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INTRODUCTION

The Syria Crisis Education IM Package: In 2015, within the context of the Syria crisis education response and with a view of aligning the Regional Refugee and Resilience Plan (3RP) sector objectives with the No Lost Generation (NLG) Initiative and ensuring coherence in reporting between the different countries of Turkey, Lebanon, Jordan, Iraq and Egypt, the 3RP education co-leads (UNICEF and UNHCR) developed guidance for suggested outcome and output indicators for Education in Emergencies (EiE) linked to specific activities. These were categorized along three key objectives: (i) Access to education, (ii) Quality of education services and (iii) Education system strengthening. The guidance was presented to and developed with country education sector coordinators during the 2015 3RP mid-year review and subsequently introduced at country level. Feedback and suggestions for improvement from this pilot phase were incorporated at regional level, and a revised version of the guidance was developed. This takes into considerations challenges relating to different interpretation of indicators, different methodologies used for data collection, and difficulties in aligning EiE data collection with national education data collection systems.

In February 2016, the London ‘Supporting Syria and the Region’ Conference engaged all Syria crisis countries around strategic shifts that need to be taken into consideration in the education response planning, programming and reporting. This further consolidated the education response around three key pillars of access, quality and system strengthening, and provided a more strategic focus for interventions along a humanitarian-to-development continuum. A first Syria Crisis Information Management (IM) workshop was held in Amman, Jordan in July 2016. Key outcome of the workshop was the development of the Syria Crisis Education IM Package in its current form. Building on the 2015 guidance, the Package presents a coherent and comprehensive list of EiE indicators accompanied by an elaborate guidance on definitions, activities and methods of calculation with a specific focus on comparability and alignment with national data collection and management systems. Following the workshop, efforts were exerted to improve indicators for quality and system strengthening, as country developed their response plans. The Syria Crisis Education IM Package was in 2016 tested at country level and feedback sent to the regional level was consolidated into a developed version that, while aiming to be as comprehensive as possible, also notes the challenging environment and the difficulties partners face on the ground. This version of the Package was presented at the Syria Crisis Education Response IM Workshop in 2017. Although the IM Package has been currently finalized, it is considered as an ongoing work that, while guiding the education response, remains flexible and open to changes, as the response and the needs evolve on the ground.

The Syria Crisis Education Response IM Workshop held in Amman on 10-12 July 2017 brought together country delegations from Syria, Turkey, Lebanon, Jordan, Iraq, Egypt, the State of Palestine and Yemen, as well as regional representatives of UN agencies, NGOs, ALECSO and the donor community to discuss and endorse the final version of the Syria Crisis Education IM Package. Given the interest in the Package by other crisis countries in the MENA region, its application and mainstreaming in other crisis contexts were also discussed (the State of Palestine and Yemen participated in the workshop). In addition, the workshop provided an opportunity to continue the discussion regarding the alignment of IM tools and systems used in crisis response to national data collection and management systems. A session on the Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG) data processes explored connections between the Syria crisis Education IM Package and the SDG4 targets.
and indicators. Finally, during the last day of the workshop participants discussed four emerging issues and priorities in crisis contexts: early childhood education (ECE) and measuring early learning; monitoring learning outcomes, including in relation to the Life Skills and Citizenship Education (LSCE) Initiative’s 12 core life skills; technical and vocational education and training (TVET); and higher education.

| Workshop Objectives | • To strengthen and endorse the Syria Crisis Education IM Package of indicators and activities together with the accompanying guidance.  
  • To discuss the mainstreaming of the Education IM Package in other MENA crisis contexts.  
  • To identify channels of alignment between the Syria Crisis Education IM Package and national education data systems and SDG4 monitoring.  
  • To take a deep dive into thematic issues in the emergency response in terms of definition, targeting and data collection and reporting (ECE, learning assessments, TVET, and higher education). |
|---------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| Workshop Outcomes   | • Finalization of the Syria Crisis Education IM Package, subject to a final set of revisions emerged during the workshop, including greater harmonization of the IM Package with national data collection and data management systems.  
  • Dialogue initiated on and preliminary alignment of the Education IM Package with SDG4 monitoring processes. |
| Participation       | • **Country delegations** from Syria, the five host countries of Turkey, Lebanon, Jordan, Iraq, Egypt, representatives from the State of Palestine and Yemen. The country delegations are constituted of sector/cluster/hub coordinators, education and IM officers in UN agencies and NGOs, as well as relevant officials from MOEs.  
  • **At the regional level**: Education and IM officers from UN agencies and NGOs; ALECSO.  
  • **Donor community** during the last day of the workshop. |

**Structure of the Syria crisis education response information management (IM) workshop report**

**Section one** provides an overview of the programmatic education response to the Syrian crisis through the Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP) and the 3RP. It also includes the IM monitoring frameworks of the HRP and 3RP at regional and country level.

**Section two** introduces the Syria Crisis Education IM Package, explores linkages with the SDG4 indicators and records discussions on how to further develop the Package. It also provides a snapshot of selected IM systems and tools.
**Section three** deeps into four key areas of the programmatic response that need further focus and joint efforts: ECE, learning assessments, TVET, and higher education.

**Section four** provides an overview of opportunities to further develop the Syria Crisis Education IM Package and sets the way forward for the Package and the key areas of ECE, learning assessments, TVET, and higher education.
SECTION ONE: OVERVIEW OF PROGRAMMATIC RESPONSE IN SYRIA AND THE FIVE HOST COUNTRIES

The Syrian crisis has now entered its seventh year and continues to have devastating effects on the educational prospects of its people, both within the country and across the region. Inside Syria, 1.98 million children have been internally displaced, many multiple times.\(^1\) 5.82 million children and youth are in need of education assistance, of whom 1.75 million are out of school and 1.35 million are at risk of dropping out. Almost 7,000 schools — in 3 — have been damaged, destroyed, repurposed (for shelter or other uses) or are no longer accessible. Nearly 150,000 education personnel (over one third of the total) have left the teaching force. In short, the Syrian education system is suffering from a severe lack of resources that makes difficult to provide a conducive learning environment to its intended beneficiaries, many of whom are suffering from psychosocial distress. This shortfall leaves Syrian children at risk of exploitation, child labour, early marriage and recruitment into armed groups. The total economic loss due to dropout from basic and secondary education is estimated to be USD 11 billion, equivalent to about 18 per cent of the 2010 Syrian GDP, if children do not go back to school.

Despite the challenges, there has been some progress. Between the 2014/15 and 2015/16 school years, enrolment increased from 3.24 million (60 per cent) to 3.66 million (68 per cent). In consequence, the number of out-of-school children has decreased from 2.12 million to 1.75 million. Even so, this is still a far cry from meeting the London Supporting Syria and the Region Conference’s target of reaching all out-of-school children inside Syria.

At the same time, refugee children and youth in the five host countries who have fled conflict and insecurity in Syria face major barriers accessing education, including limited space in schools, different language of instruction and curriculum, discrimination and financial constraints. As of July 2017, the number of registered Syrian school-age refugee children (5-17 years) in the Republic of Turkey (hereinafter Turkey), the Lebanese Republic (hereinafter Lebanon), the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan (hereinafter Jordan), the Republic of Iraq (hereinafter Iraq) and the Arab Republic of Egypt (hereinafter Egypt) was nearly 1.6 million, about a third of the total number of Syrian refugees in these countries (4.83 million). 1.05 million of these children (66 per cent) were enrolled in school by December of 2016, reflecting an encouraging increase from only 781,000 (55 per cent) in the previous year. This progress was principally the result of increased formal education enrolment in Turkey and Lebanon. 534,500 refugee children (34 per cent) remain out of school.

