



Report from the  
**Knowledge Roundtable on  
Programmatic Measures in Prevention,  
Intervention and Response to Attacks on Education**

November 8–11, 2011 | Phuket, Thailand

Global Coalition to  
**Protect Education from Attack**





Report from the

# **Knowledge Roundtable on Programmatic Measures in Prevention, Intervention and Response to Attacks on Education**

November 8–11, 2011 | Phuket, Thailand

---

Global Coalition to

## **Protect Education from Attack**



## About the Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack

The Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack (GCPEA) was established in 2010 by organisations from the fields of education in emergencies and conflict-affected fragile states, higher education, protection, international human rights, and international humanitarian law who were concerned about ongoing attacks on educational institutions, their students, and staff in countries affected by conflict and insecurity. The mission of GCPEA is to catalyse enhanced prevention of attacks on education, effective response to attacks, improved knowledge and understanding, better monitoring and reporting, stronger international norms and standards, and increased accountability.

GCPEA is governed by a steering committee made up of the following international organizations: Council for Assisting Refugee Academics (CARA), Education Above All (EAA), Education International (EI), Human Rights Watch (HRW), Save the Children International (SCI), UNESCO, UNHCR, and UNICEF. The Institute of International Education (IIE) currently serves as GCPEA's fiscal and administrative agent.

### Secretariat

350 5th Avenue, 34th Floor  
New York, New York 10118-3299  
Phone: 1.212.377.9446  
Email: [GCPEA@protectingeducation.org](mailto:GCPEA@protectingeducation.org)  
Website: [www.protectingeducation.org](http://www.protectingeducation.org)

This report was commissioned by the Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack. It does not necessarily reflect the views of each individual member organization of the Steering Committee of GCPEA.

**Front cover photo:** Coats of students hang on the wall of a partially destroyed school in Kabul, where children attend as part of the “Back to School” campaign launched by the Afghan government with UNICEF’s support to bring 1.7 students back to school.

© 2006 UN Photo/Eskinder Debebe

**Back cover photo:** Scorched pages from school textbooks litter a floor in Ban Ba Ngo Elementary School, Pattani, Thailand, set on fire by insurgents in March 2010.

© Bede Sheppard/Human Rights Watch



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b>	2
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	3
<b>THEME ONE: ESTABLISHING A KNOWLEDGE BASELINE</b>	4
<i>Session 1: Current knowledge base: programmatic measures</i>	
<i>Session 2: Current knowledge base: country summaries</i>	
<b>THEME TWO: DEEPENING KNOWLEDGE OF PROTECTION</b>	8
<i>Session 3: Physical protection</i>	
<i>Session 4: Community involvement in protection</i>	
<i>Session 5: Alternative delivery of education</i>	
<i>Session 6: Negotiations</i>	
<i>Session 7: Restricting military and political use of education institutions</i>	
<i>Session 8: Protecting higher education from attack</i>	
<b>THEME THREE: DEEPENING KNOWLEDGE OF PREVENTION</b>	17
<i>Sessions 9 and 10: Conflict sensitive policy reform and curriculum reform</i>	
<i>Session 11: Advocacy</i>	
<b>THEME FOUR: MOVING THE AGENDA FORWARD</b>	20
<i>Session 12: Program evaluation</i>	
<i>Session 13: Monitoring and reporting</i>	
<i>Session 14: Global database and networking</i>	
<i>Session 15: Country summaries: priorities and challenges</i>	
<i>Session 16: Prioritizing the research agenda</i>	
<b>CLOSING: GCPEA: THE WAY FORWARD</b>	28
<b>ANNEX 1: RESEARCH AGENDA FOR PROGRAMMATIC MEASURES TO PROTECT EDUCATION FROM ATTACK</b>	29
<b>ANNEX 2: GUIDELINES FOR PROGRAM EVALUATION</b>	47
<b>ANNEX 3: KNOWLEDGE ROUNDTABLE AGENDA</b>	53
<b>ANNEX 4: KNOWLEDGE ROUNDTABLE PARTICIPANT LIST</b>	67

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

*GCPEA wishes to thank UNICEF for its generous support in providing funding earmarked for the Knowledge Roundtable through the Education in Emergencies and Post-Crisis Transition Programme (EEPCT) jointly funded by the Government of the Netherlands and the European Commission. GCPEA also wishes to extend its appreciation to the Interagency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE) for co-sponsoring the Knowledge Roundtable and providing financial assistance. GCPEA also acknowledges the generous financial and human resources support from UNICEF Asia Pacific Shared Services Centre (APSSC) in Bangkok, which enabled GCPEA to expand the scope of the Knowledge Roundtable to include 15 countries. UNICEF APSSC staff members Yuwadee Sakultaweewat and Krittiya Sintupongphan provided essential administrative and logistical support and Luc Chauvin and Gary Ovington provided leadership in making the Roundtable possible.*

*Appreciation is also due to GCPEA researcher/consultant Christine Groneman for her skills and perseverance writing the report and providing extensive research in identifying critical field-based practitioners and relevant documents. GCPEA also appreciates Columbia University interns Elena Matsui and Mitzi Steiner for their excellent research and to New York University intern Victoria Reis for her copy editing of the document. Further, GCPEA wishes to thank the Roundtable working group members John Akker, Pilar Aguilar, Emily Echessa, Lori Heining, Jane Kalista, Gary Ovington, Ita Sheehy, and Margaret Sinclair for their input and guidance during the process of developing and conducting the event. Thanks are also extended to colleagues at the Institute of International Education (IIE), GCPEA's fiscal agent, including Daniela Kaisth and Amy Eppen, for their tireless administrative support. Finally, GCPEA would like to thank the participants and resource people for their work in preparing presentations, their participation in the event, and their commitment to protecting education from attack.*

# INTRODUCTION TO THE REPORT

In over 30 countries in Africa, Asia, Europe, Latin America and the Middle East, education has become the target of violent attacks or threats by non-state armed groups and state security forces. As part of a multiyear initiative to promote effective, coherent, timely, and evidence-based programmatic measures to protect education from targeted attacks, the Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack (GCPEA) convened a global Knowledge Roundtable on Programmatic Measures in Prevention, Intervention, and Response. The Roundtable was held in Phuket, Thailand from November 8 to 11, 2011.

The Roundtable brought together field practitioners, program managers, Ministry of Education officials, child protection specialists, human rights advocates, and researchers working in 15 different countries: Afghanistan, Central African Republic (CAR), Colombia, Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), India, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Myanmar, Nepal, occupied Palestinian territory (oPt), Pakistan, Philippines, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, and Zimbabwe. The purpose of the meeting was to:

Collect and share information about a range of programmatic prevention and protection measures currently being implemented for inclusion in the GCPEA *Study of Programmatic Measures to Protect Education from Attack*.

Identify challenges faced by countries to deliver protection and prevention measures.

Share existing research and evaluation on program effectiveness and identify priority areas for research and evaluation.

Address mechanisms for establishing global databases of key actors and programmatic responses, and for interpractitioner networking.

During the Roundtable, information was presented and discussed under the umbrella of four themes:

1. Establishing a knowledge baseline
2. Deepening knowledge of protection
3. Deepening knowledge of prevention
4. Moving the agenda forward

This report highlights key points from country-specific presentations on programmatic responses and the discussions that followed each panel session; priority areas and challenges identified by each country for implementing programmatic responses; priorities identified for the research agenda; and ways forward for GCPEA.

# THEME 1: ESTABLISHING A KNOWLEDGE BASELINE

The first two sessions of the Roundtable focused on the theme of establishing a knowledge baseline on programmatic responses.

## Session 1: Current knowledge base - programmatic measures

**FACILITATOR:** Ms. Melinda Smith (Coordinator, GCPEA)

**PRESENTER:** Ms. Christine Groneman (Consultant, GCPEA)

This session summarized the findings of the *Study on Programmatic Measures to Protect Education from Attack*, a report that synthesizes information on current programmatic measures being implemented in the field. Supplemented by a slide show, the presenter described each type of programmatic measure that would be explored further in the upcoming sessions and touched on considerations for implementing each type of measure. Following the slide presentation, a plenary discussion raised issues of concern that would be addressed throughout the Roundtable. Participants were also encouraged to provide feedback to update the study.

## Session 2: Current knowledge base – country summaries

**FACILITATORS:** Dr. Lori Heninger (Director, INEE), Dr. Gary Ovington (Senior Emergency Specialist – Education, UNICEF APSSC (Asia Pacific Shared Services Centre, Bangkok))

**PRESENTERS:** Country representatives

A representative from each country gave a brief summary of the current situation in the field by providing information on the nature, scope, and motives of attacks in their respective countries, and on programmatic responses being implemented to respond to those attacks. Key points are highlighted below:

COUNTRY	NATURE, SCOPE, AND MOTIVE OF ATTACKS	PROGRAMMATIC MEASURES
<b>Afghanistan</b>	<p>Burning schools and books, bombing schools, sending threatening ‘night letters,’ kidnapping, murder, acid attacks on female students</p> <p>Previously in the South and East, but expanding to the North</p> <p>From 2006-2008: 1,350 attacks on schools</p> <p>Motives: anti-education mentality, low level of awareness, lack of proper security, educational institutions used as polling stations</p>	<p>Physical protection: protection committees, guards, infrastructure</p> <p>Community involvement in protection</p> <p>Alternative delivery: community-based schools</p> <p>Advocacy: awareness training, depoliticize schools</p> <p>Research</p>



COUNTRY	NATURE, SCOPE, AND MOTIVE OF ATTACKS	PROGRAMMATIC MEASURES
<b>Central African Republic</b>	<p>Over 300,000 people forced to flee to the bush during attacks when armed groups were fighting for power in a politically unstable environment</p> <p>Northern part of the country neglected and not receiving any services</p> <p>Rebel groups and road bandits also kidnapping people and trying to make money by taking advantage of insecurity</p>	<p>Alternative delivery: bush schools</p> <p>Negotiations with armed groups</p>
<b>Colombia</b>	<p>Many armed actors: left-wing guerrillas, right-wing paramilitary groups</p> <p>Complex context – political motives, drugs, crime, small armed groups</p> <p>Forced recruitment, sexual violence, bombing of schools by both military and illegal armed forces, occupation of schools, landmines near schools, massive displacements, teachers threatened/ killed/ kidnapped</p> <p>Across the country, but specifically in the north near the border with Venezuela</p> <p>Data collection is difficult and there is discrepancy in data depending on the source (government or NGO)</p>	<p>Physical protection for teachers</p> <p>Advocacy: rights awareness</p>
<b>Democratic Republic of Congo</b>	<p>Conflict between armed groups and the army; now in post-conflict phase</p> <p>Recruiting of children, looting of schools, destruction of schools, occupation of schools, sexual violence, killing or maiming of students and teachers</p>	<p>Alternative delivery and rapid response</p> <p>Advocacy: training and awareness of protection issues</p> <p>Monitoring</p>

COUNTRY	NATURE, SCOPE, AND MOTIVE OF ATTACKS	PROGRAMMATIC MEASURES
<b>India</b>	Occupation of school by state security forces, bombing of schools In Naxal-affected (Maoist rebel) states	Alternative delivery for IDPs Restricting military use of schools through monitoring, court decisions
<b>Iraq</b>	After 2003, 90% of education institutions were looted and destroyed, over 400 academics assassinated, over 6000 academics fled the country	Protection of higher education: relocation, funding, research, scholarships
<b>Ivory Coast</b>	Ten-year civil war ended in 2010; now there is post-election violence 244 reported attacks against education between January and July 2011 Destruction and looting of schools, school closures, occupation of schools, attacks on teachers, unexploded ordinance in schools, armed posts near schools Motives: anti-education sentiment due to its perceived role in previous conflict, politicization of education	Negotiations: led to restricting military use of schools Monitoring Advocacy
<b>Myanmar</b>	Conflict is mainly in southeastern part of the country State army is forcing Karen people to flee their villages Attacks against villages, burn whole villages, school closures, school occupations	Community involvement Alternative delivery Monitoring: early warning Advocacy
<b>Nepal</b>	Conflict phase (1996 – 2006): Schools attacked both by state and non-state parties, used for military purposes, threats, extortion, killing, power exercises nationwide Motive: weaken the state, create and deepen socio-political crises, change the status quo Post conflict phase (2006 onwards): Political instability, violence, threats, misuse of power Mainly in Terai (plains area in eastern and central part of country) Motive: political harassment and indoctrination	Community involvement: school management committees Negotiations: led to codes of conduct Advocacy: use of media, coalition building Conflict sensitive education reform

COUNTRY	NATURE, SCOPE, AND MOTIVE OF ATTACKS	PROGRAMMATIC MEASURES
<b>Occupied Palestinian territory</b>	<p>60-year refugee crisis in oPt</p> <p>Forced displacement, demolition of schools and houses, airstrikes and shelling in Gaza that cause collateral damage, vandalism, violence, arrests, checkpoints, schools occupied or used as detention and interrogation centers</p>	<p>Physical protection</p> <p>Alternative delivery</p> <p>Advocacy</p> <p>Monitoring</p>
<b>Pakistan</b>	<p>More than 2,000 schools attacked since 2006</p> <p>Bombing of school buildings, shooting of teachers, systematic recruitment of children as suicide bombers (average age is 15 years)</p> <p>Motive: In 2007 Pakistan-based Taliban started campaign to create own government in North West Pakistan and ordered all girls' schools closed; military responded and ensuing conflict displaced millions</p> <p>Initially in the North, now also in central areas of the country</p>	<p>Physical protection</p> <p>Alternative sites</p> <p>Community involvement</p> <p>Advocacy: Welcome to School initiative</p>
<b>Philippines</b>	<p>Communist insurgency in Philippines, Muslim separatists in Mindanao, also family feuds and armed groups contributing to violence</p> <p>Election-related violence: Murdering of school principals after elections; 75 teachers threatened; schools closed for 4 months, affected 2000 children</p> <p>Schools destroyed by war and many not safe for children now, kidnapping for ransom, personal attacks, schools burned, bomb attacks</p>	<p>Monitoring</p> <p>Community involvement</p> <p>Restricting military/ political use of schools</p>
<b>South Sudan</b>	<p>Tribal attacks, Lord's Resistance Army (LRA) in the southwestern part of country</p> <p>Occupation of schools, destruction and looting of schools, kidnapping and recruitment of students and teachers</p>	<p>Alternative delivery: accelerated learning program (ALP)</p> <p>Conflict sensitive education reform: language policy</p>

COUNTRY	NATURE, SCOPE, AND MOTIVE OF ATTACKS	PROGRAMMATIC MEASURES
<b>Sri Lanka</b>	During the civil war (1983-2009): students, teachers, and academics killed, mines on school grounds, schools occupied	Alternative delivery Advocacy
<b>Zimbabwe</b>	Political violence, militarization of education, torture and violence against teachers, books burned  In 2008, schools open an average of only 23 days due to teacher displacement	Physical protection of teachers Community involvement Advocacy Monitoring

## THEME 2: DEEPENING KNOWLEDGE OF PROTECTION

The six sessions under the theme of deepening knowledge of protection examined country-specific examples of programmatic measures being implemented at both the local and the systemic/government level to protect education from attack. Participants discussed factors that need to be considered in adapting and implementing programmatic measures in their own countries and conflict situations.

### Session 3: Physical protection

**FACILITATORS:** Mr. David Robinson (Senior Advisor, Education International), Ms. Jane Kalista (Assistant Programme Specialist, Section for Planning and Emergency Response, UNESCO)

**PRESENTERS:** Mr. Waheedullah Sultanie (Acting Director General for Administration, Ministry of Education, Afghanistan), Ms. Maria Paula Calvo (Community Services Assistant, UNHCR, Colombia), Ms. Erum Burki (Cluster Coordinator, Save the Children, Pakistan), Dr. Takavafira Zhou (President, Progressive Teachers' Union of Zimbabwe (PTUZ), Zimbabwe)

Physical protection measures are responses that defend students, teachers, and education institutions from attack, for example by assigning school guards, providing safer transportation, or relocating personnel. During the presentations in this session, more than one panelist made the point that physical protection measures are short-term solutions to attacks on education. It was recommended that in all cases, efforts should also be made for long-term, systemic change to address the causes of the conflict. The four country-specific examples presented during this session focused on school guard programs in Afghanistan and different programs for protecting teachers in Pakistan, Zimbabwe, and Colombia.

## **Afghanistan**

In Afghanistan, four different types of programs using school guards have been implemented. Two of the programs employed unarmed guards: the donor-funded School Guards Program and the Ministry of Education (MoE)-funded Night Guards Project. A common challenge in these two programs was a lack of communication technology. In another program for unarmed guards, the Volunteer Adult Disciplinary Program, volunteer students in their final year of study were trained in surveillance and search techniques. In all three of these programs, there was risk to the guards, as they had no way to defend themselves. Finally, an Armed Guards project assigned local police to guard schools. However, it was commonly believed that the police were a target and their presence put the school community at risk of attack. The School Guards and Armed Guards programs were not continued.

## **Zimbabwe**

In Zimbabwe, threatened education personnel can be transferred to safe, temporary housing with the help of the Progressive Teachers' Union of Zimbabwe (PTUZ) and Students Solidarity Trust. The transfer of teachers can be risky, however, and requires coordinated response and trusted individuals in each district to relay messages. Also in Zimbabwe, Teacher-Student-Parent Defense Units established in six schools work together for better communication and towards the removal of militia camps from schools. Participation by students, teachers, and parents is voluntary and there is a risk that they could be exposed to violence.

## **Pakistan**

In Pakistan, several measures protect female teachers from attacks en route to schools, such as financial support for public transportation, appointment of local teachers to minimize commuting, and the provision of teacher housing. Teachers also receive psychosocial support and support from communities.

