and build relationships with data repositories where needed</li> <li>Share reports including disaggregated data more regularly</li> <li>Report both Standard and Supplemental Indicators, including simple impact analyses (e.g., Indicators 1.3.1, 1.4.1)</li> </ul>
3	Established or prolonged conflicts; NGO, government, or MRM with long-standing experience collecting and reporting on attacks	Collecting and managing data on attacks from diverse sources; routinely and accessibly reporting across all relevant attack categories to broad audiences using standard definitions	<ul> <li>Revise data collection tools and spreadsheets to accommodate indicators and suggested disaggregations</li> <li>Collect and manage as much disaggregated data as possible, even if for a limited geography or time period</li> <li>Obtain other education data (e.g., EMIS); run the more advanced analyses in the Indicators on Attacks on Education section</li> <li>Report on Advanced Indicators including more complex impacts of attacks (e.g., Indicators 1.2.1, 8.2.1)</li> </ul>

#### 3.1. Note regarding disaggregation and analysis

This *Toolkit* encourages users to disaggregate data – for instance by gender, level of schooling, whether attack survivors are students or educators – throughout the research, analysis, and report sharing process. The Indicators on Attacks on Education section lists suggested disaggregations for each indicator. If data collection and entry tools make space for such disaggregations (which the tools presented throughout the *Toolkit* do), then at the analysis stage, nearly all calculations described in the Indicators section can be performed on disaggregated data. For simplicity, the calculations appear at the aggregate level (e.g., schools, students) in the Indicators section, but the same calculations can be used at the disaggregate level (e.g., girls' schools, boy students). For instance, rather than find the proportion of schools damaged or destroyed by attacks in a region (Indicator 1.2.1), users can find the number of *girls' schools* damaged or destroyed by attacks, using the same calculation but entering the number of schools disaggregated by gender. As other examples, users could find the number of girl students whose education was reportedly affected by military use, the number of primary schools (rather than secondary schools) attacked, or the number of teachers or academics (rather than students) harmed in education-related protests. Results from the calculations on disaggregated data can also be compared; for instance, users could investigate whether girls miss more days of learning in the wake of attacks on schools than boys. Decisions for which disaggregations to analyze can be made based on users' needs and the context under consideration.

#### 3.2. What the *Toolkit* does not include

This *Toolkit* has two limitations in tracking the impact of attacks on education and military use of educational facilities. First, several common indicators of impact are not included due to common data limitations. Specifically, students' learning outcomes after an attack, whether learners continue their education or permanently drop out years after an attack, and the duration of students' or educators' detentions or arrests are not included as indicators, since the longitudinal data necessary for the analyses are very rare. Second, other common indicators of impact are not found in the Indicators on Attacks on Education section due to GCPEA's strict definitions of attacks on education. Specifically, the *Toolkit* does not consider in its analyses school closures due to generalized insecurity or parents not sending their kids to school out of generalized fear, since these are beyond the scope of attacks on education.

#### 3.3 Integrating data on attacks on education into education sector planning

Many of the specifications in this *Toolkit* were developed with education and child protection actors in mind, primarily those working within humanitarian settings. However, these indicators and tools can also play a role in broader education planning. For example, ministries of education or other partners can use data already collected as part of risk assessments or other components of sectoral analysis.

In order to encourage coherence between humanitarian and development planning, and to ensure that safeguarding education is considered in national planning, attacks on education should be taken into account in education sector planning. This is relevant for countries that are currently experiencing attacks on education as well as countries with an elevated risk of attacks, such as where attacks have occurred in the past or where a heightened the risk of conflict exists.

JANUARY 2023 3

Including attacks on education in education sector plans or other planning documents enhances cooperation and better ensures access to safe education by:

- 1) facilitating the distribution of resources to either prevent attacks from occurring or mitigate their impacts
- 2) enhancing communication between education providers to more effectively extend learning opportunities to areas affected by attacks or to communities hosting teacher and students displaced by attacks
- 3) aligning education sector goals and objectives with a government's commitments to protect education, such as through the Safe Schools Declaration.

There are a number of existing tools that include provisions for including attacks on education within education sector planning or other related sectors. These include:

<u>Comprehensive School Safety Framework 2022-2030</u> (Global Alliance for Disaster Risk Reduction and Resilience in the Education Sector, 2022)

School Safety Context Analysis (Save the Children, 2018)

<u>Guide for Transitional Education Plan Preparation</u> (UNESCO IIEP and Global Partnership for Education, 2016)

Safe to Learn Diagnostic Tool (Safe to Learn and UNICEF, 2021)

Strengthening Administrative Data on Violence against Children (UNICEF, 2021)



### Global Coalition to **Protect Education from Attack**

### **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

This *Toolkit* was authored by by Amy Kapit, Jerome Marston, and Marika Tsolakis, with contributions from Christine Choi and Felicity Pearce. The Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack (GCPEA) is grateful for guidance provided by the Expert Reference Group.

GCPEA is a coalition of organizations that includes: Amnesty International, Education Above All Foundation, the Institute of International Education (IIE), Human Rights Watch, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), Plan International, Save the Children, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), and the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF).

The *Toolkit* is independent of the individual member organizations of the Steering Committee of GCPEA and does not necessarily reflect the views of the Steering Committee member organizations.

Support for the *Toolkit* has been provided by Education Above All Foundation, Education Cannot Wait (ECW), UNESCO, UNICEF, the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and an anonymous donor.

January 2023

# Toolkit for Collecting and Analyzing Data on Attacks on Education

#### **Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack**

Secretariat

350 5th Avenue, 34th Floor, New York, New York 10118-3299 Phone: 1.212.377.9446 · Email: GCPEA@protectingeducation.org

www.protectingeducation.org