The three key components of the strategic education response to the challenges faced by Syrian children and youth and the host communities that were agreed upon during the London Conference in 2016 focus around: 1) system strengthening, 2) scaling-up access, and 3) improving quality. **System strengthening** involves policy development to ensure outreach to the most vulnerable groups in the crisis (non-formal education accreditation frameworks, NGO collaborative frameworks, engagement of Syrian teachers); education sector planning that mainstreams the refugee response (for example, RACE in Lebanon, the Jordan Compact); and more responsive EMIS that integrates refugee-related data collection (YOBIS in Turkey, OpenEMIS in Jordan). **Scaling-up access** requires systematic approach to maximize utilization of public schools (including double-shift schools); Back-

\(^{1}\) 2017 Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO).
to-Learning (BTL) campaigns; social protection programmes; child protection support and referral mechanisms. Finally, interventions to **improve quality** have consisted primarily of teacher professional development (more than 45,000 teachers and education personnel were reached in 2016), including acquisition of officially recognized certification in Turkey and KRI; quality assurance; and the Life Skills and Citizenship Education (LSCE) initiative.

At country level, key developments have taken place the London Conference in 2016. In terms of system strengthening, the Education Cannot Wait (ECW) Investment for Syria is key in bridging the humanitarian-development divide to strengthen education systems. In Turkey, the Ministry of National Education (MONE) has further strengthened the Education in Emergencies and Migration Unit within the Directorate for Lifelong Learning to develop a roadmap for the education of Syrian refugee children. The Foreign Students Education Management Information System (YOBIS) is being used for evidence-based programming for Syrian and other vulnerable students. In Lebanon, a second ambitious iteration of the Reaching All Children with Education (RACE) Strategy was launched in 2016 with a clear vision of the priorities to improve the capacity of the Ministry of Education and Higher Education (MEHE), its personnel and its schools to better administer a quality public education system. In Jordan, the MOE has made investments to strengthen the EMIS to serve as a centralized source of information for planning and monitoring results, with a focus on formal education. Through OpenEMIS the MOE was able to improve the overall accuracy of national education data. In Iraq, the education sector, with leadership by the MOE in the Kurdistan Region of Iraq (KR-I), has worked towards the development of an emergency preparedness and response plan. In Egypt and Iraq, efforts have been exerted to support decentralization and improvement of school governance through the strengthening of school-based management. In terms of scaling up access, BTL campaigns have been extensively conducted in Syria and the five host countries, with the aim of engaging with families and children on the importance of education and on the options available for children, using innovative ways, extending the campaigns throughout the year and including in some countries, case management and household levels. Regulatory frameworks for non-formal and informal education have also been developed with clear pathways of reintegration to formal education. In terms of improving quality of formal and non-formal education, in Syria and the five host countries teacher development programmes have been supported, including the development of teacher training programmes for Syrian volunteer teachers in Turkey and KRI, in-service teacher training in Jordan, literacy boosts intervention in Egypt.²

There is a need for effective partnerships and resource mobilization to support this strategic response. In the five hosting countries, the education sector received US$506 million in 2016—up from US$409 million in 2015—but unfortunately the funding gap expanded during the same period due to larger sector requirements (from 93 per cent of the required US$439 million funded in 2015 to 74 per cent of the required US$ 666 million funded in 2016). Multi-year, sustained, predictable and timely funding is crucial to quality programming, and the London Conference stipulated that US$933 million per year would be needed to provide quality education for all. As such, more concerted outreach needs to be made to non-traditional donors and the private sector, and innovative financing mechanisms and the untapped resources of multiple organizations and associations need to be leveraged. The NLG Initiative represents a key component of this effort,

involving broad partnerships between diverse stakeholders within the framework of the Syria crisis response.

**Key issues emerged during the discussion**

- In terms of the education response to the Syrian crisis, there has been major progress in system strengthening. An area for further progress is the design of access and quality initiatives to **benefit host communities** with the need to address any inequities between host and refugee/IDP communities.

- The issue of **teachers’ salaries/incentives** should be tackled at length in subsequent focused meetings as it seems to cut across several countries: some countries are struggling to pay their teaching force (different incentives provided to teachers, 75 per cent of the teaching force not paid in Yemen, KRI’s difficulties in paying Syrian teachers) while others are introducing schemes to ultimately have Syrian teachers included in national payroll systems.

**HRP processes**

The country and region-wide frameworks in place to address the Syria and Iraq crises include the **HRP** for Syria and Iraq (coordinated by the United Nations Office for Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs—UN OCHA) and the **3RP** for the refugee response in the five host countries of Turkey, Lebanon, Jordan, Iraq and Egypt (coordinated by UNHCR and UNDP).

The Humanitarian Programme Cycle (HPC) provides the framework for identifying humanitarian needs, planning an appropriate response, funding and implementing the response, monitoring its progress, and evaluating its impact. Within the HPC, the HRP is a response management tool for country-based decision makers. In line with the Whole of Syria (WoS) approach, humanitarian partners have begun the process of preparing the Syrian Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO) and HRP as the basis for forward planning and response for 2018. The HRP aims to encompass the collective vision and strategic priorities of the international humanitarian community and its national partners for responding to the assessed humanitarian needs of people in Syria. The HNO is intended to be completed in September 2017 to then inform the sector strategy for the HRP, be completed and launched in December 2017. Iraq, a Level 3 emergency responding to an IDP crisis, will also be embarking on an HRP funding appeal over the next six months with a similar launch time.

The **HRP processes** in the two countries are coordinated by OCHA and the WoS Education Sector and Hubs in Syria and the Education Cluster in Iraq. The HRP monitoring framework is guided by a number of overarching multi-sector strategic objectives in which sector specific objectives, activities and indicators are defined as a way to measure progress towards achieving the goals set out in the sector strategy. As of June 2017, both the Syria and Iraq 2017 HRP education appeals are underfunded with a dramatic gap of 71 per cent and 64 per cent respectively.

The countries affected by the Syria crisis and hosting refugees are part of the 3RP coordinated by UNHCR and UNDP. The 3RP was launched in December 2014 to respond to both the growing demand for protection and humanitarian assistance for refugees from Syria and the growing need to build the resilience of individuals, communities and institutions in host communities to cope with
the Syria crisis. The 3RP planning process for 2017 - 2018 was initiated in 2016 and will have a mid-year report in 2017. As of April 2017, the Education Sector 3RP appeal is only 19 per cent funded.

Introduction to the HRP processes in other countries in the region

The 2017 HRP for Libya was built to address life-saving needs of Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs), returnees, most vulnerable Libyans, migrants, refugees and asylum seekers in urgent need of humanitarian assistance. The 2017 HRP for the Occupied Palestinian Territories (OPT) is the fifteenth coordinated appeal that aims to extend protection to Palestinians living under occupation, in accordance with international law, to ensure access to basic services for the most vulnerable Palestinians and to strengthen the capacity of families to cope with the continued pressures of life under occupation. Both the Libya and OPT HRPs are underfunded with a gap of 77 per cent and 86 per cent respectively.

The 2017 Yemen HRP (YHRP) strategy is based on common planning assumptions and commitments that emphasize a clearly defined scope for the YHRP, a more integrated approach, local empowerment, stronger partnerships and strategic use of pooled funds intended to bolster partners’ ability to deliver against the HRP strategic objectives.

The Sudan Humanitarian Country Team (HCT) is rolling out a Multi-Year Humanitarian Strategy 2017 – 2019 (MYHS), which provides the overall framework for humanitarian activities in Sudan for the next three years, and is in line with the Government’s quarter century strategy and third five-year plan. In order to retain the flexibility to respond to new emergencies and needs, and to adapt the response to changes in the operational environment and capacity, the three-year strategy is complemented with annual operational plans. The education chapter of the MYHS is only 7 per cent funded.