## **Colombia**

In Colombia, there are government decrees to protect teachers through such measures as providing escorts, cell phones, and relocation assistance. Challenges remain, however, as teachers have limited trust in the government to protect them because of the perception that the government is aligned with the paramilitaries who carry out attacks. Also, there is still widespread impunity for attacks on teachers.

In the discussion that followed the presentations, participants reiterated the point that physical protection measures can inadvertently put others at risk and that these risks should be carefully considered before implementing any type of physical protection program. For example, the point was raised that involving students in protection and putting them at risk could be a violation of child rights. In the case of Zimbabwe, the students involved initiated the response.

Also, there was discussion of who replaces teachers in the classroom after they have been relocated to ensure that education continues. In the Colombian context, another teacher will be moved in to fill the gap. In Zimbabwe, no other teacher fills the position. Finally, participants discussed the challenge of physical protection in cases where attacks are perpetrated by the state. Suggestions were made to train armed forces in human rights and to build community capacity for protection. The next session elaborated further on community involvement in protection.



## Session 4: Community involvement in protection

**FACILITATOR:** Ms. Emily Echessa (Education Adviser, Save the Children, UK)

**PANELISTS:** Ms. Jyoti Rana Magar (Field Coordinator, World Education, Nepal), Mr. Daoud Ghaznawi (Education Projects Senior Manager, Save the Children, Afghanistan), Ms. Mary Ann Arnado (Secretary General, Mindanao Peoples Caucus, Philippines)

The country-specific examples in this session show that there is no one category of “community.” In all cases, however, community involvement requires consensus building, mobilization, and capacity building. On the part of practitioners, it also requires flexibility to build partnerships with a variety of community members. The presentations in this session focused on capacity building of school management committees in Nepal, engaging community members and religious leaders in school protection and education programs in Afghanistan, and mobilizing community members to monitor and report attacks on education in Philippines.

### Nepal

In Nepal, World Education worked to re-establish community involvement in school management after many years of corruption. They held valid elections and governance training of School Management Committees (SMCs) and Parent Teacher Associations (PTAs), World Education also advocated for women and minority representation. This helped to improve transparency, management, and conflict resolution in the schools. The key lesson learned was to work with local, non-political NGOs to implement programs.

### Afghanistan

In Afghanistan, Save the Children works to establish community trust, build relationships, and gain support of community leaders and shuras (councils) for education and protection programs by working as locally as possible. Well-respected elders and religious leaders play an important role in promoting education as a fundamental Islamic value in the community. This has a positive ‘bubble effect’ of protecting education. The challenge remains that there are some areas where Save the Children cannot work due to insecurity.

### Philippines

In the Philippines, thousands of local community volunteers for Bantay Ceasefire play a role in monitoring and reporting violations of human rights and violations of the terms of the ceasefire, including attacks on schools. This work is risky, as it sometimes puts volunteers in the crossfire. Bantay Ceasefire has reported a drop in violations from over 700 in 2004 to less than ten in 2008.

In the discussion that followed, it was noted that similar SMCs and PTAs already exist and are being utilized in other countries, such as DRC. A question was raised to the panelists about the role of children on the committees. Participants from Nepal indicated that there are also child clubs and participants from Afghanistan described committees that include children and communities that have separate shuras for children. Regarding gender, there are also some areas of Afghanistan that have female-only PTAs. A comment was made that perhaps in some contexts, gender affects how communities can work with armed groups. Finally, one participant noted a concern that in some contexts these committees might have too much power over teachers and contribute to conflict. The session concluded with the point that practitioners must consider how to build linkages between different groups in a specific context to create a harmonized, synchronized approach to protection.

## Session 5: Alternative delivery of education

**FACILITATOR:** Ms. Nathalie Fiona Hamoudi (Education Specialist, UNICEF)

**PANELISTS:** Ms. Nathalie Fiona Hamoudi (Education Specialist, UNICEF), Mr. Omar Anbar (Director of Education – Jerusalem Suburbs District, Ministry of Education and Higher Education, occupied Palestinian territory), Ms. Severine Ramis (Field Manager – Province Orientale, Save the Children UK, Democratic Republic of Congo), Ms. Jennifer Blinkhorn (Education Director, Aga Khan Foundation, Afghanistan)

Alternative delivery of education ensures that some level of schooling continues during conflict when formal schools are occupied, damaged, or destroyed. When implementing alternative education programs, sustainability of the programs and their relationship with the formal education system are important considerations. Examples of quality alternative education programs that have become integrated to some degree into the Ministry of Education system were presented from CAR, DRC, Afghanistan, and oPt.

### Central African Republic

In CAR, resourceful communities in the crisis-affected north of the country started temporary schools in the bush when they were forced to flee their villages. NGOs supported them by providing teacher training to community members and scaling up the project. A key lesson learned is to work with the MoE so that the schools are recognized and students and teachers can transition back into the formal system. In 2011, about 100,000 students were taking advantage of the education provided by bush schools.

### Democratic Republic of Congo

In DRC, there are several initiatives underway to address the needs of the 2.3 million out-of-school children in the country, particularly in the eastern provinces. For example, the Accelerated Learning Program (ALP) for children ages ten to fourteen condenses six years of primary education into three years. The ALP is officially recognized by the MoE and students are awarded a national diploma after passing the national exams.

### Afghanistan

In Afghanistan, in remote villages without education services nearby, community-based primary classes are set up in mosques, houses, or other community centers using MoE curriculum and local community members as teachers. These classes are also protective due to relative invisibility, central location, local trust, and parent involvement. A consortium of organizations (Aga Khan Foundation, CRS, IRC, and Save the Children) helps to support 50,000 students in community-based schools in 19 provinces.

### Occupied Palestinian Territory

In oPt, there are many ways that students and teachers attempt to continue schooling despite obstacles. For example, they create alternate routes to schools to avoid blockades, such as climbing from house to house over the rooftops. Alternate building materials, tents, and mobile caravans are also being used to set up alternative sites for schools. In addition, home study is possible through distance learning programs over both the TV and internet, such as the Jerusalem Education Station.

In the discussion that followed the presentations, sustainability and quality were two issues that came up repeatedly. Many alternative programs that start out as temporary provision of services become long-term. South Sudan was mentioned as another good example of alternative delivery being integrated into the formal education system. As the country rebuilds, accelerated learning (ALP) has become a department in the MoE. Regarding quality, evidence from a mixed methods study on CBE in Afghanistan shows that community-based schools do in fact provide a quality education.<sup>1</sup> A concern was raised, however, about the impact of training temporary teachers on the future and quality of the teaching profession. Finally, an important point was made to consider the differences in attacks carried out by the state and attacks carried out by insurgents and how this might affect programming.

## **Session 6: Negotiations**

**FACILITATOR:** Ms. Melinda Smith (Coordinator, GCPEA)

**PANELISTS:** Ms. Jyoti Rana Magar (Field Manager, World Education, Nepal), Mr. Oshcard Kouassi Kouadio (Child Protection Officer, United Nations Operations in Cote d'Ivoire (UNOCI), Ivory Coast), Pere Aurelio (Caritas, Central African Republic)

In some contexts, negotiations have taken place at the local level to successfully ban certain practices from school grounds, to rid school grounds of occupying armed groups, and to demobilize armed rebels in the area. It was noted during this session that the identity of the mediator/negotiator, his or her approach to negotiations, and credibility with stakeholders is integral to the success of negotiations, and even the willingness of parties to come to the table. Country-specific examples from the Ivory Coast, Nepal, and CAR illustrated this point.

### **Ivory Coast**

In the Ivory Coast, the first step in negotiations was to gather data on violations in the western region through the UN Security Council Resolution 1612 Monitoring and Reporting Mechanism (MRM) process to use as a baseline. A child protection officer from the United Nations Operation (UNOCI) who had authority and the respect of the commanders of both the Armed Forces and the armed group, Dozo, then sat down with them to review the report. Commanders were willing to attend trainings and sensitization campaigns about child rights and international humanitarian law due to their fear of sanctions, arrest, or being relisted as violators of children's rights. As a result, only five schools (of 45) are still occupied today.

### **Central African Republic**

In CAR, many schools were closed in 2006 due to insecurity on the roads, including cases of rape and kidnapping. Eventually, armed bandits took the first step to contact a trusted religious leader in the community to facilitate negotiations with the government. The bandits then met with government and military leaders to negotiate a return home. In this context, a good-faith effort made by all parties and support from the community helped the negotiations succeed. It was noted that it is important when negotiating to keep in mind the causes of conflict, and that many young people have few opportunities in these contexts.

### **Nepal**

In Nepal, World Education organized a series of participatory meetings with political parties, underground armed groups, head teachers, and SMC representatives to plan negotiations. Mass public meetings were held to develop codes of conduct in order to reach agreement among all stakeholders on contentious issues in the

---

<sup>1</sup> Dana Burde and Leigh Linden, "The Effect of Village Based Schools: Evidence from a Randomized Controlled Trial in Afghanistan," Steinhardt New York University Working Paper, 2010.

school. Again, a key lesson learned was the importance of involving local NGOs in the process. The terms of the codes of conduct are different for each school.

In the discussion that followed the panel presentations, another country-specific example, DRC, was mentioned. The education cluster in DRC has been successful in engaging in dialogue with armed groups in part because it is not an NGO or an UN agency. The discussion also raised several concerns for negotiation in other contexts. For example, in other situations, negotiations might need to be more covert, as in the case of negotiations that took place in Nepal during the Maoist insurgency. In this case, it was necessary for community facilitators to conduct shuttle diplomacy among various groups rather than have face-to-face meetings, for the security of all stakeholders and the facilitators. Also, in some contexts there is the complication of dealing with internal fragmentation of armed groups. A final concern as we move forward is to consider the implications of negotiations at the policy level.

## **Session 7: Restricting military and political use of education institutions**

**FACILITATOR:** Mr. Bede Sheppard (Senior Researcher, Human Rights Watch)

**PANELISTS:** Ms. Jennifer Hofmann (Education Specialist, UNICEF, Ivory Coast), Mr. Yudishtira Panigrahi (Programme Coordinator, Save the Children, India), Atty. Baratucal Caudang (Secretary of Education, Department of Education - Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao, Philippines), Mr. Lloyd Pswarayi (Research Officer, Research and Advocacy Unit, Zimbabwe)

### ***Military use of education institutions***

Mr. Bede Sheppard of Human Rights Watch introduced the session by facilitating a discussion on the scope of the problem of military occupation of education institutions worldwide. There are instances of military use of schools in almost every country that was represented at the Roundtable; however, it is reported in only one third of the reports on violations of UN Security Council Resolution 1612.

There are a variety of reasons why military or armed groups partially or completely occupy schools including using structures as barracks or bases; as firing positions or observation points; as training grounds, for weapons and ammunition storage; and as interrogation or detention centers. Roundtable participants contributed examples from their own countries, noting that in Colombia, informants are planted in schools and bases are built next to schools. In the Ivory Coast, the military occupies teachers' houses and sets up checkpoints outside of schools; in Nepal, schools are used as police stations. In oPt, the military patrols security fences that cut through school yards. In Pakistan the military teaches if schools are built by the military and they come in to recruit at schools. In Sri Lanka, the military holds meetings in schools; and in Zimbabwe, the army conducts drills on school grounds and also plants informants in the school community.

The use of schools for any of these reasons poses threats to physical security, such as the risk of an attack from the enemy injuring students and teachers or damaging infrastructure, the risk of students being exposed to violence when police or security forces detain and interrogate suspects, and the risk of students or teachers being sexually harassed by armed men. Military occupation of schools also poses threats to education, such as increased absences and drop-outs, lower enrollment rates, lower transition rates from one grade to the next, and greater gender disparity in school. When advocating for a restriction of military use of schools, highlighting different negative impacts of military occupation might be useful depending on the audience.

In the panel presentations that followed, country representatives from India and Ivory Coast presented strategies being tried to restrict the military use of schools, such as legal action against the state and negotiations with armed forces and armed groups to vacate schools.

## India

In India, Maoist rebels attack schools in remote areas because the schools are symbols of the state. Indian policy dictates free and compulsory education for all, but security forces that occupy schools while they are stationed in these remote affected areas are violating that right. In 2009, Public Interest Litigation (PIL) was filed against the state in Chhattisgarh to get the armed forces to vacate the schools. Only six schools have been evacuated so far; 24 are still occupied. Also, Mr. Sheppard noted that there was similar litigation at the national level in 2011, but many schools remain occupied.

## Ivory Coast

In the Ivory Coast, a monitoring network set up by the MoE, humanitarian partners, and UNOCI child protection officers report back to the education cluster on military use of schools. During the post-election crisis, there were 45 reported cases of military use of schools, including total and partial occupation, occupation of teacher housing, and checkpoints next to schools. After these reports were verified, occupied schools were prioritized for rehabilitation and for negotiations with the armed forces and armed groups to vacate school grounds. Negotiations that took place in the western part of the country were largely successful (see session on negotiations above) and only five schools are still occupied to date.

After the presentations, it was noted that other countries have policies for limiting the use of schools: Colombia, Nepal, Philippines (a law in 1992 and a potential new law that would make it a criminal offence punishable with jail time or a fine), oPt (MoE policy), and Iraq (academic asylum law). A concern raised by these presentations is that of accountability or enforcing these policies.

## *Political use of schools*

The panel presentations on the political use of schools explore the use of schools as polling stations and the extreme politicization of education that may result. Voting in schools is a common experience worldwide; however, it becomes a problem when elections are contentious and violence is directed at the role schools and teachers play in the election process. Two country-specific examples, Philippines and Zimbabwe, present strategies for trying to reduce the violence associated with the political use of schools in their respective country contexts.

## Philippines

In Philippines, the election code requires teachers to serve at election polls, as they are the only group of public servants in great enough numbers to serve as such. As a consequence, teachers and schools are susceptible to attacks by candidates and their supporters against opposition candidates and supporters nationwide. In response to the violence, police can be appointed as substitute pollsters for teachers in highly contested areas. In addition, military and police are posted at least 50m away from election sites, but can be moved closer for security reasons. Now, there is also a law for improved training of election officials and better monitoring and assessment of elections to minimize violence.



## Zimbabwe

In Zimbabwe, education is highly politicized. Beginning in 2000, teachers were accused of influencing the outcome of the election in which the opposition party first challenged the ruling party. Teachers became targets for attack by the ruling party and the youth militias, ‘ghost’ workers were planted in schools to report on teacher activities, and 70,000 teachers were forced to flee. The teachers’ union (PTUZ) documents incidents of violence and has conducted a national survey of teachers to use as an evidence base. They plan to take this evidence to Parliament and use it to advocate for a policy change that would promote and protect education institutions as politics-free zones. The situation in Zimbabwe is not that elections in schools are inherently bad, but that there is a crisis in governance, legitimacy, and rule of law.

In the discussion that followed the four presentations on both the military and the political use of schools, several issues were raised regarding policy change. The first is that more exploration is needed into the possible link between the military use of schools during conflict and the political use of schools during the non-conflict phase, in addition to how to address this link to implement better policy for both situations. Another issue is the lack of a strategy for engaging non-state actors who might not be bound by policy or legislation.

Regarding the creation of politics-free zones in schools, the point was raised that there are possible negative consequences of making schools politics-free, for example on the value of critical thinking, the practice of free speech, or the freedom to challenge authority. Also, neutralizing schools might prolong tension. In response, there are cases in which consideration for donors and parents requires schools to maintain neutrality. Also, several participants responded that it is possible to distinguish between political *instruction* and political *activism* in schools. Ultimately, participants were reminded of the need to be very specific about the focus of our efforts on the negative effects elections in schools have on education.

In closing, Mr. Sheppard noted that GCPEA is conducting research and gathering evidence on the military and political use of schools and intends to advocate on this issue by approaching authorities such as Ministries of Defense with this evidence.

## Session 8: Protecting higher education from attack

**FACILITATORS:** Mr. John Akker (Executive Secretary, Council for Assisting Refugee Academics (CARA)), Mr. Jim Miller (Executive Director, Scholar Rescue Fund)

**PANELISTS:** Dr. Yahya Al-Kubaisi (Researcher, Iraqi Center for Strategic Studies, Iraq), Dr. Alex Magaisa (Senior Lecturer in Law, Zimbabwe Diaspora Development Initiative (ZDDI)/CARA, Zimbabwe)

To introduce the session on protecting higher education, Mr. John Akker and Mr. Jim Miller summarized the work of three organizations responding to attacks on academics: Scholar Rescue Fund (SRF), Scholars at Risk (SAR), and the Council for Assisting Refugee Academics (CARA). These organizations provide support for the relocation of refugee academics and students, and for in-country programs in Iraq and Zimbabwe. SAR also supports the Academic Freedom and Advocacy Team (AFAT), a group of international researchers who monitor attacks, develop legal briefs, and advocate for the protection of higher education. Following this introduction, two academics from Iraq and Zimbabwe presented on the situation of attacks on higher education in their respective countries.

## **Iraq**

Since 2003, there have been many direct physical attacks on academics in Iraq, including over 400 assassinations to date. But the problem in higher education is not just these direct attacks. The problem is also indirect attacks, such as the politicization and control of the education system. To respond to the crisis, CARA is providing funding to scholars for research on this issue, both inside and outside the country.

## **Zimbabwe**

In Zimbabwe, academics abroad founded the Zimbabwe Diaspora Development Initiative (ZDDI) and partnered with CARA to conduct needs analysis in Zimbabwe and South Africa, where many academics are working in non-academic jobs. They provide grants to support research and created a virtual lecture theatre in Zimbabwe to bridge the gap caused by a lack of lecturers in the country.