3RP processes

The countries affected by the Syria crisis and hosting refugees are part of the 3RP coordinated by UNHCR and UNDP. The 3RP was launched in December 2014 and comprises two interconnected components: the refugee protection and humanitarian component that addresses the protection and assistance needs of refugees as well as the most vulnerable members of impacted communities; and the resilience/stabilization-based development component that addresses the resilience and stabilization needs of impacted and vulnerable communities. In line with the NLG Initiative, the education sectors in the five 3RP countries implement programmes within three objectives: 1) scaling up opportunities for equitable access to formal and non-formal education; 2) promoting the quality and relevance of education; and 3) strengthening education systems at national and sub-national levels.
Key issues emerged during the discussion

- Education needs to be prioritized in the humanitarian appeal for crisis contexts such as Syria and Yemen, as it is critical for future reconstruction and development.
- Further steps should be taken to align activities targeting refugees with those having a more development oriented approach, particularly where separate groups or processes are responsible for these respective areas. The distinction between the 3RP’s refugee and resilience pillars is somewhat artificial, as these areas should ideally form a continuum.
- While other refugee caseloads (i.e. refugees coming from countries of origin other than Syria) are not going to be addressed through the 3RP, their needs should not be obscured by the Syria crisis, and other methods of making funding more equitable across caseloads should be explored.
- Returns of Syrians —both within and from outside the country—will be a major issue for the forthcoming HNO and the HRP. UNHCR, the Camp Coordination and Camp Management (CCCM) cluster, and other organizations are tracking returns so that they can to inform coordinated and evidence-based response.
- Given that governments have different programme cycles, humanitarian and development actors need to be flexible when it comes to programming. Multiyear planning may be one mechanism for this; while 3RP is still using a 2018-19 timeframe, Jordan and Lebanon are planning until 2020. Multi-year planning, as in the case of the 3RP, should be pursued in other crises that are becoming protracted such as that in Yemen. Discussions are ongoing to have a multi-year HRP for inside Syria.

HRP and 3RP IM processes

IM processes within the WoS

The WoS education sector objectives, outputs, targets and indicators are based on the HRP’s three objectives and twelve associated inter-sector outcomes. Monitoring occurs through the 4Ws monthly reporting process (who is doing what, when, where and for whom), which relies on inputs from sector members through the three Hubs to the WoS OCHA IM (please refer to section on IM tools). The primary challenges confronting this process are lack of granular data (community, neighborhood, school level), particularly for the most vulnerable groups; conflicting response monitoring data from different Hubs (e.g. double counting of beneficiaries and duplication of activities), and high turnover of reporting staff (requiring repeated training).

3RP IM processes at regional level

At the regional level, a regional monthly dashboard aggregates the information from all the 3RP country-specific dashboards to highlight the regional results, achievements, challenges and opportunities, covering nine regional indicators. The key challenges in the regional 3RP IM process are lack of timely submission of country inputs, poor quality of figures provided, differences in progress issued by sector lead agency vs. country sector, clearing process at regional level, use of multiple systems across countries, and limited reporting and analysis capacity for quarterly dashboard/analysis.
**3RP IM processes at country level**

The 3RP sector response plans are embedded in national plans and are aligned to country specific national priorities. Each county utilizes different country level monitoring frameworks as the process for developing the plan is country-based. All 3RP countries utilize ActivityInfo as part of their reporting processes (please refer to section on IM tools). 3RP countries use a range of indicators and produce country-specific monthly dashboards. The country-level 3RP reporting process faces several challenges, including lack of school-level reporting, lack of indicators on disabilities, lack of data on urban and particularly out-of-school refugee children, difficulties on reporting on too many indicators for certain countries, confusion over outcome and output indicators, duplication in reporting, and partners insufficiently trained in the reporting methodologies. At the same time, the process could benefit from identifying key strategic indicators, developing tools to track who is responsible for reporting on which indicator, developing ActivityInfo to prevent double counting, and tracking success of informal education (IFE) more closely by monitoring every stage of programme implementation.

**Key issues emerged during the discussion**

- It falls to country operations to decide how most appropriately to **distinguish between humanitarian and resilience indicators** in their specific context (e.g. in Jordan, any intervention targeting host communities falls under resilience).
- Further work needs to be done to identify indicators to measure the **impact of resilience interventions**. It is expected that these indicators will be included during the next planning process.
- Concern about the accuracy and level of detail of the data provided through the **Financial Tracking Service** (FTS) was raised: the FTS is only as good as its inputs, and unfortunately actors on the ground often do not provide the requested information.
SECTION TWO: THE SYRIA CRISIS EDUCATION IM PACKAGE

In 2015, with a view of aligning the 3RP sector objectives with the NLG Initiative and ensuring coherence in reporting between the five host countries, the 3RP education co-leads (UNICEF and UNHCR) developed guidance for suggested outcome and output indicators for EiE linked to specific activities. These were categorized along three key objectives: (i) Access to education, (ii) Quality of education services and (iii) Education system strengthening. The guidance was presented to and developed with country education sector coordinators during the 2015 3RP mid-year review and subsequently introduced at country level. Feedback and suggestions for improvement from this pilot phase were incorporated at regional level, and a revised version of the guidance was developed. This takes into considerations challenges relating to different interpretation of indicators, different methodologies used for data collection, and difficulties in aligning EiE data collection with national education data collection systems.

In February 2016, the London ‘Supporting Syria and the Region’ Conference engaged all Syria crisis countries around strategic shifts that need to be taken into consideration in the education response planning, programming and reporting. This further consolidated the education response around three key pillars of access, quality and system strengthening, and provided a more strategic focus for interventions along a humanitarian-to-development continuum.

The first Syria Crisis IM workshop held in Amman, Jordan in July 2016 saw the genesis of the Syria Crisis Education IM Package. Building on the 2015 guidance, the Package presents a coherent and comprehensive list of EiE indicators accompanied by an elaborate guidance on activities and methods of calculation and with a specific focus on comparability and alignment with national data collection and management systems. Following the workshop, efforts were also exerted to improve indicators for quality and system strengthening, as country developed their response plans. The Syria Crisis Education IM Package was in 2016 tested at country level and feedback sent to the regional level was consolidated into a developed version that, while aiming to be as comprehensive as possible, also notes the challenging environment and the difficulties partners face on the ground.

This version of the Package was presented at the Syria Crisis Education Response IM Workshop in 2017. Although the IM Package has been currently finalized, it is considered as an ongoing work that, while guiding the education response, remains flexible and open to changes, as the response and the needs evolve on the ground. Key issues that emerged during the discussion are noted below, and detailed results of the group work conducted during the workshop are in Annex 4.

**Key issues emerged during the discussion: how to finalize the Syria Crisis Education IM Package?**

- The **definitions of non-formal and informal education** cause considerable confusion and should be clarified further. It was suggested that using the term ‘non-accredited’ instead of ‘informal’ and ‘non-formal’ may simplify matters and better reflect the reality on the ground (i.e. accredited non-formal education vs non-accredited non-formal education). Another suggestion was to produce a matrix including the different programmes that fall under each designation, given the differences between countries.
The distinction between accelerated and remedial education also causes some confusion, in part because of differences between countries. It was suggested to use the definitions with the broadest usage in the IM Package and to harmonize language with the INEE’s work on accelerated education.

Several countries noted that their definition of school age departed from the 5-17 age range specified in the Package. Participants also pointed out that children who had missed several years of school may fall outside of that age range. Additionally, in the Package, the composition of the group of children concerned (e.g. host, refugee, host and refugee children together) is left open because this differs between countries.

The most common form of double counting is between formal and non-formal education. Some country operations have found ways to prevent confusion in reporting on this point and other countries may benefit from these experiences.

Participants called for the IM Package to be harmonized further with other processes (like INEE’s, for example) and a four-page glossary developed by UNICEF Regional Office was presented in an effort to standardize the terminology used (see Annex 3).

It is necessary to balance the need for more detailed data with considerations about the number of indicators on which partners can fairly be expected to report against. There is a need for further disaggregation of certain indicators by age or level of education, the latter of which may be easier to implement. Participants requested technical guidance regarding when and how to adjust their data collection practices to accommodate such changes. It may be necessary to include further indicators for tertiary education in the Package.

There is a need for additional qualitative indicators to measure the impact of interventions (such as for example, for the BTL campaigns, instead of measuring how many campaigns, it would be important to measure how many children have been reintegrated to formal education). The IM Package needs to further develop indicators measuring outcome or quality. In order to have more such indicators, it is necessary to engage in more activities that measure outcomes, both inside and outside of emergency contexts. Global surveys (e.g. PISA) and national end-of-year tests are not sufficient by themselves. In the meantime, several indicators in the IM Package have been moved from access to quality, as proxies for quality (e.g. trained teachers indicate better teaching). The need for strong engagement with MOEs in the development of country indicators was reiterated.

Concerning how to properly capture psychosocial support (PSS) activities within the IM Package’s framework, there was some concern about overlapping areas with the Child Protection sector. In addition, a clear definition of PSS in schools is needed to avoid this becoming a vague indicator.

Procedural issues (i.e. frequency/quality of reporting, etc.) raised by all groups could not be addressed by the IM Package, but would need country-level solutions.

The delegations from Palestine and Yemen felt that the Syria Crisis Education IM Package could be useful to their operations and that many of the indicators would apply, but that certain elements (like school age and classifications) would need to be adapted to their specific contexts.
• Participants pointed out the need for a comprehensive Arabic translation of the IM Package, given the difficulty of rendering certain nuances in terminology in translation.

SDG4 data processes

The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) are the result of an inclusive goal setting process during which one million people were consulted. They build on the unfinished Millennium Development Goal (MDG) Agenda, and include a broader set of goals and a greater emphasis on equity while encompassing all countries. The SDGs’ objectives are ambitious —they aim to completely eradicate undesirable phenomena like hunger and lack of enrolment in school — as is the process’s data-gathering methodology. Success in reaching the SDGs will depend on more and timelier data, greater disaggregation, and concerted feedback of results to the people the process is meant to serve.

The SDG indicator development process is led by the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on SDG Indicators (IAEG-SDG), which is composed of Member States from all regions, multilateral agencies and civil society. National governments set their own targets guided by the global level of ambition, but taking into account domestic circumstances. Each government decides how these targets should be incorporated into national planning processes, policies and strategies.

SDG4 sets the goal of ensuring inclusive and equitable quality education and promoting lifelong learning opportunities for all. The 11 global indicators developed for SDG4 by the IAEG-SDG are translated into 32 thematic indicators by the Education for All (EFA) Steering Committee Technical Cooperation Group (TCG), which in turn feed into two subsequent layers of regional and national indicators. Different indicators are allocated to three tiers based on whether an agreed methodology already exists for their measurement. Custodian agencies (including UNESCO and UNICEF) are responsible for managing the data collection process for these indicators.

Key issues emerged during the discussion

• The SDGs aim to have countries take more ownership over their development within their own resources. Nevertheless, all the work that international and NGO actors do in crisis contexts should still feed into and facilitate this process and be captured by its monitoring framework.

• The 1951 Refugee Convention, key international instruments on the Right to Education, the New York Declaration (2016) and subsequent Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF) underline the shared international responsibility to protect refugee children and youth while reaffirming their inclusion in national systems as the most sustainable solution to enable them follow certified programs and become visible and reflected in the host countries’ SDG progress.

• The work done in the Syria Crisis context should move along a continuum from humanitarian to development interventions. Aligning the IM Package with the SDG process is part of this effort, and indicators aggregated at country and outcome level form the critical bridge between the two. The linkage between the IM Package and the SDG work should be integrated into the three pillars, and emergency indicators should be integrated into EMIS.

• Drawing from SDG4.1, the IM Package should further disaggregate indicators by level and age, track disability, and distinguish clearly between refugee and host populations. More needs to be
done to track completion rates, proficiency levels and transition between non-formal and formal education. The IM Package should look beyond the number of children enrolled in ECE, to their readiness for school. Generally, besides tracking the number of activities more attention should be paid to the type of activities particularly those related to improving the quality of education opportunities (as for example through Life Skills and Citizenship Education training). Finally, the addition of indicators measuring violence in schools indicator, scholarships and teacher salaries should be further considered.

IM systems and tools

This section introduces IM tools (4Ws and ActivityInfo) and systems (Bayanati and YOBIS) and mobile-based IM tools (Kobo Toolbox, RapidPro) used in crisis response and how they relate to national data collection and management systems.

4Ws

The 4Ws system is an excel-based matrix that tracks who, where, what, when and for whom activities are conducted. Among other uses, the tool can help visualize the overlaps and gaps in terms of coverage of a specific thematic area or geographical area, provide information on the source of funding for the education activities being implemented, help visualize information on the number of beneficiaries of education interventions and inform indicators defined in the country for response monitoring and reporting needs in the HPC. The principal challenges involved in using the 4Ws are the high turnover of reporting staff (necessitating repeated training), de-confliction of response monitoring data from multiple hubs (i.e. preventing double counting of beneficiaries and duplication of activities) and obtaining data at the most granular level about the most vulnerable individuals.

ActivityInfo

ActivityInfo is an online response monitoring tool used in all 3RP countries (Turkey, Lebanon, Jordan, Egypt and Iraq) that helps humanitarian organizations to collect, manage, map and analyse indicators. The system encourages accountability by tracking ongoing activities against an initial plan. Each year, education actors submit appeals for projects they plan to implement over the course of that year and then provide monthly reports of their progress. That data is then extracted and reported in dashboard form. The system is being further developed in order to capture more details about the services being provided to beneficiaries.

Bayanati

Bayanati (“My Data” in Arabic) is a web-based monitoring and data management system that tracks delivery of services and outcomes at an individual level in real time. It collects and collates UNICEF’s Makani programme’s indicators (a programme involving three interventions: informal education, PSS and life skills youth training), which contribute to 3RP indicators for Education, Child Protection, Youth and WASH sectors. Its objective is to help refer students from the Makani programme to formal education. Bayanati functions as source data for partners from which they generate monthly reports to UNICEF and feed data into ActivityInfo. The principal challenge Bayanati’s roll out has faced were in insufficiently trained frontline staff and therefore in ensuring quality data entry by frontline service officers (which demonstrates that data quality assurance has to start at the
implementing partner level with managerial staff). More information can be accessed at: https://prezi.com/pok-mawtw3yg/bayanati-unicef-jordan.

**YOBIS**

The Foreign Students Education Management Information System (YOBIS) is a complementary EMIS developed jointly by UNICEF and Turkey’s MOE. It collects data on Syrian students, teachers and classrooms; including demographic and contact details of students and staff; information on enrolment, attendance and subjects taught; and information of accessibility and common spaces. This provides a good basis for qualitative and quantitative analysis of education opportunities for Syrian children and their education outcomes, as well as for assessment of unmet needs and existing capacity gaps. The information is entered at the school/Temporary Education Centre (TEC) level, but data review, data control and report generation can be done both at the central and provincial levels. Data has been entered for all 53,221 affected schools and 421 TECs. Currently, there are 291,039 students and more than 13,000 Syrian volunteer instructors registered to the system.

**KoBo Toolbox**

KoBo Toolbox is a free, open source tool that allows users to design survey forms, collect and analyse data through their mobile phone. It is optimized for humanitarian work. Users can access forms and collect data on their phones offline, as long as they eventually connect their devices to the internet to synchronize and store that data in one centralized database. Data can also be collected via paper questionnaire forms (designed using Kobo), using KoBoCAT to enter, clean and analyse that data. More information can be accessed at: https://www.humanitarianresponse.info/en/applications/kobotoolbox.