Further discussion on protecting higher education held during an additional meeting on this topic revealed that the real needs in higher education are not well identified and documented. Historically, strategies to protect higher education have focused on individuals. There is now a need to look at higher education in the broader scope of attacks on education and how it links to other education institutions. GCPEA aims to start a network for higher education stakeholders, collect data, and develop strategies for more effective response. A survey was distributed to begin to gather information and make contacts in the field to this end.

## THEME 3: DEEPENING KNOWLEDGE OF PREVENTION

The three sessions under the theme of deepening knowledge of prevention examined systemic/ governmental changes in policy or curriculum that address the root causes of conflict. It also looked at advocacy strategies to bring about this type of change.

### Sessions 9 and 10: Conflict sensitive policy reform and curriculum reform

**FACILITATOR:** Ms. Margaret Sinclair (Technical Advisor, Education Above All)

**PRESENTER:** Dr. Alan Smith (Professor/UNESCO Chair, University of Northern Ireland, Ulster)

**PANELISTS:** Ms. Jennifer Rowell (Head of Advocacy, CARE International, Afghanistan), Mr. Deepak Sharma (Deputy Director General, Ministry of Education, Nepal), Ms. Andrea Berther (Regional Education Specialist – Emergencies, UNICEF, West and Central Africa Regional Office), Dr. Manish Thapa (Assistant Professor of Peace Studies, Tribhuvan University, Nepal), Ms. Sudarat Choovej (Save the Children, Thailand)

Dr. Alan Smith framed the issue of conflict sensitive education reform for sessions nine and ten. Over the past decade, three discourses have emerged around the issue of education and conflict: 1) a humanitarian response to education in conflict which addresses the symptoms of the conflict, 2) a conflict sensitive approach that analyzes the two faces of education (described below) in the context of the conflict, and 3) education as a part of peace-building efforts to address the causes of the conflict. These discourses have implications for national governments, donors, and development agencies in terms of positioning and framing of programs, agency capacity, anticipated results of interventions, and monitoring/ evaluation of programs. The challenge is that no organization is neutral; it is part of a political economy, which affects programming.

One of the two faces of education in conflict to consider is that it can be a part of the problem and contribute to cultural repression and segregation the denial of education can be used as a weapon of war; history and textbooks can be manipulated; attitudes of superiority can be inculcated; and these can have a particular impact on girls and minorities. Education institutions can promote separatism, assimilation, or integration.

Dr. Smith concluded with a checklist of factors for planning conflict sensitive education programming and reform:

Education governance and administration: centralized or decentralized, political interference in administration and appointments, accountability to students and parents

Access to education: distribution of types of schools (shared, separate, public, private)

Identity factors: gender, language, religion, ethnicity

Teaching and learning: school environment, curriculum, textbooks, pedagogy, assessment

Teachers: recruitment, training, deployment, ethics

Youth: Are they treated as risk to be pacified or as a resource to be engaged?

The final question to consider for promoting the positive face of education in conflict sensitive reform is whether programming is creating a negative peace, the absence of conflict; or a positive peace, the reform of structural inequalities that leads to conflict transformation.

Three of the panel presentations that followed focused on country-specific examples of conflict sensitive reform: policy in Nepal to improve access and inclusion, curriculum in Nepal to teach peace education, and

curriculum in Thailand for a pilot language program. The other two presentations from this session outline different approaches or strategies for reform that can apply in many different country contexts and can serve as guidelines for practitioners.

## **Nepal**

In Nepal, on the macro-level, the peace agreement of 2006 provided that children could not be part of any military force and that child victims of conflict have rights and privileges. There are policy measures within the Department of Education for conflict-affected children, such as access to scholarships and residential schools. There are also policy measures for reducing bias, such as quotas for female and marginalized persons in teacher training programs.

Curriculum has also been reformed to integrate peace education into textbooks at all grade levels. The development of the peace education curriculum was a participatory, multi-disciplinary, and multi-dimensional process that included policy integration, curriculum mapping across disciplines, capacity development, coordination between the MoE and NGOs, and the participation of many stakeholders. Some of the challenges of implementing the program are that schools still deal with corporal punishment that runs counter to the messages in the curriculum, teacher training has not been practically applied, and social studies is already an overloaded course.

## **Thailand**

In Southern Thailand, a mother-tongue bilingual education program has been piloted in several schools in the early grades, kindergarten and grade one, to introduce otherwise-marginalized students who do not speak Thai at home to literacy in their native Malay language. Mother-tongue instruction improves students' communication skills and serves as a bridge to later literacy development in the dominant Thai language. The program aims to improve literacy in both languages and provide students with greater access to opportunities.

## **Multiple countries**

A presentation by Ms. Jennifer Rowell outlined four different ways to think about policy engagement that apply in multiple country contexts. One approach is to create a policy that should exist, but doesn't yet, for example regulating community-based education in areas where the MoE cannot provide education services. Another approach is to improve a policy that already exists, such as improving the MRM database to collect more nuanced information. A third approach is to revoke a policy that does harm, such as prohibiting elections in schools. Finally, another approach is to implement a good policy that exists already, but is not being fully implemented, for example ensuring that school principals and SMCs are reporting attacks on education.

A presentation by Ms. Andrea Berther addressed the development of guidance notes for a conflict-Disaster Risk Reduction policy in the education sector to have a larger scale impact through the policy level. In the case of the West and Central Africa region, UNICEF is creating these guidelines to address the protection needs of schools and sustainability of programs. This goes beyond just rapid assessment to risk or vulnerability analysis as part of regular education sector diagnosis to identify how the education system can increase the resilience of the population. The policy includes plans for access, quality, and management.

## Session 11: Advocacy

**FACILITATOR:** Ms. Ita Sheehy (Senior Education Officer, UNHCR)

**PANELISTS:** Mr. Christopher Gunness (Spokesman/Head of Information and Advocacy, United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA), occupied Palestinian territory), Mr. Tarak Dhital (Programme Coordinator, Child Workers in Nepal Concerned Center (CWIN), Nepal), Ms. Maria Paula Calvo (Community Services Assistant, UNHCR, Colombia), Ms. Sandra Vargas (Legal Representative, Corporacion Casa Amazonia, Colombia)

The country-specific panel presentations in this session on focused on media use for advocacy in occupied Palestinian territory and Nepal, coalition building for advocacy in Nepal, and child rights advocacy in Colombia.

### Occupied Palestinian Territory

In oPt, the United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA) is running the “Don’t Demolish My Future!” campaign using social media to address the specific issue of school demolitions. The campaign started modestly so as not to incur any negative consequences, such as donors revoking funding due to the messaging. The guiding principles behind the campaign are to represent the community’s voice, to do no harm, and to involve the Palestinian Authority. Phase two of the campaign will involve tougher messaging to start in January when demolitions are expected to commence in response to recent Palestinian membership in UNESCO.

### Nepal

In Nepal, Child Workers in Nepal Concerned Center (CWIN) has developed partnerships with the media to promote awareness, create social pressure for adherence to codes of conduct, and provide information to the public. They work with modern media, folk media, and alternative media towards the goal of sensitizing people to the issue, not sensationalizing it. Nepal also has a successful coalition of child rights organizations, Children as Zones of Peace and Child Protection (CZOPP), to advocate for the protection of children.

### Colombia

In Colombia, UNHCR is working to train national armed forces in human rights and international humanitarian law and promote awareness of child protection issues. UNHCR programs also provide technical assistance to the Ministry of Education on fulfilling children’s right to education in conflict. A coalition of child protection organizations, the Coalition to Stop the Use of Child Soldiers (Coalico), works together to advocate for children’s rights in armed conflict.

In the discussion after the presentations, it was reiterated that when advocating, the tone of the messaging is important to consider in terms of risks and consequences, such as having funding revoked or getting an organization banned from a country. One strategy suggested is to partner with other actors who can make stronger messages with less risk of negative backlash.



## THEME 4: MOVING THE AGENDA FORWARD

### Session 12: Program evaluation

**FACILITATOR:** Dr. Lori Heninger (Director, INEE)

**PRESENTER:** Dr. Carolyne Ashton (Evaluator, Search for Common Ground)

A session on program evaluation was included in the Roundtable because evaluation promotes good practice, provides information to program managers about what works and doesn't work, ensures that programmatic interventions do not harm, and provides evidence to donors of program effectiveness. Furthermore, since one of the GCPEA goals is to promote evidence-based programmatic measures to protect education from attack, GCPEA wants to encourage program evaluation among field-based practitioners in order to collect and disseminate data on what works in a range of countries and contexts.

One important principle of program evaluation is that it should be localized and contextualized. When done well, it provides important lessons learned and contributes to program improvement. Planning for quality evaluation should start during the program design stage, allow for the collection of baseline data, define measurable goals and objectives of the program, and identify clear indicators to be used to measure progress. During the session, participants were given time in small groups to practice writing objectives, goals, and defining indicators. For the complete guidelines for program evaluation addressed in the session, see Annex Two: Guidelines for Program Evaluation.

### Session 13: Monitoring and reporting

**FACILITATOR:** Ms. Zama Coursen-Neff (Deputy Director, Children's Rights Division, Human Rights Watch)

**PANELISTS:** Ms. Jennifer Hofmann (Education Specialist, UNICEF, Ivory Coast), Ms. Marina Partier (Education Programme Specialist, UNESCO Ramallah Office, occupied Palestinian territory) via Skype, Ms. Hiba Qaraman (Documentation and Communication Coordinator, Save the Children UK, occupied Palestinian territory), Mr. Matt Finch (Advocacy Coordinator, Karen Human Rights Group, Myanmar)

Ms. Zama Coursen-Neff opened the session with an anecdote about her own work researching attacks on education in Afghanistan in 2006. At that time, an attack on a girls' school that police had been using as a base was not recorded as an attack on education because the building was being used for a different purpose. This incident is now recognized as a missed opportunity to report on the occupation of the school and subsequent attack. The session that followed explored what monitoring is, how it can be used, who does it, and the challenges/gaps in current practices of monitoring and reporting. A clear distinction was made between evaluating programs (as discussed in the previous session), and monitoring and reporting actual attacks on education.

***What is monitoring and reporting?*** Monitoring is the systematic collection of information that is ongoing and standardized. For attacks on education, it can be done formally through the UN Security Council Resolution 1612 monitoring and reporting mechanism (MRM), through 'snapshots' such as the reports generated by an organization like Human Rights Watch, through sustained and ongoing monitoring by think tanks and governments, or through another type of informal monitoring mechanism. Monitoring of attacks on education helps us to see how much of the picture we are capturing and how much we are missing. Reporting is the sharing of the information collected, although not necessarily in public, and must be done in a timely enough period to be useful.

**Who monitors and reports and why?** Governments are important monitors of attacks on education, but in some cases they are too weak or unwilling. Monitoring can also be done by NGOs and civil society organizations, although sometimes security is a risk. Human rights groups and the media also report on attacks, but may lack the capacity for response. Finally, UN agencies are mandated to report in situations of concern, and outside of the UN 1612 MRM, do not need government consent to do so. The information collected through both formal and informal monitoring can be used for many purposes. Data can be analyzed and used for early warning, for prevention of violations like child recruitment, for action to produce change, for negotiations, for rapid response in the field, or for accountability in a court of law. The desired action should help inform what type of information is collected.

**What are the gaps and challenges?** The formal UN 1612 MRM reports on six grave violations of children in situations of armed conflict.<sup>2</sup> The MRM reporting process was expanded recently through UNSC Resolution 1998 (2011) to include attacks on schools and ‘protected persons’ as a trigger to initiate the MRM mechanism in a country, and also to require reporting on the military use of schools. Despite this progress, gaps and challenges remain. For example, there is still a challenge of linking monitoring of attacks, whether formal or informal, to response. There also remains a gap in the lack of monitoring in higher education. Finally, there are logistical and ethical challenges to monitoring and reporting.<sup>3</sup> The INEE Minimum Standards recommend that when attacks on education do occur, they should be confidentially documented and reported.<sup>4</sup> Monitors should adhere to the humanitarian principles of ‘do no harm’, impartiality, dignity, non-discrimination, and the obligation to act.

Moving forward, there is a need to strengthen monitoring practices in the field, and improve coordination and global monitoring. Country-specific presentations in this session provided examples of both informal and formal monitoring and the linking of monitoring to action in oPt, Ivory Coast, and Myanmar.

## Occupied Palestinian Territory

In oPt, a working group on grave violations against children developed a reporting process and built an evidence database that can be analyzed by region or by perpetrator. The data informs responses that are made according to an established inter-cluster response framework. Also in oPt, schools identified as most vulnerable through the monitoring process implemented a pilot conflict Disaster Risk Reduction (cDRR) program to make them safer. This program includes capacity building in monitoring and reporting and the creation of an SMS system for security updates, early warning, data collection through surveys, and improved communication.

## Ivory Coast

In the Ivory Coast, the education cluster has developed a standardized tool and uses an informal network of education stakeholders to monitor and report on attacks against education. Information is logged into a database that categorizes attacks based on the categories listed in the UNESCO report *Education Under Attack*.<sup>5</sup> Information is used for advocacy with the Ministries of Education and Defense, is shared with appropriate agencies and organizations for action, and is published in bimonthly reports. The Ivory Coast has been delisted from the formal UN 1612 MRM, but the task force is still present and monitoring continues.

<sup>2</sup> The six grave violations are: recruitment or using children as soldiers, killing and maiming, attacks on schools or hospitals, rape or other grave sexual violence, abduction, denial of humanitarian access.

<sup>3</sup> See ICRC, *Professional Standards for Protection Work Carried Out by Humanitarian and Human Rights Actors in Armed Conflict and Other Situations of Violence*, 2009, <http://www.icrc.org/eng/resources/documents/publication/p0999.htm>.

<sup>4</sup> INEE, *Minimum Standards for Education: Preparedness, Response, Recovery*, 2010, p. 63.

<sup>5</sup> UNESCO, *Education Under Attack*, 2010, <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0018/001868/186809e.pdf>.

## Myanmar

In Myanmar, there are two monitoring bodies: one in Myanmar and one in refugee camps along the Thai border. The Karen Human Rights Group (KHRG) trains people in the Karen community on data collection using a standardized format. Data is also fed into the formal UN 1612 MRM. However, discrepancy in reporting between different sources (UN 1612 MRM, KHRG, Amnesty International, etc) remains a challenge. In situations where the state restricts access, GCPEA can play a role in improved monitoring and reporting.

The discussion that followed the panel presentations focused on ways to expand and improve monitoring and reporting. In some contexts, there is a problem of underreporting of violations in situations where they have become frequent and therefore “normalized” occurrences. Greater clarity on the definition of “attack on education” would help with recognizing, monitoring, and reporting attacks in a more standardized way. There is also a need for a mechanism for monitoring attacks in non-conflict settings (post-conflict, political violence). Participants also cautioned against bias in both reporting and verifying reports. Finally, participants posed the question of what role GCPEA could play in contexts where the state restricts access, is a perpetrator, or doesn’t want attention drawn to the issue of attacks on education within its borders.

## Session 14: Global database and networking

**FACILITATORS:** Mr. John Gregg (Director, Education Above All), Ms. Zama Coursen-Neff (Deputy Director, Children’s Rights Division, Human Rights Watch), Dr. Lori Heninger (Director, INEE)

To move the agenda forward, participants shared in plenary format their expectations and needs of GCPEA:

- Participants expressed the need to standardize and solidify a **clear definition** of “attack on education.”
- Participants feel GCPEA should also facilitate **networking** and provide practical information, such as where to find an evaluator. Participants also expressed the need for an interactive website and the use of social media.
- Similarly, there is an expectation for **information sharing**. This includes a database on attacks, impacts of attacks, and responses, as well as systematic sharing of lessons learned and successes in responding. One participant suggested appointing a focal point in each country that would report periodically to GCPEA. Another suggested creating regional groups or groups among countries with similar types of attacks.
- The need for engagement and information sharing should also extend beyond the education sector, so that members attend events in other sectors and share publications.
- Participants also desire **leadership** in the field. For some, this means support and protection from GCPEA, and advocacy support in areas where locals do not have access. Participants also hope that GCPEA will be able to channel funds, so that other organizations do not need to continuously prove that protecting education from attacks deserves funding.
- Others also expect **common resources and tools**. This includes the evidence base, but also the development of guidance notes and standards. For some, there is a desire to create a common advocacy goal and/or research question for the year that all members would be able to promote, investigate, and report back.

## Session 15: Country summaries – priorities and challenges

By the end of the Roundtable, country participants had identified priorities for action and major gaps or challenges to program implementation.