**RapidPro**

RapidPro is an open source, mobile-based application that allows users to easily design, pilot and scale services that connect directly with other mobile phone users. It is open source, built on experience in challenging environments and can be used on non-smartphones. RapidPro users can get more rapid feedback on whether interventions are working, which aligns with the SDGs' push to allow beneficiaries to contribute and receive more information. More information can be accessed at: https://community.rapidpro.io/.

**Key issues emerged during the discussion**

- Partners have criticized **4Ws** laborious excel format, but unfortunately having an online platform in the Syrian context is difficult because the Internet is not always accessible with potential security issues to be addressed. ActivityInfo could not be implemented in Syria because of government restrictions. More efforts need to be made to incentivize partners to use 4Ws by making it helpful to them. This is important across the board: data collection is not just about producing reports, but should help users do their work.

- **ActivityInfo** does not reflect how data was collected or its quality, which should be recorded, as each institution has a different way of gathering, verifying and inputting data. Currently, using ActivityInfo requires several different steps and programmes. The aim is to eventually have one system that covers all stages of the process, but ActivityInfo is a commercial system and its reporting system does not entirely suit the needs of education actors in crisis contexts.
- **Bayanati** serves as source data to generate figures to be inputted into ActivityInfo. In light of the current push to harmonize humanitarian and development processes and focus on system strengthening, it may be worth trying to move towards national, centralized data management systems and away from separate systems for separate programmes. To that end, Bayanati’s data is twinned into OpenEmis, so it does serve to strengthen national data systems. The objective is to eventually integrate the two systems.

- Education partners must ensure the security of beneficiaries’ personal information. It is advisable to use ID numbers instead of names with **KoBo**, as it is not clear how KoBo stores its data. Mobenzi is a more secure alternative because it does not save data on a server. Open Data Kit may also be a useful alternative, as it can assign beneficiaries barcodes. A further challenge with using such tools in Syria is respondents’ concern that phones may capture GPS coordinates.

- **RapidPro** is relevant where data cannot be easily collected by other means; it is not a replacement for other systems. In rural contexts, obtaining network signal and ensuring participants have enough phone credit can be a challenge, but remote credit top-ups can help.

- The Turkish MONE was involved from the very beginning of the development of **YOBIS**, in order to give it ownership and make it easier to eventually merge YOBIS with EMIS. Nevertheless, EMIS is much more advanced because it has been in development for many years and it is not advisable to disturb a well-functioning database with very limited data on Syrians. YOBIS may not last after the crisis, but it was still a useful exercise for stakeholders. Eventually, its data will be merged with e-Okul. Only the Turkish MONE has access to YOBIS, but it shares reports with relevant partners. Every child receives a unique, one-time ID. It is not possible to track the progress of individual students through YOBIS, and in any case, the MONE’s non-formal education system does not offer clear pathways into formal education. YOBIS demonstrated that Syrian children were not returning to TECs, so the government opted to integrate them into public schools instead.

- **EMIS** is the primary system and needs to be strengthened at all costs. However, EMIS is not easy to adapt to the needs of specific contexts, which is where these other tools are beneficial. Further thinking needs to be done about how to prevent disconnects between data collected in emergency contexts versus normally. Bayanati and OpenEmis may be a good model for this. EMIS is too sophisticated to track certain NFE programmes, which are enormously important in crisis contexts. UNICEF Lebanon is currently developing a system that allows users to track children’s transitions between different education systems and monitor NFE’s quality.

- In KR-I, **standardizing the system for IDPs and Syrian refugees** could address certain data quality issues. More generally, the value of supervision has not been acknowledged in these discussions.

- Education is also a **protection tool** and to that end, it may be worth exploring how to harmonize Education indicators with those in the sectors of Protection and Livelihood.
SECTION THREE: DEEP DIVES ON ECE, TVET, LEARNING ASSESSMENTS AND HIGHER EDUCATION

This section introduces four key areas of ECE, TVET, learning assessments and higher education that were deemed in need of further attention and development within the Syria crisis education response and its monitoring framework.

Early Childhood Education (ECE)

The first years of life are a critical window of opportunity for supporting development as well as for addressing inequality. Early childhood development (ECD) is a holistic concept, multi-sectoral in nature and relates to a variety of outcomes across the full continuum of development in young children, from before birth through the transition into early grades. In contrast, ECE typically spans the period from ages three to five or six and consists of organized learning only (often school-based or otherwise institutionalized for a group of children, such as centre-based or community-based). It is central to the efficiency of formal education systems, as children who attend some form or early childhood education enter school on time, stay in school longer and have better learning outcomes. Increasing investment and enrolment in quality ECE in low- and middle-income countries is projected to yield a benefit-to-cost ratio (rate of return to human capital investment) ranging from 6:4 to 17:6.

Young children in crisis settings face tremendous vulnerability and risks of physical harm, separation from family, exploitation, physical deprivation, toxic stress, lack of educational opportunities and psychological trauma. Furthermore, their traditional support networks at home are weakened. This has long-lasting negative impacts on their ability to learn, grow and recover. ECE can protect children (e.g. by raising awareness of dangers, promoting health and hygiene and providing a safe space), ensure continuity of learning, minimize disruptions to ongoing cognitive and socio-emotional development, provide a sense of normalcy, develop children’s resilience, and promote peace and stability by motivating and uniting communities.

In both emergency response and development programming, it is the Education Sector or Cluster that is best positioned to take responsibility for ECE. Additionally, crisis contexts represent unique opportunities to leverage community engagement in refugee response to boost national focus on ECE or leverage national-level plans and ongoing work on building the sub-sector to include refugee populations. Unfortunately, ECE is chronically underfunded in both humanitarian and development contexts: only 1per cent of international aid for education is spent on such programmes. The INEE’s “Minimum Standards for Education in Emergencies” explicitly includes ECD and ECE within the scope of education in emergencies and designates it as a key thematic issue. Even so, over 60 per cent of active 2016 HRPVs, flash appeals and refugee response plans do not include any mention of ECD or ECE, less than a third of education sector response plans include specific targets for ECD or early learning, ECE appears most often in refugee and regional response plans rather than individual country plans, and the situation is even more problematic in terms of provision of services. There is the need of a step change in this area: ECE is a non-negotiable aspect of education response in
humanitarian or crisis contexts, just as it is an integral part of education sector plans in development contexts.

The IM Package primarily focuses on “school-age” children, meaning those aged 5 to 17. It does include a specific indicator on ECE and several others that are or could be made relevant to ECE, but its description of ECE activities is general. By and large, the work required in humanitarian response to set up ECE programmes is guided by the same principles as for ECE in normal times, with some adaptations to fit the circumstances. Relevant activities include raising public awareness through informational campaigns, supporting local governments to rehabilitate and rebuild ECE centres and preschools, constructing new early learning centres, exploring community- or family-based early learning spaces, setting up safe spaces for playing, providing ECE materials, developing accelerated school readiness programmes, training ECE teachers and providing parenting education, among others.

**Key issues emerged during the discussion**

- In Syria, current ECE programmes are implemented by NGOs. The MOE is also providing ECE, but only for children of teachers. NGOs use the MOE’s curriculum. There is a shortage of resources, and coverage is limited to very stable areas and does not extend to camps. ECE facilities are also not of the standard necessary to convince families to send children. Donors seem to be more focused on mandatory education, so it is necessary to work in more structured way with the MoE to make ECE mandatory.

- ECE is not yet compulsory in Turkey, but the government is discussing making one year compulsory. There is a significant language issue in the context of the Syrian response. The policy of the government is to encourage attendance of Syrians so they learn Turkish early, but teachers are not prepared for this. Additionally, the costs are quite high, and there are not enough NGO partners working on ECE. There are some NF/home-based programmes, often supported by provincial entities. Turkey has data on enrolment in parental education and is considering adding an activity-level indicator on this.

- The ECE system in Lebanon is already saturated, so MEHE has limited capabilities to accommodate refugee children. An ECE package containing a module for children 3-5 years old has been developed under the NFE framework. This package has three components—kindergarten, preparatory and community-led programmes—and its content has been finalized. One of main challenges is a lack of Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) that NGOs can abide by in order to provide certification and to fall under endorsed NFE. There is an ECE task force, and NGOs are nevertheless working in this area. Donors also seem more interested in ECE recently, and classrooms are being expanded through kindergarten. Lebanon is notably rolling out an important innovation in terms of child-level monitoring pre-, during and post-programmes, which should enable it to assess the success of its accelerated programmes and school readiness.

- In Jordan, the future of ECE for refugee populations looks very promising. Currently 80 per cent of kindergartens are private (with costs of around 200JD per month); however, the National Human Resource Plan aims to universalize kindergarten participation, and the government has started to establish new kindergarten classes. This programme may be extended to refugee populations. In camp settings, kindergartens can be established very quickly and there are also parenting programmes and other services provided by NGOs.
• **Iraq** has a lot of the same challenges. A KR-I ECE curriculum has been approved, but not yet implemented. There is political will to integrate refugees into the Kurdish school system.

• In **Palestine**, public versus private provision of ECE continues to be an issue. There is currently no standardized ECE curriculum or certification system. NGOs are trying to fill the gap, but struggle to retain teachers, as most want to work with older age groups instead.

• In **Yemen**, ECE is not currently a priority, but it was noted that the country had piloted the use of education to encourage social cohesion in emergencies and that it would be good to measure this for ECE.

• Parental education and PSS are entry points for greater coordination with Protection. That said, it has already been agreed that both will continue to be reported under Child Protection.

• The IM Package’s ECE-relevant indicators present a focus on inputs; more needs to be done to measure outcomes, in part by tracking children’s transitions between different systems. It may be worth extending the age range to include children under five for some indicators (e.g. constructed classrooms); this does not solve the lack of disaggregation, but at least shows consideration of younger children. Disaggregating programmes by formal/NFE would be helpful.

---

**Learning Assessments**

*Monitoring learning achievements in crisis contexts*

There are significant gaps for all types of learning assessments in the MENA region, except for high stake examinations. Crisis-affected MENA countries do particularly poorly on this front.

Learning assessments in crisis contexts serve several purposes. They can provide a snapshot of academic performance (one-time evaluation), often used for advocacy purposes; evaluate the impact of programmes on learning (requiring baseline, sometimes midline, and end line measurement); provide feedback to teachers and learners to improve the learning process (continuous assessment); and screen children for special services. While assessment of academic learning outcomes is not necessarily different in crisis contexts, education will often be quite different, necessitating adjusted assessment practices. In crisis contexts, students tend to have more diverse learners’ backgrounds and teachers are often less experienced, both of which should influence the choice of assessment tools.

Education actors seeking to conduct learning assessments have a number of options at their disposal. They can outsource the design and/or implementation of tailored assessments, which have the advantage of targeting specific needs. The downsides to this approach are higher costs and the difficulties involved in finding contractors willing to work in unsafe areas. Alternatively, teachers can be trained to conduct assessments, including open access assessments (like EGRA and EGMA). This builds their capabilities, but has limited foundational capacity and can suffer from high teacher turnover rates. Finally, education actors can work with existing assessments to ensure that they include children in emergencies and disaggregate based on that context. This last option provides a useful comparison to other populations, but is not adapted to a specific goal or situation, and has timeline constraints.
The Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey (MICS) Foundational Learning Skills Module

SDG4.1.1 seeks to track learning outcomes and includes a subcategory for early learning (grades 2/3). Unfortunately, MENA is lagging behind other regions in gathering data on early learning, with data on reading and mathematics skills existing for only 47 per cent and 41 per cent of children in this age group, respectively. The MICS could help make up this gap.

MICS gather data on women and children during face-to-face interviews in representative samples of households. Government organizations typically conduct the surveys, with technical support from UNICEF. Over the past 20 years, MICS has supported 108 countries in producing data on a range of indicators in areas such as health, education, child protection and HIV/AIDS. MICS data can be disaggregated by numerous geographic, social and demographic characteristics. The sixth round of MICS is currently in process (2016–2018), and planning is underway to deploy it in MENA soon.

MICS has a modular structure, allowing users to easily add and delete modules. Its Foundational Learning Skills (FLS) module assesses the skills needed to continue to learn in school and targets 7-14 year olds (one child per household). The module only requires 17 minutes of interaction with the child and contains country-specific questions, while still retaining the same general framework. As a household survey, MICS has the advantage of reaching both in- and out-of-school children.

Measuring Learning Achievements in relation to 12 Core Life Skills

Life skills are higher order, soft, cognitive and non-cognitive skills related to academic, individual and social life that enable and buttress all forms of other skills. The Life Skills and Citizenship Education (LSCE) Initiative involves a holistic and life-long approach to quality education with an ethical foundation (dignity, human rights and values). This regional framework pursues three interconnected outcomes: 1) the development of a knowledge society through improved education outcomes; 2) economic development through improved employment and entrepreneurship; and 3) enhanced social cohesion through improved civic engagement.

The 12 core Life Skills, which have been identified as part of the LSCE Initiative are creativity, critical thinking, problem solving, cooperation, negotiation, decision-making, self-management, resilience, communication, respect for diversity, empathy and participation. The main purpose of measuring them is to develop a standardized approach of assessment for improving learning outcomes in MENA. The measurement methodology is still in development, and will cover all 12 core life skills and learning settings and focus on three age groups: primary, lower secondary and post-basic education. Existing measurement tools are being reviewed based on their reliability and validity, cross-national linguistic comparability, ability to measure multiple life skills at the same time, and practical and logistical considerations. Following this review, a new measurement instrument will be developed and adapted into Arabic, pre-piloted for “face validity,” and finally operationalized in selected MENA countries.

Key issues emerged during the discussion

- The starting point of any learning assessment exercise should be clarity about **what exactly needs to be measured** (often to inform subsequent interventions). Only then can the right tool be identified. If comparability to assessments in other contexts can be useful, it can also be damaging in certain situations. While ‘we treasure what we measure’, we also need to take care
‘to measure what we treasure’ and not just measure for the sake of measurement. Finally, carefully designing learning assessments to be multi-purpose maximizes their utility.

**Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET)**

TVET is made up of 1) technical vocational education, which includes formal post-basic education opportunities leading to learning outcomes certified by national authorities and that are equivalent to upper secondary or tertiary education, and 2) vocational training delivered outside of the formal education system either by public or private sector providers and that is not necessarily accompanied by certification. TVET’s objective is not to create jobs, but rather to increase the employability of young people, including through self-employment. It can be delivered through formal, non-formal, informal or mixed mechanisms. All forms are valid as long as they address the needs of the labour market, although non-formal opportunities should lead to some form of recognized qualification. The IM Package contains indicators for formal (ages 15-17), non-formal (15-24) and informal TVET (15-24).

A systems approach to TVET hinges on private sector involvement, governance and financing, capacity, and lifelong learning. The private sector should be involved in the governance of the TVET systems, standard setting, curricula design, workplace based learning, testing and certification, and evaluation. In terms of governance, there should be inter-ministerial processes in place that ensure the coherence of all training activities in the country; and an independent system that (a) sets and updates competency standards curricula and tests, (b) accredits programmes and training providers, (c) implements quality assurance processes. Financing of TVET should come from several sources, and public funding should go to programmes with some employment impact. The aim for capacity is to have a strong cadre of instructors that have required technical/pedagogical competencies and receive salaries and incentives commensurate with those skills. Additionally, the equipment used for training should be similar to that used in the private sector. Finally, life skills should be adequately included in training programmes; and there should be (a) a hierarchy of qualifications that define vertical and horizontal progression within the qualifications system, (b) a credit system that enables learning to be transferred from one setting to another, and (c) support to lifelong learning.