COUNTRY	PRIORITIES	GAPS AND CHALLENGES
<b>Afghanistan</b>	Monitoring; capturing information on protection issues in schools	Difficult to get people to report and talk honestly about attacks
<b>Central African Republic</b>	Ensuring continuity of quality education projects in conflict-affected areas through integration of cDRR into education sector policies and curricula, capacity development of teachers and education personnel (including community and bush schools), and advocacy with education partners, donors, and decision makers on importance of education in remote and conflict-affected areas	Split between conflict and non-conflict areas with lack of services in conflict-affected areas, “donor fatigue,” weak education system, lack of coordination between education partners (linkages between development and humanitarian partners)
<b>Colombia</b>	Strengthen monitoring; help create public policy with participation of children and youth; real implementation of policy	Lack of local capacity of responsible institutions; lack of technical assistance
<b>Democratic Republic of Congo</b>	Monitoring and analyzing of data; more coordination between protection and education clusters	Insecurity
<b>India</b>	Building partnerships with community-based organizations	Documentation and evidence building
<b>Iraq</b>	Depoliticize education system	Data and documentation; relationships with international universities
<b>Ivory Coast</b>	Bring together practitioners, professionals, and researchers to work on national policy and legal provisions that government, armed forces, and non-state actors need to abide by; create national level group to work on this, report back to GCPEA, and get feedback from GCPEA; ensure continuity of schooling	Lack of community involvement in protection of schools

COUNTRY	PRIORITIES	GAPS AND CHALLENGES
<b>Myanmar</b>	Ensure that the next SRSG report includes accurate info about attacks on education; expand the definition of attacks on education; empower communities to encourage parties to conflict to prioritize education	Attacks not accurately reported; parties to conflict do not prioritize education
<b>Nepal</b>	Intervention and corrective measures; community involvement, empowerment, and mobilization for meaningful participation; involve different actors (national and international)	Policy implementation; addressing misunderstandings between government and NGOs; lack of capacity on children's issues and education issues at the local level
<b>Occupied Palestinian territory</b>	Advocacy on attacks in refugee camps; relocation plan in January – visibility; abolish emergency responses by resolving root causes	Accountability
<b>Pakistan</b>	Share outcomes of Roundtable with team and plan for the future; use available funds to do research and seek technical support from academics; look at causes of attacks	
<b>Philippines</b>	Utilize information learned nationwide and include on national level in Department of Education; share this with GCPEA	
<b>Sri Lanka</b>	Education and child protection sectors need to work together to monitor attacks	
<b>Zimbabwe</b>	Raise more funds on higher education; partnerships on programs already involved in	Raising funds



There are some common priorities for action that run across countries. For example, many countries listed the need for more community involvement. Also, there is a common priority in several cases for better communication between the education and child protection sectors. Finally, there is a priority in many countries for improved data collection. The need for better communication, information sharing, and data collection, and the potential role of GCPEA in supporting these initiatives is addressed further in the following two sessions.

## Session 16: Prioritizing the research agenda

**FACILITATOR:** Dr. Lori Heninger (Director, INEE)

**PANELISTS:** Dr. Dana Burde (Associate Professor of International Education, New York University), Ms. Amy Kapit-Spitalny (Doctoral Candidate/Researcher, New York University), Ms. Jennifer Rowell (Head of Advocacy, CARE International, Afghanistan)

In her opening remarks for this session, Dr. Lori Heninger shared a story about refugees in camps in Chad who, despite losing everything, prioritized education services as among their top three needs. The challenge, however, was providing *evidence* to donors that education programs were worthwhile. INEE has developed a strategic research agenda to gather such evidence and similarly, GCPEA needs to create a research agenda specific to the needs of the Coalition.

Dr. Dana Burde and Ms. Amy Kapit-Spitalny led the participants in an interactive session to prioritize the research agenda for programmatic responses to attacks on education. In addition to quality program evaluation, there is also a need for research in the field of attacks on education that goes beyond our current knowledge base of anecdotal case examples or hypotheses drawn from looking at patterns of attacks. Practitioners increasingly need evidence-based research, for example, data confirming that attendance drops with increasing distance from schools. At the same time, academics are increasingly interested in applied research, creating the opportunity for more partnerships between NGOs/ international agencies and academics. Quality research will lead to improved program implementation, better advocacy, and more funding from donors. Funding to do this type of research exists from foundations, national institutes, private donors, and many other resources that differ from funding sources for program implementation.

During the session, participants first brainstormed **what we think we already know** from the last few days regarding attacks on education:

- Community-based schools protect education because they are situated in a home.
- Responses differ if the perpetrator is a state or a non-state party.
- Military occupation has negative consequences on access and quality in the short-term.
- Education is targeted in almost all countries affected by conflict and in some post-conflict situations.
- Attacks on education take various forms; they affect infrastructure, personnel, and less visible processes.
- Credible threats have serious consequences for education.
- Attacks are symptoms of conflict, not necessarily causes (but in some cases the causal arrow can go both ways.)
- Attacks on higher education have a profound effect on other levels of schooling.

- Attacks might be similar, but social dynamics and context differ.
- There are some areas where it is difficult to intervene.
- There is a link between gender and attacks in some places.
- There are three different types of attacks: by state actors, by non-state actors, by collateral damage; they require different responses.
- Community involvement can make schools more resilient; strong management can make schools less vulnerable.
- In Colombia, attacks are related to forced recruitment.
- In cases where the state is the perpetrator, international response is less likely; advocacy is more important in these situations.
- Policy exists in some cases, but is not effectively implemented.
- Violence also happens within classrooms.
- Economic well-being, economic disparity, livelihoods, and survival influence attacks.
- There are limits to what communities can do, especially when powerful states are involved.

Next, participants brainstormed **what we need to know** about attacks on education in order to prioritize the research agenda. Suggestions are loosely organized here under the categories of attacks, impact of attacks, response, and use of evidence.

## ***WHAT WE NEED TO KNOW***

### **Attacks**

---

- Specific motives behind attacks
- Scope of attacks on education internationally (commonality, circumstances, etc.)
- Link between political and military use of schools
- Why we have a good understanding of attacks on education in some places, but not others, and where
- Strong definition of attacks on education

### **Impact of attacks**

---

- Long-term effects of military occupation on education
- Which motives have more severe consequences for education
- How attacks on education affect other forms of development assistance
- How attacks in one area affect schools in another area

---

## Response

---

- How education in exile can promote education in affected areas
- How to stop ideologically motivated attacks
- How to provide sustainable, quality education in these difficult circumstances
- How to mitigate indirect fear/”chilling effect” on education
- If community-based schools transfer risks or put children at different risk
- How alternative delivery affects nation building
- Tracking data on how well governments are implementing policies
- Impact of UN MRM in terms of prevention, protection, and response

---

## Use of evidence

---

- Best process to distribute information; how to horizontally share information
- How communities can use information
- How to brand these issues

During the session, a country-specific research proposal was presented from the Afghanistan context as an example of how to use existing knowledge to frame a research question that addresses gaps in knowledge. The MoE in Afghanistan has collected data on attacks on education, but there is still no information on school affiliations and attacks. The researchers plan to revisit the database and conduct a quantitative analysis to determine if who builds, runs, or is otherwise affiliated with a school has an effect on attacks. The researchers are also planning a qualitative review to understand how community involvement might protect schools. Finally, researchers will conduct a quantitative review of how elections and the location of polling stations in schools might affect attacks on education. These three questions will help provide evidence to inform policy and programming in the future.

For more information on the prioritizing the research agenda see Annex 1: Prioritizing the Agenda for Research.

## CLOSING: GCPEA: THE WAY FORWARD

GCPEA will continue to support evidence-based programmatic responses through data collection and information sharing. *The Study on Programmatic Measures to Protect Education from Attack* that will synthesize findings from this Roundtable meeting is a starting point. Next steps to consider are developing a monitoring and reporting framework, standardizing methods for collecting information, and defining terms in the field. Also of importance is ensuring the safety of people who conduct monitoring and reporting.

While GCPEA is still defining its role and developing its advocacy strategies, the coalition will continue to work towards promoting improved programmatic responses and greater accountability for attacks on education. In 2012, a study on the military use of schools will be used to advocate for new policy.

As GCPEA builds relationships with individuals and organizations, the secretariat encourages organizations to join the coalition as affiliates and individuals to work together towards protecting education from attack.

Participants were asked to respond to questions regarding what they will do as a result of the Roundtable and what suggestions they have regarding GCPEA's role in ongoing information sharing and advocacy. The following is a summary of the categories of participant responses:

1. Next steps at country level
  - Share information and create/strengthen partnerships with other agencies
  - Implement/improve monitoring and reporting of attacks on education
  - Implement programs, analysis and advocacy
  - Continue a relationship with GCPEA in ways ranging from joining as affiliated organization, engaging in joint advocacy, creating regional networks
2. Suggestions for GCPEA role in information management and sharing
  - Facilitate information sharing across countries
  - Establish global network/information sharing between GCPEA and affected countries
  - Create database/clearinghouse/provide technical support
  - Research
  - Coordinate monitoring and reporting
3. Suggestions for GCPEA role in advocacy to protect education from attack (examples of responses)
  - Country level: increase effort to influence government political forces; support training and initiatives for armed groups; provide inputs on advocacy that can be adopted by country; support members; technical support; capacity building
  - Global level: Advocacy at UN; public information to ensure that media are covering attacks on education; highlight issues at global level; advocacy with external actors (legal, military, peace-building, media); support those advocating in-country by providing greater visibility; increase GCPEA clout so that it can interact at government level where local NGOs may not have access; establishment of key messages for different contexts and topics (global/regional/country)

# ANNEX 1

## Prioritizing the Agenda for Research for the Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack: Why Evidence is Important, What We Know, and How to Learn More

AMY KAPIT-SPITALNY, *New York University*

DANA BURDE, *New York University*

### Introduction and Overview

The Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack (GCPEA) was launched in February 2010 to advocate for greater legal, institutional, and programmatic protection of education from violent attacks. It consists of a steering group of organizations involved in providing support to education in countries affected by conflict around the world [Council for Assisting Refugee Academics, Education Above All, Education International, Human Rights Watch, Save the Children International, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), and United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF)]. As part of its efforts to both learn from and educate practitioners about this phenomenon as well as to advance advocacy on the subject, GCPEA, in partnership with the Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE), organized a “Knowledge Roundtable” that took place in Phuket, Thailand from November 7-11, 2011. Participants included representatives from governments, local nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), international NGOs, and United Nations (UN) agencies from 14 countries affected by conflict around the world.

Research is integral to the work of GCPEA and its member organizations. In order to develop its research agenda, GCPEA asked us, two academics from New York University who study issues related to violence against education, to participate in its Knowledge Roundtable meeting. We were asked to collect data from presentations during the meeting about patterns of attacks on education: how participants and their organizations address these attacks, what they know about what works in their responses, and what they still need to know. Thus, we served as participant-observers during the Knowledge Roundtable.

This paper records the information we learned. It proceeds in the following way. The first two sections present a rationale for research and a survey of what we know to date from the available literature. The third section presents key information that we gathered from the participants in the meeting during their presentations, and additional information that we elicited from participants during our public presentation in response to two questions: (1) what do we know (about protecting education from attack), and (2) what do we still need to know. The fourth section relies on a research proposal from Jennifer Rowell, Head of Advocacy CARE, Afghanistan, to show how an NGO can initiate a research project. The fifth section illustrates the power of partnerships between NGOs and academics, using a research project on community-based schools in Afghanistan as an example (Burde and Linden, 2011). The final section concludes with observations about funding and frameworks for moving forward.

### Putting Research in Perspective

“Research” is a broad term that encompasses many different types of studies. It can inform programming in a variety of ways, such as, perhaps most apparently, through evaluation. Evaluations are a distinct type of

research, which typically focus on a particular programmatic intervention with the goal of assessing whether it has been successful or unsuccessful in improving a situation. However, evaluations are only a subset of the broader category of research. The types of questions that evaluations ask are often limited to those about program process and performance or comparisons that look at “before versus after,” or “intervention versus non-intervention”. For example, is a school less frequently targeted for attack after a particular intervention than before it took place? Or is a school less frequently targeted for attack in this location, which has received an intervention, than this other location, which has not received the same intervention? In contrast, the full category of research asks a wider array of questions. These can include, but are not limited to, questions about the attributes of a phenomenon (e.g. what types of attacks on education occur in this location, and do they differ from the types of attacks that occur in another location), why a phenomenon occurs (e.g. what are the main motivations behind attacks on education), the intervening factors that may make a phenomenon more or less likely (e.g. what social, economic, cultural, or contextual factors make attacks on education more likely in one locale than in another), or the impact of a phenomenon on society (e.g. what is the impact of attacks on education on school attendance, retention, or outcomes, or socioeconomic indicators).

Research is important and can shape programming, even when not directly assessing it. Indeed, understanding the problem, or phenomenon of interest, including the external factors influencing it, is a crucial first step in collecting robust evidence for any research question or goal, including programmatic intervention. In order to prevent, respond to, or limit the impact of attacks on education, therefore, we first need to understand what the problem is and the many dimensions that may influence how best to address it. Among these dimensions, it is important to understand the kind of conflict that is creating the attacks. First, a conflict may be inter-state (international) or intra-state (civil), and it may have ethnic, linguistic, religious, ideological, or even criminal dimensions. Importantly these dimensions may be of varying degrees of significance even across a single conflict setting. Second, it is important to understand what kinds of attacks on education occur (e.g., arson targeting school buildings, assassinations targeting teachers) and how they can be categorized. Third, once attacks are categorized, they can be sorted systematically in order to determine which kind is the most common (prevalence), and what range of possible attacks exists (variation). Fourth, it is critical to understand and measure how attacks affect education.

Collecting evidence on these aspects of attacks and on how they vary across conflict settings or within a single conflict is critical for programming since these factors determine what kinds of responses work, for which kinds of attacks, and in what settings. For example, an organization may believe that the perpetrators of attacks on education in a particular setting are motivated by opposition to foreign forces on their soil, and, therefore, may address the problem by removing all traces of association between a school and a foreign government. However, it may actually be the case that attacks on education in that setting are motivated by criminal or economic purposes. In that case, the solution implemented would not address the problem, and attacks on education would continue. Similarly, it is important to gather data on how attacks affect education in order to design interventions that effectively address their impact.

Robust research, therefore, helps us collect evidence that guides program choices. It helps us (1) understand the problem (attacks on education) and (2) show how that problem can be addressed (e.g. negotiations, alternative delivery, witnessing, etc.). And it allows us to (3) understand the impact of the problem and (4) show how that impact can be addressed. Research is also important to implementing organizations for other reasons. Organizations and funders increasingly seek evidence-based research in order to demonstrate program impact and effectiveness. Having this evidence can help secure funding and ensure the longevity and continued success of programs. Evidence and data on attacks can also be used to respond through advocacy, which may also help reduce the occurrence of attacks on education.

Thus, without evidence on the dimensions described above, practitioners are not able to respond, advocate, or fundraise as effectively as they would like to do. Yet, not all evidence is equal. Evidence carries different levels of authority depending on the way it is gathered. As is raised in the next sections, evidence may be anecdotal, case-based, or systematic and cross-contextual. The type of evidence and how it is gathered (e.g. qualitatively or quantitatively) has important implications for the robustness and generalizability of the data. The next section reviews the existing literature for what we know to date about how to protect education from attack, and the type of evidence that we have.

### **A Review of Existing Research on Programmatic Measures for Protecting Education from Attack**

Perhaps because attention to the problem of attacks on education is relatively recent, there exists very little research on what types of programmatic interventions most effectively protect education in which settings, why and how. To date, the only study explicitly examining this issue has come from CARE (Glad, 2009; Rowell, 2011).

#### **EXISTING KNOWLEDGE**

In the absence of rigorous and empirical research on programs for protecting education, suggestions for program responses to protect education are predominantly based on one of the two following types of inquiry.

*(1) Anecdotal evidence about measures that have prevented or mitigated attacks on education in particular circumstances:* The most common source of information on programs that may protect education is anecdotal evidence drawn from case studies or examples of interventions that have been effective in specific settings. Indeed, Groneman (2010; 2011)'s desk studies of programmatic measures for protecting education draw primarily on anecdotal cases of protection mechanisms that have worked in different locations. One example of this type of work is Smith (2010), who examines in detail the “School as Zones of Peace” campaigns in Nepal, during which negotiations between community representatives and armed factions largely eliminated attacks on schools in that context.

*(2) Hypotheses drawn from existing data about patterns of attacks in different locales:* A second source of information regarding measures protecting education comes from empirically grounded, but hypothetical, arguments. Despite the identified need for additional research into the prevalence, nature, and reasons for attacks on education (UNESCO, 2010), there is existing data from various sources on the types of attacks that occur worldwide. These include, but are not limited to, UNESCO's global surveys of violence against schools, learners, and education personnel (O'Malley, 2007; 2010), INGO reports (e.g. Human Rights Watch (HRW), 2006; 2009; 2010a; 2010b; Jarecki & Kaisth, 2009), and data drawn from global reporting processes like the Monitoring and Reporting Mechanism on Grave Violations against Children, which is active in conflict-affected countries. Based on these resources, as well as knowledge about the education and social effects of particular education interventions, some researchers have theorized how such programs might help protect education. A good example of this work is Burde (2010), who draws on data on violence directed towards education in Afghanistan and findings on community-based schools to make conjectures about how and why these schools may be less likely to experience attack than other types of schools. She hypothesizes that community-based schools may help reduce attacks on education for several reasons: a lack of school-specific infrastructure provides less of a target; their location in the center of a village means that, in contrast to traditional government schools in Afghanistan, outsiders have more difficulty reaching a school to attack; a stronger sense of community ownership leads to increased community participation in protection; and the fact that students do not have to travel long distances to school reduces the risk that they will face attack.



## PROGRAMMATIC INTERVENTIONS FOR PROTECTING EDUCATION

Among the programmatic interventions most commonly suggested for protecting education are: (1) community-based mechanisms and community engagement, (2) negotiations with armed groups, (3) physical protection, and (4) awareness raising and curricular measures. Below we examine the extent and quality of the existing evidence on how effective these programs are, and in what circumstances.

### *Community-based Mechanisms and Community Engagement*

Practitioners suggest a wide range of community-based mechanisms for protecting education. In their reviews of programmatic protective measures, Groneman (2010; 2011) and O'Malley (2010) list several that have been used in different settings. These include: community participation in educational planning and oversight through school management committees (SMCs) and parent-teacher associations (PTAs), community involvement in school/education defense, and children's clubs. Other proposed interventions are community-based schools (Glad, 2009; Burde, 2010) or teacher, parent, and community trainings in skills like first aid and emergency and disaster preparedness (UNESCO, 2011). Finally, communities may also have developed their own coping strategies that humanitarian actors may learn from and help cultivate (Groneman, 2011).

In general, these community-based mechanisms are the best researched of the commonly suggested interventions for protecting education. This is largely due to research previously produced and currently proposed by CARE. In 2009, CARE conducted a study of attack on education in Afghanistan and mechanisms for increasing educational protection (Glad, 2009). The study involved a review and analysis of Ministry of Education and UNICEF databases tracking attacks, interviews with education stakeholders, and a field study including Ministry of Education officials, police officers, education personnel, and parents. As the author points out, much of the research on mechanisms protecting education was based on interviews with local community members. As a result, the study was unable to objectively determine how different forms of community participation may prevent or mitigate attacks. Nevertheless, one of its key conclusions is that education may be better protected when its administration is decentralized, particularly since patterns of attacks tend to be localized. This conclusion was supported by interviewees, most of whom contended that protection of schooling is primarily the responsibility of the local community. Glad further explains, "Protecting schools using too centralized an approach could be not only an ineffective use of resources (for example, offering negotiation training in those communities where no contact with attackers exist), but in some cases even detrimental (putting a police station close to a school in an area where the police themselves are a chief target)" (p. 53).

More specifically, different community-based interventions have been studied in terms of their potential for protecting education to varying degrees:

**SCHOOL COMMITTEES:** There has been some research on the effectiveness of school committees, including parent-teacher associations, management committees, or school protection committees, set up to nonviolently prevent attacks or negotiate with potential attackers (negotiation with armed groups will be discussed in more detail below). Such committees are widely used in places like Afghanistan, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Nepal, and Somalia, and Burde (2010) suggests one way in that such committees may protect education: through what she calls the "witnessing effect." Increased participation in school planning and oversight may cause parents and other community members to feel a greater sense of ownership over the school, leading to a more protective environment. Additionally, there is evidence that these committees may reduce violence and have a positive impact on social outcomes in general. In Nepal, school management committees were found to result in greater transparency, improved governance, and conflict resolution in schools. In Somalia, Community Education Committees reportedly reduced the influence of one armed group in some schools (Groneman, 2011). Nevertheless, the findings on the success of such committees specifically in mitigating attacks on education are

mixed. The 2009 CARE study found anecdotal cases where these groups had been successful in preventing attacks. However, the majority of respondents (87%) did not believe such committees had been effective. Although this evidence is largely anecdotal, in 2012, CARE will undertake further and more systematic research to identify how, when, and why school protection committees may protect education in Afghanistan (Rowell, 2011).

**COMMUNITY-BASED SCHOOLS:** The evidence on the role of community-based schools in preventing attacks on education indicates that the effectiveness of this intervention is highly context-specific. For instance, findings from the CARE 2009 study suggest that, in Afghanistan community-based and NGO-run schools may be less susceptible to attack than other types of schools, such as those run by the government. Although CARE found that the datasets were incomplete, MOE and UNICEF data indicated that community-based schools are attacked less frequently. Glad suggests several possibilities for why: these schools are less visible, they are not run by the state (an important factor when that attackers' intent is to attack the government), and they have stronger and more proximate security mechanisms. Similarly, as mentioned above, Burde (2010) hypothesizes that community-based schools are less likely to come under attack because they tend to be more likely to have school management committees and tend to be located centrally within the community. However, in other contexts, such as in Nepal, community-based schools have been specifically targeted for attack (Smith, 2010). These conflicting findings indicate that the type of violence and the motivations of the attacks are important factors to determine whether community-based schools are sufficiently protective. Relatedly, who is supporting the school—and how public that support is—may matter. CARE's 2012 research in Afghanistan is addressing these questions more comprehensively. The new study will look at how external actors, including NGOs, affect attack rates and how protective government supported community-based education is compared to that which is NGO-run (Rowell, 2011).

**CHILDREN'S CLUBS:** No systematic research has been undertaken to examine whether and how children's clubs may help protect education. There are some examples of children's clubs confronting armed groups to prevent recruitment and ensure that schools and passage to schools remain protected (Groneman, 2010). However, it is unclear the extent to which these efforts have been successful.

**COOPERATION WITH RELIGIOUS LEADERS:** In addition to cooperating with parents, some organizations have also reported increased levels of success for their interventions when they cooperate with religious leaders. For example, in Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Somalia, religious leaders have engaged in advocacy about the importance of education and school attendance (Groneman, 2011). There is no data, however, on the extent to which the involvement of these leaders has made a difference in protecting education, or whether the potential impact of religious leaders may differ in varied contexts.

**COMMUNITY COPING MECHANISMS:** In addition to programs provided by local and international organizations, communities may also develop their own mechanisms for coping with attacks on education. For instance, in Myanmar/Burma, where international actors have been limited in their ability to implement programming, local organizations and communities have developed systems for monitoring, negotiating with armed groups, and providing physical protection. Similarly, in Zimbabwe, student and community members formed their own committees to protect education (Groneman, 2011). Based on initial research, organizations could further develop the mechanisms local communities already have in place. For example, in Gaza, UNESCO has built on the activities of parents who would call teachers in the morning to ensure that the route to school was safe. UNESCO has now set up an SMS system for alerting parents, teachers, students, government officials, and responding organizations when an incident occurs (UNESCO, 2011). It is unclear, however, whether these community-initiated activities are more, less, or equally effective in comparison to those initiated by humanitarian organizations.

## ***Negotiations with Armed Groups***

Negotiation with armed groups is a second commonly suggested programmatic intervention for protecting education. Such negotiations may be taken up by different actors, including in the central government, regional or district governments, or at the community level. Doing so may involve simple negotiations between individual communities and potential attackers, talks leading to painting schools with a particular symbol, or color, or the negotiation of codes of conduct surrounding schools and education (Groneman, 2010; O'Malley, 2010). As described below, most evidence on negotiations is case-based and/or anecdotal, rather than systematic and comparative.

**COMMUNITY NEGOTIATIONS:** There are several cases of communities reportedly successfully negotiating with armed groups to protect education, either individually or on a large scale. For instance, the CARE study found that, in Afghanistan, there were several instances of community leaders engaging in dialogue with potential attackers, although they found that interviewees' reported success was more likely when the community was familiar with the armed groups (Glad, 2009). On a more systemic scale, Smith (2010) gives case study evidence from the "Schools as Zones of Peace" initiative in Nepal, where the organization World Education engaged community partners, including civil society, NGOs, and community-based organizations to facilitate the negotiation of codes of conduct with Maoist groups who were attacking schools in Nepal. Importantly, World Education found that engaging at the community level was more effective in this case. When they first attempted to engage government officials in negotiations, they found that this created too much conflict and contention with the Maoists. In interviews, teachers and community members reported an increased sense of safety and security in schools (Smith, 2010).

**GOVERNMENT NEGOTIATIONS:** There are also case examples of successful negotiations between different levels of government officials and armed groups. One interesting case, again, is Nepal. Smith (2010) writes that, following the 2006 Peace Accord, unrest in Terai district again began targeting schools. This time, a Schools as Zones of Peace campaign took place at the national and district levels. Whereas previously, during the insurgency, it had been impossible to engage government officials, this time, "When partners attempted to negotiate school level codes of conduct, local leaders would not sign until they had a clear commitment from the central and district levels," and district leaders would not sign until national leaders had (Smith, 2010, p. 273). There have also been negotiations between the state and armed groups in Afghanistan, where the Ministry of Education agreed to a more religious curriculum and the hiring of mullahs as teachers in exchange for the Taliban ending attacks on schools (Groomsman, 2010; O'Malley, 2010). However, it is unclear the extent to which these negotiations have been successful and there have been some questions about negative unintended consequences in terms of girls' education (Borger, 2011).

## ***Physical Protection***

A variety of physical protection measures are commonly suggested for protecting education from attack. Among these, Groneman (2010) lists: reinforcing of school infrastructure, using materials like sandbags to catch ricocheting bullets, building fences or walls around schools, providing school guards, escorts for transportation or other protective presence by security forces or third parties, provision of school buses, arming of teachers, and construction of on-campus housing. Another commonly suggested protective measure is the provision of alternative school sites. In addition, one of the most commonly cited measures for responding to attacks on academics and other higher education personnel is physical relocation to another country (Jarecki & Kaisth, 2009). As in other cases, the evidence supporting the use of physical protection consists of anecdotal reports. Although physical protection interventions are often assumed to be useful in preventing attacks on education, these examples show inconclusive, and sometimes even unsuccessful, outcomes.

**SCHOOL ESCORTS OR ARMED GUARDS:** School escorts or vehicles have been provided to protect teachers and students en route to school in Afghanistan, Columbia, the occupied Palestinian territory (oPt), and Thailand (Groneman, 2010; 2011). In Afghanistan and Columbia, there is no evidence on the impact of this intervention. In the oPt and Thailand, however, there is evidence that these interventions have been either ineffective or have had unintended consequences. In the oPt, there is case study evidence that military escorts have not prevented settler harassment of students, and, in some cases, have actually played a role in harassment themselves (CPT & Operation Dove, 2009). In Thailand, evidence shows that the presence of police or security force guards at schools and as escorts may just shift the target of violence. O'Malley (2010) points out that, after soldiers were posted at schools in 2007, the number of school arsons fell dramatically, but the number of students and teachers killed rose during the following year (see also HRW, 2010a). He writes, "This suggests that with schools better protected, insurgents concentrated more on attacking teachers individually or their security details" (p. 111). Similarly, although interventions like providing student or teacher housing or arming teachers with weapons or other resources occur in many countries, including Afghanistan, Columbia, Somalia, Thailand, and Zimbabwe, there is little conclusive and systematic evidence on their effectiveness.

**ALTERNATIVE SCHOOL SITES/DISTANCE LEARNING:** In cases where the route or location of a school is considered too dangerous, an often-used intervention has been to relocate schools or provide distance learning. For example, in the Central African Republic, international organizations opened temporary schools in the bush after entire communities fled their villages. A similar intervention occurred in Myanmar/Burma, where schools were built in temporary facilities (Groneman, 2011). In addition, distance learning projects have been implemented in areas like the oPt (during the *intifadas* and when curfews are in place) and in Somalia, over the radio. Although such interventions clearly prevent students and teachers from being subject to attack in the original school location, it is unclear whether they are effective in other ways. For instance, it is not known whether temporary schools are later targeted for attack, or how the quality of education provided during these interventions may be affected.

### ***Awareness Raising, Curricular Measures, and Education Policy***

Awareness raising and peace-oriented curricula and psychosocial support are programmatic measures suggested for both preventing and mitigating the effects of attacks on education.

The 2009 CARE study provides some evidence that community acceptance of education helps protect schools, learners, and teachers. The researchers found that communities that had reportedly requested that a school be built in their area tended not to experience attacks on schools. In contrast, communities that had reportedly not requested that a school be built in their area tended to continue to experience school attacks. Based on this evidence, the author suggests that community awareness raising campaigns could have a protective effect on education. It is important to note that this evidence is based on perception and on a limited number of case studies; however, it may indicate a trend that could be researched more systematically, in order to determine the extent to which awareness raising is protective, and under what conditions. CARE is undertaking some research in this regard. Their upcoming 2012 study will examine why and how community acceptance of education may mitigate the number of attacks on education that occur (Rowell, 2011).

In a similar vein, Sinclair (2010) notes from anecdotal evidence from Sierra Leone that former students may attack education institutions because of anger regarding inequitable access to, or discriminatory content and delivery of education. She suggests that peace, human rights, and life skills education can be protective because of a positive effect on students' attitudes, as demonstrated for example in the evaluation of peace education in refugee camps in Kenya (Obura, 2002). She suggests that in the short term, these types of initiatives may reduce anger toward education among young people and decrease the numbers that join armed groups. In the medium term, they may help lessen the number of violent attacks that occur for similar reasons.

And in the longer term, these measures might contribute to social cohesion and reduce conflict more generally. There is a substantial literature showing that education can be a driver of conflict, though this has rarely been related to the content of education as such or to attacks specifically on education. There is also a significant amount of research on the effectiveness of peace education generally (Bar-Tal & Rosen, 2009), but there have not yet been any studies that look directly at the role that education policy reforms may have in reducing the number of attacks on education.

This literature review demonstrates that there is scant empirical, comparative, and rigorous research on how programmatic intervention can best protect education. The majority of evidence available is anecdotal, single case-based, and hypothetical. In the context of these significant gaps, we turn in the next section to what one group of practitioners—participants at GCPEA’s 2011 Knowledge Roundtable—believe are the most critical research questions.

### ***What We Still Need to Know about Protecting Education from Attack: Suggestions Elicited from Roundtable Participants***

During the Roundtable, we collected information on what participants believe are priorities for further research on protecting education from attack in two ways. First, we listened to what they said during their presentations and group discussions. Second, we elicited direct feedback during our own presentation on “Prioritizing the Agenda for Research.” We asked participants to tell us both what they believe they **know** and what they **still need to know** in terms of (1) attacks on education and their impact and (2) what works to prevent attacks on education. This section presents and discusses participants’ responses.

### ***What do we know and still need to know about attacks on education and their impact?***

Roundtable participants reported that they feel confident that they know the following information about attacks on education, including their characteristics, causes, and effects:

#### **Characteristics of Attacks on Education**

- Education is targeted in almost all countries affected by conflict, as well as in some post-conflict contexts.
- Attacks on education take various forms, affecting structure and personnel. Attacks on education can also be less visible.

#### **Causes of Attacks on Education**

- Attacks on education can be symptoms of conflict, and they can also play a role in causing conflict.
- In some contexts, gender-related issues may be linked to an increased number of attacks on education.
- In places like Columbia, attacks on education may be related to forced recruitment into armed forces.
- Economic disparity and inequitable access influence attacks on education.
- Natural disasters may increase the risk of conflict and may put pressure on the school system, increasing the risk of attacks on education.

### **Impacts of Attacks on Education**

- Long-term military use of schools has negative consequences for educational access and quality.
- Credible threats of attacks have serious consequences for education.
- Attacks on higher education affect lower levels of schooling as well.

Participants listed the following questions as key unanswered questions and research priorities in terms of the characteristics, causes, and impacts of attacks on education:

### **Characteristics of Attacks on Education**

- What is the scope of attacks on education globally and systematically?
- Why do we have good data in some places and not others?

### **Causes of Attacks on Education**

- What is the link between the political and military use of schools and attacks on education?

### **Impacts of Attacks on Education**

- What is the global impact of attacks on education?
- Does military use of schools have long-term consequences, and if so, to what extent?
- Do attacks stemming from some motives tend to have more severe consequences than attacks stemming from other motives?
- What is the best way to measure the consequences of the indirect fear caused by attacks on education (i.e. the “chilling effect”)?
- Do attacks on education divert aid and money away from other development goals and to what extent? And what is the long-term impact of this?

The above feedback from by Roundtable participants during our Research Agenda session demonstrates their confidence that we do know general information about the characteristics, causes, and impacts of attacks on education. However, we know much less about their specific dynamics and about the associations between different factors in terms of their incidences, causes, and impacts. For example, we know generally that attacks on education occur worldwide in conflict-affected and unstable areas. However, we do not have more specific and systematic evidence on whether there are patterns in the types of attacks that occur in some locations as compared to others (e.g. are ideologically motivated attacks on education more common in inter- or intra-state conflicts), or whether different tactics can be linked to particular motives (e.g. are school arsons more common when attacks are ideologically, criminally, ethnically, or religiously motivated). Similarly, we have reason to believe that factors such as gender, economic disparity, or natural disasters affect the likelihood of attacks on education, but we do not know the relative importance of each of these factors, or what other factors may also be influential in various settings. We also have some general evidence that attacks on education, and even the threat of attack, negatively impact the quality and access of education. However, we do not know how these impacts differ depending on the type of attack or the motives of the attack, or the longer-term or wider social consequences of attacks. More systematic, comparative, and cross-contextual research is necessary to answer these questions.



***What do we know and still need to know about what works to prevent attacks on education?***

Participants reported that they were confident that they know the following information about what works to prevent attacks on education:

- Context matters: Attacks on education might look similar, but because context (including politics, economics, social dynamics) differs, interventions must be context-specific.
- The structure of a school matters: Community-based schools may work to protect education because they are situated in a home or community structure.
- The perpetrator of an attack influences the appropriate response: The response differs depending on whether the perpetrator is a state or non-state party.
- The motives behind an attack influence the appropriate response: For example, the response differs depending on whether the attack directly targets education or whether the damage to education is collateral.
- Community involvement is important, but limited: It can make schools more resilient to attacks. However, there are also limits to what individual communities can do to protect education, particularly when powerful states are involved.
- Strong school management and governance is important: They can make schools less vulnerable to outside political and military influence and to attack.

In contrast, participants cited the following questions as among those still unanswered:

- Do some interventions, such as alternative education sites, present unintended protection risks for children (e.g. could schooling in a home increase the incidence of unmonitored abuse)?
- How do interventions like alternative education models affect nation-building (and other longer term security issues) over time?
- What are the effects of interventions that rely on untrained teachers?
- What are the effects of interventions that relate to education content and process?
- How can we ensure that interventions intended to protect education are sustainable and of good quality?
- How can education provided in exile be used to promote education in the home country?
- What is the impact of monitoring and reporting on prevention, protection, and response?

Participant responses to the questions of what we know and still need to know about how to protect education from attack show that they feel relatively confident that we know what variables may influence a response, making it more or less effective in a particular setting. But we still do not have a strong and systematic understanding of how exactly these factors are influential, the patterns in the types of impacts that they might have, the relative advantage of one intervention in comparison to another, and whether interventions may have negative side effects or unintended consequences. The Roundtable discussion highlighted in particular the awareness that context, structure, perpetrator, and motives may each influence the success of an intervention. For example, there was agreement that in negotiating codes of conduct with armed groups, it is important to consider the motives and structures of the negotiating partners, as well as their relationship with the international community or other third party actors. These may indicate how willing the factions are to engage in



negotiations and follow the agreement. However, participants did not feel that they had strong evidence on how, systematically and comparatively, these factors might matter.