**Key issues emerged during the discussion**

- TVET programmes should develop **skills that are actually needed** and match directly with available jobs. Some programmes provide very technical training and run the risk to raise expectations, so those who have completed the programmes subsequently do not accept the jobs available, which in turn negatively impacts the success of future recruitment for training. TVET programmes need to be very transparent about the jobs available (e.g. by starting the training programme with one week on the job) to avoid these sunk costs. There have been complaints from the private sector about too many workers being trained at a higher level than what is needed. Furthermore, the first jobs in Yemen and Syria’s reconstruction will be lower level jobs. A systemic approach is needed to ensure good salaries and dignified working conditions at that level, so that people are willing to fill these positions. In addition, training packages should be reviewed with employers to assess their utility before being rolled out.
TVET is a very expensive form of education in terms of unit costs, so a lot depends on the ability of the state and private sector to create job opportunities. Actors involved in TVET have a choice between a sector approach, as in Jordan, and an area approach, as in Palestine, where employers come to local councils to share which skills they need.

It is vital to track both the direct and long-term impact of TVET interventions. In MENA, interventions are not really being evaluated, as there are no incentives to do so. It is necessary to assess not only the number of graduates employed, but also the decency of the work they do.

TVET programmes should be for both host and refugee communities where possible in order to assuage concerns about refugees taking resources and jobs away from host communities. Concerted advocacy to encourage governments to increase opportunities available to refugees is essential and has already yielded some positive results in Palestine and Lebanon.

It may be worth exploring ways to connect TVET programmes to possible employment in public works, although these are often run by the private sector and do not always create sufficient jobs. Reduced reliance on technology creates more jobs, but these tend to be at very low wage levels.

Higher Education

Tertiary education encompasses any officially recognized qualification that is equivalent to International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED) level 5 or above; including short-cycle tertiary education; and Bachelor’s, Master’s and Doctoral degrees, or their equivalent. A secondary school completion certificate is a prerequisite for entry into any tertiary education programme.

Less than 1 per cent of refugee youth (aged 18-24) are able to access universities, as compared to the global average at 34 per cent. In the context of the Syria crisis, it is estimated that 5.8 per cent of refugee youth in Lebanon are in tertiary education—the highest proportion in the region—but that number falls to 4 per cent in Turkey, 2.6 per cent in Jordan, and 0.6 per cent in KR-I. Syrian refugee youth face considerable barriers to accessing formal education, including acquiring valid residency, accessing authenticated academic documentation from Syria, recognition of prior learning, securing necessary financial support (tuition fees and living expenses), and engaging in learning within the context of a non-Arabic language of instruction or foreign curriculum. As such, provision of support to refugee youth—such as language support, distance or e-learning options, and tutoring—and technical support to governments to encourage more refugee-friendly policy development and help develop institutional capacity (including in terms of data management) is critical to enabling refugee youth access higher education.

Scholarships and other means of financial support are another key tool to enable access (e.g. DAFI, DAAD, EU, SPARK, etc.). Between 2011 and 2016, Syrian students enrolled in higher education received an estimated 10,117 scholarships, 3,600 of which were in Syria itself. Far fewer scholarships were available in Turkey and Jordan than in other host countries (only 123 and 510, respectively).

In March 2017, UNHCR and UNESCO held a conference on higher education in the context of crisis in the MENA region attended by nineteen Arab states. The “Sharm El Sheikh Statement on Higher Education in Crisis Situations in the Arab States” sets out the following recommendations to be undertaken to improve access to higher education for those affected by crisis and overcome the main barriers:
Mainstream crisis in national higher education planning and policy;

Enhance coordination and collaboration between all relevant stakeholders;

Facilitate the recognition of studies and qualifications;

Improve the data collection and management for policy dialogue, programme planning and implementation;

Encourage regional cooperation for emergency response preparedness and build institutional capacity; and

Develop a national contingency plan to prepare for and face various crisis situations.

Next steps include a ministerial conference planned for end of 2017, following up with Member States on commitments made in Sharm El Sheikh, contributing to the revision of the 1978 regional convention on higher education and development of a global convention, scaling up of key activities, and continuing to advocate (especially amongst donors) to prioritize tertiary education in times of emergencies.

Key issues emerged during the discussion

- Continued engagement with League of Arab States through ALECSO is essential following the meeting in May 2017 in Tunis on Education for Refugees in the Arab Region.

- More needs to be done to gather as much evidence of higher education’s benefits as possible to make the case for investment in a comparatively expensive area. Tracer studies are one way of doing this. Possible benefits include increased incentive to complete basic and secondary education in light of subsequent opportunities; trade links developed through diasporas; and graduates earning higher salaries resulting in more tax revenue, paying the tuition of siblings/others in their community, and becoming positive role models/changing gender norms. It is also important to know the profiles of students receiving scholarships, to avoid skewing resources to the richest group.

- More analysis of the unit cost of higher education is also needed. While it is often seen as a luxury, it actually has advantages in terms of scale: 400 students can share a lecture hall, but 400 second graders cannot share a classroom.

- A third country scholarship constitutes a complementary pathway to a durable solution for refugee youth, particularly where linked to a change in legal status. There have been a small number of such opportunities so far from Japan, France, Slovenia, Czech Republic, Mexico, and Argentina. It is proving difficult to track this pathway because some scholarships are provided directly by member states, some are initiated by refugees, and some are provided through UNHCR.

- It is also necessary to track the measures refugees are taking, in order to maximize the benefit of their enrolment. Both Jordan and Lebanon are doing so. That being said, it is not realistic to organize majors according to the assumed need for Syria’s reconstruction, as refugee youth should be allowed to study what they want to study.

- Countries shared the following lessons from their efforts to use blended or online learning platforms: in KR-I, 5 to 6 students are participating in Jesuit WorldWide Learning and funding for 10 more from Erbil is being requested. So far, there is no certification for e-learning, but once
that changes, there will be more opportunities from different universities. Dohuk University is also developing a partnership with the Erasmus programme, although this has not yet been formalized. In Jordan, there is a number of providers, but a key challenge is lack of English proficiency (blended courses tend to be available in English). It is also difficult for participants to get credit-transfers in Jordan. Discussions are ongoing with the British Council, al-Bayt University, Kings College and the University of Geneva, among other. National institutions, like Hashemite University, have also been innovating in this area. There is a need for more transportation support, etc. to ease retention issues. In Lebanon, in addition to the processes already mentioned, the EU has funded the HOPES programme.
SECTION FOUR: CONCLUSIONS AND WAY FORWARD

The Syria Crisis IM workshop has provided the opportunity to further discuss definitions, indicators and alignment of country packages with the regional Syria Crisis Education IM package and endorse it. Looking ahead, the Syria Crisis IM Package will be further refined basing on the discussions held and the inputs received during the workshop and will be presented to the 3RP Regional Technical Committee and integrated in the overall 3RP planning guidance. It will be then translated into Arabic and eventually in Turkish. The Minimum Indicators for dashboard reporting and aggregation at the regional level will also be refined building on the workshop’s discussions.

Ways of mainstreaming the Package beyond the Syria crisis were also explored with the presence of countries such as Yemen and the State of Palestine. ALECSO also reiterated the interest of mainstreaming the Package to the region, as a follow up to the High Level Regional Meeting organized by ALECSO and UNHCR on the Education for Refugees in the Arab Region that took place in May 2017 in Tunis. The alignment of IM tools (ActivityInfo, 4Ws, etc) to national systems was discussed during the workshop and a dialogue on linkages to SDG4 and the Syria Crisis IM Package initiated.

The discussion surrounding the humanitarian-development nexus must continue, and the distinction between the refugee and resilience pillars under the 3RP may need reconsideration in this context. The SDG4 presents an opportunity to bring these areas together more closely with regard to education. Harmonisation critically depends on greater communication between those responsible for these respective processes (as in this workshop) and country cooperation. It bears repeating that SDG4 is not a parallel process, but is embedded in national systems and engagement with the education sector working groups need to be more systematic.