Similarly, the discussion throughout the Roundtable showed that participants feel confident that community-based schools protect education. Participants can even suggest possible reasons why they might function in this way (e.g. location in a home; see also Glad, 2009; Burde, 2010). Nevertheless, there is no systematic evidence on how and why community-based schools are protective, and under what conditions. For instance, it is not yet known whether NGO-supported community-based schools are more, less, or equally protective as government-supported community-based schools—although CARE is taking up this research question in 2012 in Afghanistan (see below).

Finally, the Roundtable discussion reflected an awareness that some interventions to protect education may have unintended and negative social consequences or trade-offs. For instance, alternative education sites where education is moved into a more private setting could mean that it is more difficult to track children's social wellbeing during a time of conflict. Or reinforcing school infrastructure to insulate it from attack may make it more attractive for police or armed groups to use as a base (see HRW, 2011). There could also be trade-offs between positive short term and negative long term consequences, such as for the quality of education, or for nation or state building in cases where non-state actors provide education. Participants expressed the need to understand more systematically what these consequences and trade offs are.

### ***Priorities for Future Research***

Based on the Roundtable discussion, we outline below several priority areas for rigorous and empirical research. Given that the majority of knowledge on programmatic measures for protecting education is case-based and anecdotal, there is a substantial need for this type of study.

**CROSS-COUNTRY/CROSS-CONTEXT COMPARISON:** Despite the global reviews of attacks on education published by O'Malley (2007; 2010), the Roundtable discussion emphasized that there is a need for a stronger, more systematic, and comparative understanding of the dynamics of attacks on education as they occur in different settings and of the relative influence of different factors on their incidence, causes, and impacts.

**THE IMPACT OF CONTEXT-SPECIFIC FACTORS ON PROGRAMMATIC INTERVENTIONS:** Roundtable participants also emphasized that the relevance and effectiveness of interventions is largely dependent on context-specific factors, including the type of violence faced and motivations of armed groups perpetrating attacks. Research is needed into how and why interventions are successful or unsuccessful in particular contexts and to identify their key attributes in this regard.

**QUESTIONS OF IDENTITY OR "AFFILIATION":** Another important issue raised throughout Roundtable discussions was the role of different actors affiliated both with attacks on education and different educational interventions (e.g. NGOs, school committees, armed forces, international donors). There is a need for further research on how different motives and affiliations on the part of each of these actors may influence prevention. Importantly, as discussed below, CARE is undertaking some of this research in Afghanistan in 2012.

**LONGITUDINAL RESEARCH AND LONG TERM IMPACT OF INTERVENTIONS ON OTHER EDUCATIONAL INDICATORS:** There is not yet any longitudinal research on programs protecting education. This is particularly important because there may be tradeoffs between short term gains from interventions and long term impacts. For example, what effect do community-based schools have on learning outcomes over the long term? Or, what is the impact of changes in policy to reduce bias in access to and content of education?

**UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES OF INTERVENTIONS:** The Roundtable reflected a deep concern with potential negative consequences of programmatic interventions. Several of the interventions discussed above are associated with unintended and negative consequences (e.g. reinforcing schools may trigger additional attacks or occupation). Research is needed into the costs and benefits of different interventions in order to determine whether they are more helpful or more harmful.

### ***Using Data Gathered during Research and Monitoring***

The discussion during our Research Agenda session also highlighted that Roundtable participants feel that they need guidance from GCPEA in order to use the information collected during research and monitoring in ways that bolsters advocacy and furthers the protection of education. They posed questions about the best ways of collecting data, sharing it, and using it for advocacy purposes. More specifically, participants asked the following questions:

- How can an “attack on education” be defined in a way that is inclusive yet not too broad?
- While implementing programs in specific settings how can learning be effectively measured and documented?
- What is the best way to monitor and collect data?
- How can organizations gather tracking data that shows how well governments are implementing their policies regarding the protection of education?
- How can this information be shared and disseminated?
- How can communities effectively use this information?
- How can program implementers share information horizontally across countries, and how can GCPEA facilitate this?
- How can organizations brand the issue of attacks on education and “message” it to the public?
- How can organizations use information gathered to show and convince perpetrators that attacks are bad for their “political careers”?

### **How to Initiate a Research Project**

Given the research priorities developed at the Roundtable, we now turn to what program managers (or those in other management positions) can do to actually collect evidence to answer these and other questions of interest. There are several approaches for collecting data: qualitative methods which generalize to a theory, quantitative methods which generalize to a population (Maxwell 2004), or mixed methods which can do both. Qualitative methods typically rely on open-ended or semi-structured interviews and “purposeful sampling” to gather data (in other words, the researcher selects respondents to interview based on particular characteristics of interest). Quantitative methods typically use standardized interview instruments to survey a large, randomly selected sample of the population of interest. Mixed methods use some combination of the two approaches. The best type of data collection to choose depends on the question of interest. For example, if you are interested in understanding questions of impact and effectiveness, often a mixed methods approach will provide the richest and most versatile data.

Although methods for data collection and analysis are evolving and improving all the time, there are many excellent resources to guide research project design and data collection. Some of our personal favorites for research design and data collection are the following:

- Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches (Creswell, 2008)
- Qualitative Research Design: An Interactive Approach (Maxwell, 2004)
- Case Study Research: Design and Methods (Yin, 2008)
- Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data (Rubin and Rubin, 2005), for qualitative data collection.
- Standardized Survey Interviewing: Minimizing Interviewer-Related Error (Fowler and Mangione, 1989), for training staff in standardized data collection.

International agencies and NGOs increasingly value strong research skills. Many emphasize research skills in their on-the-job training for their current staff and in hiring decisions for new staff. In addition, in the past decade, a number of large international NGOs have modified the way they work, placing much more emphasis on the importance of data collection and research than they have in the past. For example, the International Rescue Committee (IRC) has a large research unit staffed by trained researchers with doctorates in relevant fields who work closely with program staff and outside academics to evaluate program effectiveness (see, e.g., Fearon et al., 2009; Humphreys and Weinstein, 2009). Save the Children U.S. carries out research internships in partnership with universities [see Save the Children Save-University Partnerships for Education Research (SUPER) program: <http://www.savethechildren.org/site/c.8rKLIXMGIpI4E/b.6196513/>]. These studies are typically initiated from staff working in the field.

An example of this type of work is that of CARE International in Afghanistan, which has identified research questions related to attacks on education that their staff consider essential to answer. The organization plans to conduct this research in 2012. To illustrate the way in which humanitarian organizations can initiate research projects, we draw on Jennifer Rowell's (2011) CARE research proposal here at length.

The research was prompted in part by CARE's concerns about the safety of education in Afghanistan after foreign troops withdraw in 2014. To support the best outcomes for education in the future, the organization has decided that it is crucial to gather data on the conflict related challenges that the education system faces in the present. In considering the state of attacks on education in Afghanistan, and the current information that they have on these attacks, CARE staff realized that they would need to gather evidence that does more than count and categorize the numbers and kinds of attacks on education. In addition to understanding the prevalence and range of attacks on education (descriptive data), therefore, CARE intends to gather information about what causes these attacks (explanatory data). This information will allow them to be better informed about how to support the education system in addressing them.

Thus, basing its current research design on its previous work discussed above (Glad, 2009), CARE proposes to examine several questions. First, they ask about the relationship between attacks and school affiliations: "Is there a difference in attack rates between schools which are visibly or publicly affiliated with external actors versus schools built or run by the community?" (Rowell, 2011). Knowing the answer to this question will allow Afghans to identify whether any of these associations may affect Afghan children's right to education. In addition, this would help guide the Afghan Ministry of Education's policies to determine appropriate actors to "build, run, or be affiliated with schools during and after transition" (Rowell 2011). CARE plans to use quantitative analysis of its database as well as that of the government to study these questions systematically.

Second, CARE is interested in understanding how community involvement affects school safety. They would like to understand how community involvement may work to protect schools, identifying which strategies seem to be effective and why communities think these efforts are successful. Conversely, they are also interested in understanding if there are community strategies that do not seem to work, why this might be the case. To answer these questions about process and perception, they plan to carry out in-depth qualitative analysis. They believe that understanding these local interventions better will help them identify and support specific mechanisms to empower communities and provide them with additional resources to manage the security of their schools.

Third, in earlier work (Glad, 2009), CARE established a clear correlation between attacks on schools and using schools as polling sites during elections. They plan to conduct a quantitative review of existing databases “to better understand the nature of attacks against education undertaken during the 2009 and 2010 elections” (Rowell, 2011).

CARE is well on its way to carry out this research. Once they have these data collected and analyzed and once they produce a well-documented, well-organized, and well-written report, it will not only help them understand better how to protect education from attack in Afghanistan, but it will help them institutionalize these responses at all levels—community, national government, and with international organizations (NGOs, UN agencies, donors).

### **Power in Partnership for Practitioners and Academics**

We have discussed why research on responses to attacks against education is important, what research exists currently, what we need to know more about, and how NGOs can initiate this kind of research. But initiating this research is different from actually carrying it out. How can organizations conduct rigorous research? Staff may not have the time, training, or resources to conduct significant and rigorous quantitative, qualitative, or mixed-methods studies.

Because the need for evidence-based research is great and widely recognized, partnerships between NGOs/international agencies and academics are on the rise. Academics are interested in conducting “applied research” – studies that require hands-on field experience for the collection of original data and that serve to answer questions of interest to policy makers and humanitarian aid workers. At the same time, practitioners increasingly need “evidence-based research” to support their programs both to improve program implementation and to strengthen advocacy. Practitioners recognize the importance of basing programmatic decisions on systematic, reliable evidence. At the same time, funders demand that practitioners provide evidence to show the effects of their work in order to win resources.

A study of community-based schools in Afghanistan illustrates an example of this kind of partnership and the effect it can have on program response, advocacy, and funding. Starting in 2005, one of the authors of this paper (Dana Burde) worked with Catholic Relief Services (CRS) to study their community-based schools in Afghanistan. The research grew from a pilot study of CRS accelerated learning programs in Panjshir Province, to a large-scale mixed methods randomized trial of CRS community-based schools in Ghor Province in 2007-2008. The study randomly assigned the community-based schools to 31 eligible villages (i.e., villages that had none previously), creating 13 “treatment” villages and 18 “control” villages (all received schools after one year). In addition, the researchers conducted 36 qualitative interviews with village leaders from 8 villages. After approximately one year, the researchers found that community-based schools have a dramatic effect on children’s academic participation and performance and eliminate existing gender disparities in attendance in rural areas in Afghanistan (for a detailed discussion of the study see Burde, 2012; Burde and Linden, 2011).<sup>6</sup>

The study’s findings are the result of a fruitful collaboration between academics and practitioners—neither one could have carried out this work without the other. Academics bring their skills in research design, methods,

data collection, and analysis to the projects on which they work. However, they may lack deep contextual knowledge of a country or region, or strong local ties to communities. In addition, academics who are not involved in program design and implementation may not know what, precisely, the educational concerns of communities are, or what research questions practitioners have about program implementation. Practitioners, in contrast, are often embedded in the communities in which they work and understand local priorities in education. In countries affected by conflict, their strong ties to local populations allow them to continue their work even in the midst of conflict. In Afghanistan, CRS's deep local relationships, understanding of the educational needs and questions of the communities they worked with, and organizational infrastructure in the field made it possible for them to implement their program and for us to carry out our research. CRS staff in turn benefited from the research skills and training that we provided to carry out the study. Finally, because there was a high level of trust between the two—our research team and the CRS staff, the collaboration was successful. (For additional information about collaboration on field experiments among governments, NGOs, and academics, see Humphreys and Weinstein, 2009).

In addition, the research described here has had significant programmatic implications for education in Afghanistan, particularly for girls. In Afghanistan, the findings were presented to national and international NGOs, the Ministry of Education, to the European Ambassadors (at an EU meeting), to international bilateral donors, and to interested Afghan researchers and academics. The data show that if girls in Afghanistan need to walk almost any distance to school, most will not be able to attend. As a result, the Ministry of Education discussed changing its strategy of providing access to school for clusters of villages through one central school, to providing support to community-based schools in order to increase girls' attendance. A major bilateral donor—the U.S. Agency for International Development—designed its 2011 education strategy in Afghanistan based on these research findings, moving support for community-based schools “on budget” (personal communication, July 2011).

Although this study did not look directly at responses to attacks on education, community-based schools are often considered an alternative delivery mechanism for education in Afghanistan that would likely enhance its protection. The findings described here, in conjunction with CARE's earlier study mentioned above (Glad, 2009), were used to advocate for greater attention to the problem of attacks on education in Afghanistan (see for example, <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/09/17/opinion/17burde.html>). Thus, research partnerships between academics and practitioners can enhance practitioners' work in the field. In fact, increased collaboration can lead to improved programmatic response, better advocacy, and increased resources.

### **Funding Frameworks**

There are many different ways to fund practitioner-academic collaborative research. Sometimes funds come from evaluation budgets related to programs, but there are other ways to support this kind of work. Public and private research foundations are interested in field experiments (like the one described above). These foundations (e.g., the National Science Foundation or the Spencer Foundation) only provide funding for research, not programs. Thus, there is no possibility that research funds will drain program support. One of the drawbacks to these types of academic research grant is that they operate on set funding cycles. Most foundations require long term preparation, only review grant applications once or twice a year, and maintain significant gaps between the deadline for proposal submission and grant-making decisions. Yet with the increasing number of applied studies carried out by academics in networks such as the Jamil Abdul Latif Poverty Action Lab

<sup>6</sup> This program was part of the Partnership for Advancing Community Education in Afghanistan (PACE-A). Leigh Linden, economist at University of Texas-Austin, was co-principal investigator of the randomized trial; the study was funded by the Columbia Institute for Social and Economic Research and Policy, the National Science Foundation, the Spencer Foundation, the U.S. Institute of Peace, and the Weikart Family Foundation.

(<http://www.povertyactionlab.org/About%20J-PAL>) and Innovations for Poverty Action (<http://www.poverty-action.org/>), this may be starting to change and funding cycles may become more conducive to practitioner-academic partnerships.

Although academic-practitioner partnerships are on the rise, it remains an emerging field. As a result, there are not yet many mechanisms for matching practitioners who need research studies completed with academics who would like to carry out that research. A few organizations, which have begun implementing these partnerships more regularly, take different approaches. As mentioned above, IRC has an in-house team of researchers who work both with practitioners within the organization as well as with academics from outside the agency. Save the Children has organized a team of affiliated academics with whom they announce and circulate interesting research projects (typically for advanced doctoral students) (see the SUPER program mentioned above).

## **Conclusion**

The protection of education from attack is a relatively new and emerging field of programming, policy, advocacy, and research. As this paper shows, there has been little systematic and rigorous research on the patterns and dynamics of attacks against education and how to protect education effectively. Carrying out this research is essential for furthering the agenda of the Global Coalition. The first step in addressing a problem is understanding it. Only with a comprehensive understanding of the problem, such as of the factors or role of different actors in exacerbating or mitigating it, can programmatic interventions be most relevant. Research, furthermore, provides the evidence critical for successful advocacy and to secure funding.

The example from Afghanistan shows that systematic research can improve the implementation of safe quality education in times of conflict and insecurity. Especially where there is a major international investment in supporting education under such insecure conditions (typically linked to national and local social, economic, cultural and political tensions), it is imperative to have country-specific research to promote safe and effective program implementation. This type of research, examining educational opportunity at country level, will cumulatively build up a global portfolio of research findings that will help guide both future program development and the agenda for future research. It can also be complemented by comparative research, to allow for a more complete understanding of how educational interventions may function differently in various settings, and why.

Based on discussions and feedback from participants at GCPEA's 2011 Knowledge Roundtable in Phuket, Thailand, we have suggested a research agenda that prioritizes answering the following sets of questions: (1) What are the dynamics of attacks on education in different settings? (2) What is the influence of different context-specific factors on the relevance and effectiveness of different interventions? (3) What is the role of different actors affiliated both with attacks on education and different educational interventions? (4) What is the long term impact of educational interventions and are there short term trade-offs? And (5) What are the costs and benefits of different interventions? Practitioner-academic partnerships can be fruitful for answering these questions: academics want to do this type of research that informs policy and practice and practitioners want systematic and reliable data to inform their programming.



## References

- Bar-Tal, D. and Rosen, Y. (2009). Peace Education in Societies Involved in Intractable Conflicts: Direct and Indirect Models. *Review of Educational Research*, 79(2), 557-575.
- Borger, J. (2011, December 13). Kabul 'agreed deal with Taliban' to end attacks on schools, report reveals. *The Guardian*. Retrieved 15 December 2011 from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2011/dec/13/afghanistan-taliban/print>.
- Burde, D. (forthcoming August 2012). Assessing impact and bridging methodological divides: Randomized trials in Afghanistan and Rwanda. *Comparative Education Review*.
- Burde, D. and Linden, L. (2011). The effect of village-based schools: Evidence from a randomized controlled trial in Afghanistan. NYU Steinhardt Working Paper.
- Burde, D. (2010). Preventing violent attacks on education in Afghanistan: Considering the role of community based schools. In UNESCO, *Protecting Education from Attack: A State of the Art Review*. Paris, UNESCO, pp. 245-260.
- Burde, D. (2010, September 16). It takes a Village to Raise a School. *New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/09/17/opinion/17burde.html>.
- Christian Peacemaker Teams (CPT) and Operation Dove (2008). *The Dangerous Road to Education: Palestinian students suffer under settler violence and military neglect*. CPT/Operation Dove.
- Creswell, J.W. (2008). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. Third Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Fearon, J.D., Humphreys, M., and Weinstein, J.M. (2009). Can Development Aid Contribute to Social Cohesion after Civil War? Evidence from a Field Experiment in Post-Conflict Liberia. *American Economic Review: Papers & Proceedings*, 99(2), 287-291.
- Fowler, F.J. and Mangione, T.W. (1989). *Standardized Survey Interviewing: Minimizing Interviewer-Related Error*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Glad, M. (2009). *Knowledge on Fire: Attacks on Education in Afghanistan, Risks and Measures for Successful Mitigation*. CARE.
- Groneman, C. (2011). *Study on Field-based Programmatic Measures to Protect Education from Attack*.
- Groneman, C. (2010). Desk study on field-based mechanisms for protecting education from targeted attack. In UNESCO, *Protecting Education from Attack: A State of the Art Review*. Paris, UNESCO, pp. 227-244.
- Human Rights Watch (2011). *Schools and Armed Conflict: A Global Survey of Domestic Laws and State Practice Protecting Schools from Attack and Military Use*. New York: Human Rights Watch.
- Human Rights Watch (2010a). *Targets of Both Sides: Violence against Students, Teachers, and Schools in Thailand's Southern Border Provinces*. New York: Human Rights Watch.
- Human Rights Watch (2010b). *'Their Future is at Stake': Attacks on Teachers and Schools in Pakistan's Balochistan Province*. New York: Human Rights Watch.



Human Rights Watch (2009). *Sabotaged Schooling: Naxalite Attacks and Police Occupation of Schools in India's Bihar and Jharkhand States*. New York: Human Rights Watch.

Human Rights Watch (2006). *Lessons in Terror: Attacks on Education in Afghanistan*. New York: Human Rights Watch.

Humphreys, M. and Weinstein, J.M. (2009). Field Experiments and the Political Economy of Development. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 10, 367-378.

Jarecki, H.G. and Kaisth, D.Z. (2009). *Scholar Rescue in the Modern World*. New York: Institute of International Education.

Maxwell, J.A. (2004). *Qualitative Research Design: An Interactive Approach*. Second Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

O'Malley, B. (2010). *Education Under Attack 2010*. Paris: UNESCO.

O'Malley, B. (2007). *Education Under Attack*. Paris: UNESCO.

Rowell, J. (2011). *Research Proposal: School Protection, 2011*. CARE.

Rubin, H.J. and Rubin, I.S. (2005). *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data*. Third Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Sinclair, M. (2010). Protecting through curriculum: A call for collaboration. In UNESCO, *Protecting Education from Attack: A State of the Art Review*. Paris, UNESCO, pp. 279-301.

Smith, M. (2010). Schools as Zones of Peace: Nepal case study in access to education during armed conflict and civil unrest. In UNESCO, *Protecting Education from Attack: A State of the Art Review*. Paris, UNESCO, pp. 261-278.

UNESCO (2011). *Safe Schools: Protecting Education from Attack, Twelve Schools in the Gaza 'Buffer Zone.'* UNESCO.

UNESCO (2010). *Protecting Education from Attack: A State of the Art Review*. Paris, UNESCO.

Yin, R.K. (2008). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. Fourth Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

## ANNEX 2

### Guidelines for Program Evaluation of Programmatic Measures to Protect Education from Attack

DR. CAROLYNE ASHTON, *Search for Common Ground*

#### Taking the Pulse

- What does “program evaluation” mean to you?
- What is your experience with evaluating your education protection efforts?
  - Share examples
- What challenges have you faced?
  - Share examples
- Why do program evaluation?

#### What Is Program Evaluation?

- Helps you *ask and answer*, “What do you want to achieve and how will you know you did it?”
- An *assessment* of the *effectiveness* of an individual program
- *Reflection* on implementation that provides *lessons learned* that contribute to *program improvement*
- It is **NOT** “gold standard” research; it is *localized* and *contextualized* assessment

#### Why Is Program Evaluation Useful?: Big Picture

- It helps fill a current *research gap* by gathering useful data on education in conflict setting
- The data collected contributes to better *policy decisions* at all levels
- Evaluation data can be used to *advocate* for more support from all stakeholders

#### Why Is Program Evaluation Useful?: Small Picture

- Provides feedback to program staff on effects of their work
- Provides data to insure accountability, revise implementation, or design a new program
- Program staff can do monitoring functions
- Can contribute to larger evaluation projects
- More cost-effective than “gold standard” research

## Steps in Program Evaluation

Evaluation ideally begins at the *design stage*, but may be woven in at any time a program is underway:

- Developing a *theory of change*
- Setting *measurable goals and objectives*
- Developing *indicators*
- Designing a monitoring and evaluation (M&E) *plan* to insure data collection
- *Analyzing* data and *writing* reports

**Where are you in your planning or implementation now?**

**What steps can you start now?**

## Theory of Change

- Helps us ask the “why” and “how” questions before we design a program – how will this program get us to the results we want?
- “If we do ....., then we will get .....”
- Can apply to any level of evaluation hierarchy (goals, objectives, activities), but usually relates to goal
- Helps to engage all stakeholders
- Donors often require it
- Example: If we build advocacy skills among stakeholders, we will be able to influence policy change on education under attack

## Qualities of a Theory of Change

- Highlights assumptions about effects of certain interventions in certain contexts
- Explicit, clear and based on evidence
- Engages staff, donors and other stakeholders in development to create buy-in
- Focuses staff, donors and other stakeholders on a common goal
- Provides the basis for program evaluation

**Write a theory of change for your program/project:**

## Design Hierarchy

**Goal:** Measurable statement of desired longer term, global *IMPACT*

**Objectives:** Measureable statement of desired immediate/intermediate *OUTCOMES*

**Activities:** Concrete events or services performed leading to *OUTPUTS*

**Outputs:** Use of products or services lead to accomplishment of outcomes

## Design Hierarchy (cont.)

**Outcomes:** Changes in behavior, attitude, knowledge and/or skills contribute to reaching the desired impact stated in the goal

**Impact:** Cumulative outcomes, often reached by collaboration of many projects, bring about long-term change that is more statistically measurable

### Identifying Goals & Objectives

- Goal questions to ask: What issue or problem are you addressing, e.g., physical protection, monitoring attacks, engaging community, etc.
- Objective questions to ask: What behavior (skill), knowledge or attitude are you trying to change, e.g., citizens willing to protect education facilities, agreement on protection of neutrality of textbook content, etc.
- Exercise: Identifying what you want to change – what questions do you need to ask to shape a goal or objectives?

**What issues or problems are you hoping to address?**

### Example Goals

- Country X will have established national policy for protection of teachers in conflict areas by March 2012. (national level)
- All concerned citizens in X town will participate in programs protecting different aspects of education while conflict continues (local, municipal)
- What is your goal for your program or project?

**Write your program/project goal:**

### Types of Indicators

*Quantitative:*

- Objective:  
Increase in number (over baseline) of children remaining in school after zones of peace established  
500 citizens participating in advocacy for protective school policies
- Activity:  
Training workshop developed will be developed  
Four Trainings will be conducted

**Write a quantitative indicator for one of your objectives:**

## Types of Indicators (cont.)

### Qualitative:

- Increase in level of confidence to circulate freely in a former conflict area
- Decrease in fear of violence
- Increase in knowledge about rules governing protection of education

**Write a qualitative indicator for one of your objectives:**

## Evaluation Planning

- Start early
- Budget, budget, budget
- Develop monitoring plan – what data to collect
- Goals & objectives of evaluation
  - What do you want to know?
  - What questions do you want answered?
  - Who should be involved?

**What type of data might you collect for the goals and objectives you have identified? Where might you collect it?**

## Logical Framework

### WHAT IS A LOGFRAME?

- A matrix that summarizes the project
- Makes objectives explicit
- Shows the logical link between interventions and results

**Fill out the logframe template below for your goal and one objective:**

### Logframe Example

**INTERVENTION**

**INDICATOR**

**MEANS OF VERIFICATION**

**RISK/ASSUMPTION**

**GOAL:**

**OBJECTIVE:**

**ACTIVITY 1**

**ACTIVITY 2**

## Quantitative Research Methods - Survey

Purpose:

- Mostly to gather generalizable information over a large population
- To get socioeconomic characteristics of your beneficiaries
- To study causal relationships
- To compare change over time/compare groups
- To make predictions

**Could you use surveys in your project/program? How? Where?**

## Quantitative Research Methods - Survey (cont.)

When do we use surveys?

Domain of change where survey can be useful:

- Opinions
- Attitudes
- Behavior
- Knowledge
- Economic, structural, physical, etc. characteristics of beneficiaries and their environment

## Quantitative Research Methods - Survey (cont.)

Limitations:

- Hard to capture complex processes, in-depth motives and perceptions (and roots of perceptions), extensive narrative & stories
- Self-reports on behavior are often biased
- Sampling errors can be assessed, but non-sampling errors can jeopardize quality of data

Disadvantages:

- Time consuming
- Costly (for big samples)
- Require a larger set of skills

**What resources will you need in your project/program, if you choose survey methods?**

## Qualitative Research Methods

- Case Study
- Interview
- Focus Group
- Diaries/Journals/Videos
- Direct Observation

### Qualitative Research Methods - Interviews

- Person-to-person questioning
- Open-ended questions directly related to what you want to know
- Allows for free flow of information; deeper knowledge of what is going on
- Supplements knowledge gained from other research
- May be structured or unstructured (in-depth).
- Can be project participants or key informants (KI)

**Have you used interviews as an evaluation tool? What was your experience like?**

### Qualitative Research Methods - Focus Groups

- Focus groups are in-depth qualitative interviews with a small number of carefully selected people. They have a focused discussion and can be used to understand a target group; how they feel, what they think, and how they perceive specific issues. (Inst. Of Sport/Loughborough Univ. 2011)

**Have you used focus groups as an evaluation tool? What was your experience like?**

### What are the Drawbacks of Using Focus Groups?

- Sometimes they can present a logistical challenge.
- They require a skilled moderator to facilitate the discussion.
- The participants shape the discussion; therefore, you may have little control over the data collection.
- Focus groups may reflect the minority view because the wider community group has been excluded.
- They may sometimes be open to manipulation and bias. (Ibid.)

### Focus Group Tips

- Determine focus group objectives, e.g., purpose of FG, info desired, context, etc.
- Prepare discussion guide or protocol for facilitator
- Prepare 6-12 questions related to what you want to know
- Setting: comfortable, accessible, reasonably private
- Homogeneity & diversity – can you have both?

**Where might you use focus groups as an evaluation tool in your project/program?**

**Using examples from your own programs, let's identify challenges to evaluation and possible responses.**



# ANNEX 3

## Knowledge Roundtable Agenda

### GLOBAL COALITION TO PROTECT EDUCATION FROM ATTACK

#### Programmatic Measures in Prevention, Intervention and Response

November 8 – 11, 2011

Westin Hotel, Phuket, Thailand

**Co-Sponsor:** Interagency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE)

**GCPEA Steering Committee Organizations:** Council for Assisting Refugee Academics, Education Above All, Education International, Human Rights Watch, Save the Children, UNESCO, UNHCR, and UNICEF

#### Purpose of Roundtable

Collect and share information about a range of programmatic prevention and protection measures currently being implemented in countries for inclusion in GCPEA *Study of Programmatic Measures to Protect Education from Attack*.

Identify challenges faced by countries to deliver protection and prevention measures to guide further programmatic initiatives.

Share existing research and evaluation on program effectiveness and identify priority areas for research and evaluation.

Address mechanisms for establishing global databases of key actors and programmatic responses, and inter-practitioner networking.

#### Participants

Teams of representatives of NGOS, UN agencies, INGOs, Ministries of Education, human rights and child rights organizations, advocacy groups, teachers unions.

Countries represented: Afghanistan, Central African Republic, Colombia, Cote d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of Congo, India, Iraq, Myanmar, Nepal, occupied Palestinian territory, Pakistan, Philippines, South Sudan, Thailand, and Zimbabwe.

#### Methodology

Each country will have a station on the wall with a small display table in the meeting room to post information about the country context and distribute information to others about programs and approaches to protecting education.

On Day One, each country will briefly summarize the country context and the types of programmatic measures that are currently being undertaken to prevent, protect and intervene to protect education.

During the Roundtable, participants will be given opportunities to reflect on the types of approaches that would be appropriate and adaptable to their countries and post priorities on VIPP (colored cards) at their stations.

On Day Four, countries will be asked to provide an update on their priorities, challenges and needs.

**DAY 1: TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 8**

Time	Session	Content/ Activities/Panelists	Facilitators
8:00 – 8:30	Coffee, registration		UNICEF APSSC staff
8:30 – 9:30	<b>OPENING SESSION:</b>	<p><b>Opening remarks:</b> GCPEA, INEE and UNICEF APSSC Bangkok</p> <p><b>Roundtable:</b> Agenda overview, goals, outcomes</p> <p><b>Introductions:</b> Participants, sponsoring organizations, consultants, resource people</p>	<p>Zama Coursen-Neff, Deputy Director, Human Rights Watch and GCPEA chair</p> <p>Lori Heninger, Director, INEE</p> <p>Gary Ovington, Senior Emergency Specialist, Education UNICEF APSSC</p>
9:30– 10:30	<p><b>THEME 1: ESTABLISHING A KNOWLEDGE BASELINE</b></p> <p><b>Session 1: Current Knowledge Base on Programmatic Measures</b></p>	<p><b>Slide-show presentation:</b> Knowledge baseline of programmatic responses based on GCPEA research study on “Programmatic Responses to Protect Education from Attack”</p> <p>Christine Groneman, GCPEA consultant and study author</p> <p><b>Plenary discussion:</b> Q+A</p>	Melinda Smith, Coordinator, GCPEA
10:30 – 11:00	Break		
11:00 -12:30	<b>Session 2: Current Knowledge Base: Country Summaries</b>	<p><b>Country updates:</b> Representative from each country will give a brief update on 1) nature, scope and motives for attacks on education and 2) types of programmatic responses to protect education from attack. One-page country summaries will be included in notebooks.</p> <p><b>Small group work:</b> Successes, challenges, gaps</p>	Gary Ovington, UNICEF APSSC

**DAY 1: TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 8**

Time	Session	Content/ Activities/Panelists	Facilitators
12:30 – 1:30	Lunch		
1:30 – 3:00	<p><b>THEME 2: DEEPENING KNOWLEDGE OF PROTECTION</b></p> <p><b>Session 3: Physical Protection of Schools, Teachers, Students</b></p>	<p><b>Panel:</b></p> <p>Four countries discuss physical protection measures, their successes, risks, and challenges.</p> <p><b>Afghanistan:</b> <i>Armed and unarmed guards:</i> <b>WAHEEDULLAH SULTANI</b>, Acting DG for Administration, MoE</p> <p><b>Zimbabwe:</b> <i>Safe houses for teachers,</i> <b>TAKAVAFIRA ZHOU</b>, President, Progressive Teachers Union of Zimbabwe</p> <p><b>Colombia:</b> <i>Teacher protection,</i> <b>MARIA PAULA CALVO</b>, Community Services Assistant, UNHCR</p> <p><b>Pakistan:</b> <i>Travel stipends to teachers for safe passage and other protection measures:</i> <b>ERUM BURKI</b>, Education Cluster Coordinator, Save the Children</p> <p><b>Plenary Discussion:</b> Good practice, research, evaluation</p> <p><b>Small group discussion :</b> Assessment of practices for adaptation to other countries, challenges, gaps</p>	<p>Jane Kalista, Assistant Programme Specialist, Section for Education in Post-Conflict and Post-Disaster Situations UNESCO, David Robinson, Education International</p>
3:00 – 3:15	Break		

**DAY 1: TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 8**

Time	Session	Content/ Activities/Panelists	Facilitators
3:15 – 4:45	<b>Session 4: Community Involvement in Protection</b>	<p><b>Panel:</b> Three countries discuss community involvement in protection</p> <p><b>Nepal:</b> <i>School protection and management committees:</i> <b>JYOTI RANA MAGAR</b>, Field Coordinator, World Education</p> <p><b>Afghanistan:</b> <i>Involvement of religious and community leaders in school management and protection,</i> <b>DAOUD GHAZNAW</b>, Education Projects Senior Manager, Save the Children</p> <p><b>Philippines:</b> <i>Community protection component and youth volunteers for peace,</i> <b>MARY ANN ARNADO</b>, Secretary General, Mindanao Peoples Caucus</p> <p><b>Plenary:</b> Participants contribute measures used in other countries</p> <p><b>Small-group work:</b> Assessment of practices for adaptation to other countries, challenges, gaps</p>	Emily Echessa, Education Advisor, Save the Children, UK
4:45 – 5:00	<b>Country review</b>	<i>Participants meet in country teams to identify 1) one priority for next steps in improving programmatic measures, and 2) one gap or challenge, and post these on VIPP cards at their wall stations.</i>	Brenda Haiplik, Education Chief, UNICEF Sri Lanka

**DAY 2: WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 9**

Time	Session	Content/ Activities/Panelists	Facilitators
8:30 – 8:45	<b>Preview/country feedback</b>	Countries read out their priority and one gap or challenge posted on their wall stations	Lori Heninger, INEE
8:45 – 10:15	<b>THEME 2: PROTECTION (CONTINUED)</b>  <b>Session 5: Provision of Alternative Sites, Schedules and Delivery Systems</b>	<p><b>Panel:</b> Four countries describe alternative delivery mechanisms</p> <p><b>CAR:</b> <i>Bush schools:</i> <b>NATHALIE HAMOUDI</b>, former UNICEF education officer, CAR, plus film presentation</p> <p><b>oPt:</b> <i>Distance learning through TV/radio, summer camps:</i> <b>MR. OMAR ANBAR</b>, Director of Education, MoEHE</p> <p><b>DRC:</b> <i>Alternative delivery:</i> <b>MS. SEVERINE RAMIS</b>, Save the Children</p> <p><b>Afghanistan:</b> <i>Alternative delivery mechanisms for education to protect students and teachers:</i> <b>JENNIFER BLINKHORN</b>, Education Director, Aga Khan Foundation Afghanistan</p> <p><b>Plenary discussion:</b> Good practice; research, evaluation of measures, gaps</p>	Nathalie Fiona Hamoudi, Education Manager, UNICEF
10:15 – 10:30	Break		

**DAY 2: TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 9**

Time	Session	Content/ Activities/Panelists	Facilitators
10:30 – 12:00	<b>Session 6: Negotiation of Conflict Free Zones</b>	<p><b>Panel:</b> Two countries describe negotiation of conflict free zones</p> <p><b>Nepal:</b> <i>Local negotiations for schools as zones of peace:</i>  <b>JYOTI RANA MAGAR</b>, Field Coordinator, World Education</p> <p><b>Ivory Coast:</b> <i>Negotiation with armed groups:</i> <b>OSHCARD KOUASSI KOUADIO</b>, Child Protection Officer, UN Peacekeeping Mission (UNOCI), Ivory Coast</p> <p><b>CAR:</b> <i>Negotiation with rebel groups for conflict-free zones:</i>  <b>PERE AURELIO</b>, CUNEO, Caritas</p> <p><b>Plenary discussion:</b> Q+A</p> <p>1) Input from other countries on negotiation strategies; 2) Assessment of feasibility of using negotiation strategies in other countries; 3) Challenges, and research and evaluation needs.</p>	Melinda Smith, GCPEA
12:00 – 1:00	Lunch		
1:00 – 3:00	<b>Session 7: Restricting Military and Political Use of Schools</b>	<p><b>Presentation: Military use and occupation of education institutions</b> – <b>BEDE SHEPPARD</b></p> <p><b>Country summaries on military use:</b></p> <p><b>India:</b> <b>MR. YUDISHTIRA PANIGRAHI</b>, Program Coordinator, Save the Children</p> <p><b>Ivory Coast:</b> <b>JENNIFER HOFMANN</b>, Education Specialist, UNICEF</p>	

**DAY 2: WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 9**

Time	Session	Content/ Activities/Panelists	Facilitators
1:00 – 3:00 (cont.)	<b>Session 7: Restricting Military and Political Use of Schools (cont.)</b>	<p><b>Country summaries on political use:</b></p> <p><b>Philippines:</b> <i>Use of schools and teachers in elections</i>, <b>MR. BARATUCAL CAUDANG</b>, Secretary of Education, DepEd, ARMM</p> <p><b>Zimbabwe:</b> <b>LLOYD PSWARAYI</b>, Research Officer, Research and Advocacy Unit</p> <p><b>Plenary discussion: Q+A</b>, Good practice, research and evaluation needs, challenges</p>	Bede Sheppard, Senior Researcher, Children’s Rights Division, Human Rights Watch
3:00 – 3:15	Break		
3:15 – 4:45	<b>Session 8: Protecting Higher Education from Attack</b>	<p><b>Panel:</b> Panel on nature and motives of attacks on higher education and programmatic measures to protect academics, students and education institutions</p> <p><b>Zimbabwe:</b> <b>DR ALEX MAGAISA</b>, Zimbabwean currently lecturer at University of Kent</p> <p><b>Iraq:</b> <b>DR. YAHYA ALKUBAISI</b>, Researcher, Iraqi Center for Strategic Studies</p>	<p>John Akker, Executive Secretary, CARA</p> <p>Jim Miller, Executive Director, Scholar Rescue Fund</p>
4:45 – 5:30	<b>Country review</b>	<i>Countries address gaps and challenges and post on their wall stations. Participants identify priorities for next steps in improving programmatic measures relevant to their own situation and post on VIPP cards on their wall stations.</i>	Margaret Sinclair, Technical Advisor, Education Above All



**DAY3: TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 10**

Time	Session	Content/ Activities/Panelists	Facilitators
8:30 – 8:45	<b>Activity on country priorities</b>	<i>Countries read out one priority on a VIPP card to present to the group.</i>	Nathalie Fiona Hamoudi, UNICEF
8:45 – 10:00	<b>THEME 3: DEEPENING KNOWLEDGE OF PREVENTION</b>  <b>Session 9+10: EDUCATION AND CONFLICT</b>  <b>Session 9: Conflict Sensitive Policy Reform: Equitable Access</b>	<b>Presentation: Two Faces of Education in Conflict – ALAN SMITH</b> , Professor, and Chairholder of the UNESCO Chair, University of Ulster  <b>Plenary Q+A</b>  <b>Country summaries:</b> Policy reform in equitable access to quality education  <b>Afghanistan: Policy engagement, MS. JENNIFER ROWELL</b> , Head of Advocacy, CARE  <b>Nepal: National policies promoting equitable access, MR. DEEPAK SHARMA</b> , Deputy Director General, Department of Education  <b>West Africa: Conflict Disaster Risk Reduction, MS. ANDREA BERTHER</b> , UNICEF WCARO  <b>Plenary discussion:</b> How to improve access to education in participating countries	Margaret Sinclair, Education Above All
10:00- 10:15	Break		

**DAY3: TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 10**

Time	Session	Content/ Activities/Panelists	Facilitators
10:15 – 11:30	<b>Session 10: EDUCATION AND CONFLICT</b>  <b>Conflict Sensitive Policy Reform: Curriculum</b>	<p><b>Panel:</b> Two countries describe curriculum reform</p> <p><b>Thailand:</b> <i>Film on pilot program on mother-tongue literacy and culture and overview</i></p> <p><b>Nepal:</b> <i>Peace/ human rights/ civic education:</i></p> <p><b>MANISH THAPA</b>, Assistant Professor of Peace Studies Dept. of Conflict, Peace Development Studies, Tribhuvan University</p> <p><b>Plenary discussion:</b> Q+A</p> <p><b>Country small group work:</b> Scorecard on conflict sensitive education reform</p>	Margaret Sinclair, Education Above All
11:30 – 1:00	<b>Session 11: Advocacy and Use of Media</b>	<p><b>Panel:</b> Three countries describe advocacy campaigns to protect education from attack</p> <p><b>oPt:</b> UNWRA's "<i>Don't Demolish My Future Campaign</i>": <b>CHRIS GUNNESS</b>, Spokesman and Head of Public Information and Advocacy, UNWRA</p> <p><b>Nepal:</b> <i>Coalition-building and use of TV and radio to build public awareness:</i> <b>MR. TARAK DHITAL</b>, Program Coordinator, Child Workers in Nepal (CWIN)</p> <p><b>Colombia:</b> <i>Child rights advocacy,</i> <b>MARIA PAULA CALVO</b>, UNHCR and <b>SANDRA VARGAS</b>, Representante Legal, Corporacion Casa Amazonia</p>	

**DAY3: TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 10**

Time	Session	Content/ Activities/Panelists	Facilitators
11:30 – 1:00 (cont.)	<b>Session 11: Advocacy and Use of Media (cont.)</b>	<b>Plenary Discussion:</b> 1) <i>Other advocacy initiatives from countries;</i> 2) <i>Discussion of role of GCPEA in country advocacy</i>	Ita Sheehy, Senior Education Officer, UNHCR
1:00 – 2:00	Lunch		
2:00 – 3:30	<b>THEME 4: MOVING THE AGENDA FORWARD</b>  <b>Session 12: Basics of Program Evaluation</b>	<b>Interactive presentation: Evaluating Programmatic Measures to Protect Education from Attack</b> – CAROLYNE ASHTON, Ph.D., Evaluator, Search for Common Ground, Washington D. C.	Lori Heninger, INEE
3:30 – 3:45	Break		
3:45 – 5:15	<b>Session 13: Monitoring and reporting</b>	<b>Presentation: MRM and Implications of SC Resolution 1998</b> – ZAMA COURSEN-NEFF, Deputy Director, Children's Rights Division, Human Rights Watch  <b>Topic: UN MRM process</b>  <b>Myanmar:</b> <i>UN Monitoring and reporting of attacks on schools and hospitals,</i> <b>MATT FINCH</b> , Karen Human Rights Group  <b>Topic:</b> Non-MRM monitoring and reporting  <b>Ivory Coast:</b> <i>Non-UN monitoring system:</i> <b>JENNIFER HOFMANN</b> , UNICEF	

**DAY3: TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 10**

Time	Session	Content/ Activities/Panelists	Facilitators
3:45 – 5:15 (cont.)	<b>Session 13: Monitoring and reporting (cont.)</b>	<p><b>oPt:</b> <i>Monitoring and early warning system:</i> <b>HIBA QARAMAN</b>, Documentation and Communications Coordinator, Save the Children and <b>Ms. MARINA PARTIER</b>, Education Programme Specialist, UNESCO, oPt</p> <p><b>Small-group discussion:</b> Assessment of practices for adaptation to other countries, challenges, gaps</p>	Zama Coursen-Neff, Human Rights Watch
5:15 – 5:30	<b>Country Review</b>	<i>Each country identifies one priority for their country for next steps in improving programmatic measures and posts on a VIPP card on their wall station. Gaps and challenges can also be posted on the wall stations.</i>	Brenda Haiplik, UNICEF
5:30	<b>Meeting on Higher Education</b>	<i>One focal point from each country will participate in a side meeting to discuss protecting higher education from attack and next steps for expanding the agenda</i>	Hosted by Education Above All

**DAY4: TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 11**

Time	Session	Content/ Activities/Panelists	Facilitators
8:30 – 8:45	<b>Preview/questions</b>	<i>Countries read out their special VIPP card.</i>	Lori Heninger, INEE
8:45 – 9:45	<b>Session 14: Global Database and Practitioner Networking</b>	<p><b>Interactive discussion:</b> Establishing GCPEA global databases of key actors and FBPR activities; suggestions for dynamic inter-practitioner networking mechanisms</p> <p>What are key actors prepared to do in their own countries?</p> <p>What types of information can countries provide GCPEA?</p> <p>What are the expectations and needs of countries of GCPEA?</p> <p>How should countries communicate with each other?</p> <p>What are the Links to INEE? (LORI HENINGER)</p>	John Gregg, Co-Chair, GCPEA and Director, Education Above All, Qatar
9:45 – 10:30	<b>Session 15: Country Summaries</b>	<b>Country summaries:</b> Countries read out 1) most important priorities, and 2) biggest challenge from VIPP cards	Gary Ovington UNICEF APSSC
10:30 – 10:45	Break		

**DAY4: TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 11**

Time	Session	Content/ Activities/Panelists	Facilitators
10:45- 12:15	<b>Session 16: Prioritizing the Agenda for Research and Evaluation</b>	<p><b><i>Interactive presentation: Identifying priorities for research</i></b> – DR. DANA BURDE, Associate Professor, New York University with assistance from AMY KAPIT-SPITALNY, NYU</p> <p><b><i>Country summary: CARE research in Afghanistan:</i></b> JENNIFER ROWELL, Head of Advocacy, CARE International in Afghanistan</p>	Dana Burde, Associate Professor, New York University
12:15 – 12:45	<b>Closing</b>	<p>Country input into good practice guide to be published by GCPEA</p> <p>Wrap up, evaluation/adjourn</p>	<p>John Gregg, GCPEA Co-chair</p> <p>Lori Heninger, INEE</p>

## ANNEX 4

### GCPEA Knowledge Roundtable Participant List

#### Afghanistan

Mr. Daoud Ghaznawi  
Education Projects Senior Manager, Save the Children

Ms. Jennifer Anne Rowell  
Head of Advocacy, Care International in Afghanistan

Mr. Waheedullah Sultani  
Acting DG for Admin, Ministry of Education

Ms. Jennifer Blinkhorn  
Education Director, Aga Khan Foundation

#### Central African Republic

Mr. Pere Aurelio  
Caritas

#### Canada

Mr. David Robinson  
Senior Advisor, Education International

#### Colombia

Ms. Maria Paula Calvo Suarez  
Community Services Assistant, UNHCR

Ms. Sandra Ines Vargas Mahecha  
Representante Legal, Corporacion Casa Amazonia

Ms. Wendy Marie Smith  
Researcher on Military Use, GCPEA

#### Democratic Republic of Congo

Mr. Jean de Dieu Katsongo Lwanzo Muhindo  
Education Project Manager Kivu, Save the Children

Ms. Séverine Ramis  
Field Manager Province Orientale, Save the Children-UK  
DRC

#### France

Ms. Jane Kalista  
Assistant Programme Specialist, Section for Planning  
and Emergency Response UNESCO

#### India

Mr. Rayappa Kancharla  
Regional Emergency Advisor, Save the Children

Mr. Yudhisthira Panigrahi Panigrahi  
Programme Coordinator, Save the Children

#### Iraq

Dr. Yahya Arif Jasim ALKubaisi  
Researcher, Iraq Center for Strategic Studies

#### Ivory Coast

Mr. Yaya Diarrassouba  
Deputy Education Director, Save the Children

Ms. Jennifer Emily Hofmann  
Education Specialist, UNICEF

Mr. Noel Brou Kouakou  
Advisor to the Minister, Ministry of Education

Mr. Oshcard Kouadio Kouassi  
Child Protection Officer, UNOCI

#### Myanmar

Ms. Naw Gay Nay Hser  
Information Processing Coordinator, Karen Human  
Rights Group (KHRG)

Mr. Matt Finch  
Advocacy Coordinator, Karen Human Rights Group  
(KHRG)

#### Nepal

Mr. Tarak Dhital  
Program Coordinator, CWIN

Ms. Jyoti Rana Magar (Subedi)  
Field Coordinator, World Education, Inc.

Mr. Manish Thapa  
Assistant Professor of Peace Studies, Dept. of Conflict,  
Peace Development Studies, Tribhuvan University

Mr. Deepak Sharma  
Deputy Director General, Ministry of Education



## Northern Ireland

Dr. Alan Smith  
Professor, UNESCO Chair, University of Northern  
Ireland- Ulster

## Norway

Ms. Lena Margrethe Hasle  
Senior Advisor, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Norway

## Occupied Palestinian Territory

Mr. Christopher Robert Gunness  
Spokesman/ Head of Public Information and Advocacy,  
UNRWA

Ms. Hiba Abdul Wahab Qaraman  
Documentation and Communications Coordinator,  
Save the Children UK

Mr. Omar Anbar  
Director of Education, MOEHE

## Pakistan

Ms. Erum Burki  
Cluster Coordinator, Save the Children

Mr. Sajjad Ismail  
Education Specialist, UNICEF

Mr. Najeeb Khan  
Manager Education, Save the Children

Mr. Syed Fawad Ali Shah  
Education Officer—Emergency, UNICEF

## Philippines

Ms. Mary Ann M. Arnado  
Secretary General, Mindanao People's Caucus

Mr. Atty Baratucal L Caudang  
Secretary of Education, Department of Education—  
Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao

Mr. Oliver Ramos Hernandez  
Engineer, Department of Education

Mr. Yul Adelfo V. Olaya  
Education Officer, UNICEF Philippines

## Qatar

Mr. John Gregg  
Director, Education Above All

Mr. Mubarak Nasser Thamer Al-Thani  
Project Coordinator, EAA

Ms. Margaret Sinclair  
Technical Advisor, EAA

## South Sudan

Ms. Govedi Kennedy Muzami  
Education Project Manager, Save the Children South  
Sudan

## Senegal

Ms. Andrea Berther  
Regional Education Specialist, Emergencies, West and  
Central Africa Regional Office

## Sri Lanka

Ms. Brenda Haiplik  
UNICEF Education Chief, Sri Lanka, UNICEF

## Switzerland

Ms. Ita Sheehy  
Senior Education Officer, UNHCR

## Thailand

Ms. Annette Lyth  
Senior Emergency Specialist Child Protection, UNICEF  
APSSC

Dr. Gary Ovington  
Senior Emergency Specialist- Education, Asia-Pacific  
Shared Services Center (APSSC), UNICEF

Ms. Kay Sintupongphan  
Administrative Assistant, UNICEF APSSC

## UK

Mr. John R. Akker  
Executive Secretary, Council for Assisting Refugee  
Academics

Ms. Emily Echessa  
Education Adviser, Save the Children UK

## **United States**

Dr. Carolyne Ashton  
Evaluator, Search for Common Ground

Dr. Dana Burde  
Associate Professor International Education Program,  
NYU

Ms. Zama Coursen-Neff  
Deputy Director, Children's Rights Division- Human  
Rights Watch

Ms. Christine Groneman  
Research Consultant, GCPEA

Ms. Natalie Hamoudi  
Education Specialist, UNICEF

Dr. Lori Heninger  
Director, INEE

Ms. Amy Kalit-Spitalny  
Doctoral Candidate/Researcher, NYU

Mr. Jim Miller  
Executive Director, Scholar Rescue Fund

Mr. Bede Sheppard  
Senior Researcher, Human Rights Watch

Ms. Melinda Smith  
Coalition Coordinator, GCPEA

Mr. Charles von Rosenberg  
Program Coordinator, GCPEA

## **Zimbabwe**

Dr. Alex Tawanda Magaisa  
Senior Lecturer in Law, CARA/ZDDI

Mr. Lloyd Munorweyi Pswarayi  
Research Officer, Research Advocacy Unit

Dr. Takavafira Zhou  
President, Progressive Teachers' Union of Zimbabwe





## 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](mailto:GCPEA@protectingeducation.org)



[www.protectingeducation.org](http://www.protectingeducation.org)