There was agreement on the double challenge to support the expansion of ECE in both the development sector and in the refugee response. The education sectors/clusters need to leverage national expansion plans to include a systematic focus on refugee populations while simultaneously developing effective programme models that can be scaled up. The availability of improved data on ECE in the context of the refugee response can feed into advocacy, better financing and stronger programming.

In terms of measurement of learning, the development of a measurement tool is a process that will support bridging the development-humanitarian divide. This is an area where discussions need to continue more systematically with the view of developing or building on existing tools that can mainstream and standardize measurement modalities within a system approach. Measurement tools need to be taken on board by MoEs and implementing partners in the 3RP/HRP. The possibility of using the MICS Learning Module to inform the measurement of foundational skills will be explored. UNICEF, together with the World Bank, is also in the process of developing a tool to measure the 12 core life skills within the framework of the Life Skills and Citizenship Education Initiative.

It is key to ensure a systemic approach to TVET programming and look at the totality of elements that would ensure access to quality TVET opportunities (i.e. private sector involvement, governance and financing, capacity development including focus on life skills, and lifelong learning approaches). As noted during the workshop, further work with the livelihood sector will be conducted in relation
to refining the indicators related to technical and vocational education and training and in addressing overlaps.

Finally, there was agreement on the need for continued advocacy, especially amongst donors, to prioritize tertiary education in times of emergencies. UNESCO and UNHCR will lead the organization of a Ministerial conference on the subject for end 2017 and will follow up with Member States on the commitments made in the Sharm El Sheikh Statement earlier this year.\(^3\) Indicators in this field will also need to be strengthened.

The education post-London Syria crisis reports – that report on the key IM indicators - will continue to be produced on a quarterly basis, with the quarter one report being more substantive and the other three in the form of updates. The financial observatory linked to programming, that was discussed in London, is still being developed. The issue of tracking funding is becoming crucial with respect to financial gaps.
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ANNEX 1: INFORMATION MANAGEMENT WORKSHOP AGENDA

Syria crisis education response
Information Management (IM) Workshop
Marriott Hotel, Amman/Jordan
10-12 July 2017

1. Overview of Syria crisis education situation and response

Six years into the crisis, 5.82 million children and adolescents (in and out of school), and education personnel, are in need of education assistance in Syria. There are close to 521,000 children estimated to be in areas under the control of ISIL and an additional 1.5 million in areas controlled by non-state actors. A total of 1.75 million children are out of school and 1.35 million at risk of dropping out. Nearly 3 million children have never known peace and suffer from psychosocial distress from witnessing the horrors of war. Security is the greatest barrier to accessing education, with schools and education facilities under attack and occupied by armed actors. Over 7,000 schools – one in three – can no longer be used. Where schools operate, classrooms continue to be overcrowded and learning materials limited. The situation is exacerbated by the influx of displaced children to host communities where limited resources exist for repairing damaged classrooms or expanding learning spaces. The total economic loss due to dropout from basic and secondary education is estimated to be USD 11 billion, equivalent to about 18 per cent of the 2010 Syrian GDP.

The crisis has spread across and beyond the region and into those nations surrounding Syria; the number of registered Syrian refugees in Turkey, Lebanon, Jordan, Iraq and Egypt is over 4.83 million, of which 1,580,792 are children aged 5 to 17 years. As of December 2016, 66 per cent, or more than 1 million school-age children, are accessing education opportunities, while 34 per cent or close to 535,000 school-age children are out of school. Children and families face many educational challenges, from insufficient supply of learning spaces to economic barriers and language difficulties. Issues of curriculum and certification represent a major challenge, specifically for those children unable to get a place to participate in formal education.

2. HRP and 3RP planning processes

Humanitarian Response Plans for Syria, Iraq and for other emergencies in the MENA region
In line with the Whole of Syria (WoS) approach, humanitarian partners have begun the process of preparing the Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO) and the Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP) as the basis for forward planning and response for 2018. The HRP aims to encompass the collective vision and strategic priorities of the international humanitarian community and its national partners for responding to the assessed humanitarian needs of people in Syria. The HNO is intended to be completed in September 2017 to then inform the sector strategy for the HRP, to be completed and launched in December 2017. Iraq, a Level 3 emergency responding to an IDP crisis, will also be embarking on an HRP funding appeal over the next 6 months with a similar launch time.

The HRP processes in the two countries are coordinated by OCHA and the Whole of Syria Education Sector and hubs in Syria and the Education Cluster in Iraq. The HRP monitoring framework is guided by a number of overarching multi-sector strategic objectives in which sector specific objectives, activities and indicators are defined as a way to measure progress towards achieving the goals set out in the sector strategy. As of June 2017, both the Syria and Iraq 2017 HRPs education appeals are underfunded with a gap of 71 per cent and 64 per cent respectively.

The 2017 HRP for Libya was built to address life-saving needs of Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs), returnees, most vulnerable non-displaced Libyans, migrants, refugees and asylum seekers in urgent need of humanitarian assistance. The 2017 HRP for the occupied Palestinian territory is the fifteenth coordinated appeal that aims to extend protection to Palestinians living under occupation, in accordance with international law, to ensure access to basic services for the most vulnerable Palestinians and to strengthen the capacity of families to cope with the continued pressures of life under occupation. Both the Libya and oPt HRPs are underfunded with a gap of 77 per cent and 86 per cent respectively.

The 2017 Yemen HRP (YHRP) strategy is based on common planning assumptions and commitments that emphasize a clearly defined scope for the YHRP, a more integrated approach, local empowerment, stronger partnerships and strategic use of pooled funds intended to bolster partners’ ability to deliver against the HRP strategic objectives. Unfortunately, the Education chapter of the Yemen HRP is 0% funded as reported in the OCHA FTS.

The Sudan Humanitarian Country Team (HCT) is rolling out a Multi-Year Humanitarian Strategy 2017 – 2019 (MYHS), which provides the overall framework for humanitarian activities in Sudan for the next three years, and is in line with the Government quarter century strategy and third five-year plan. In order to retain the flexibility to respond to new emergencies and needs, and to adapt the response to changes in the operational environment and capacity, the three year strategy is complemented with annual operational plans. The Education chapter of the MYHS is only 7 per cent funded.

**Regional Refugee and Resilience Plan (3RP)**

The countries affected by the Syria crisis and hosting refugees are part of the Regional Refugee and Resilience Plan (3RP) coordinated by UNHCR and UNDP. The 3RP was launched
in December 2014 to respond to both the growing demand for protection and humanitarian assistance for refugees from Syria and also the growing need to build the resilience of individuals, communities and institutions in host communities to cope with the Syria crisis. The 3RP planning process for 2017 - 2018 was initiated in 2016 and will have a mid-year report in 2017. As of April 2017, the Education Sector 3RP appeal is 19 per cent funded.

3. HRP and 3RP information management and reporting processes

The programming of the response to the Syria crisis, including in Syria and in the 5 hosting countries, is generally aligned and there has been systematic work to streamline activities and indicators across all countries.

SYRIA HRP

The Syria HRP is a combination of the interventions across three hubs in Damascus, Gaziantep and Amman. The plan is anchored by three strategic objectives, focusing on providing life-saving humanitarian assistance to the most vulnerable people, enhancing the prevention and mitigation of protection risks, and increasing resilience and livelihood opportunities. The education sector response contributes to the HRP through three objectives:

1) Increase safe and equitable access to formal and non-formal education for crisis-affected children and youth (5-17 years).
2) Improve the quality of formal and non-formal education for children and youth (5-17 years) within a protective environment.
3) Strengthen the capacity of the education system and communities to deliver a timely, coordinated and evidence-based education response.

There are 14 indicators which are monitored as part of this plan. The data is collected in an excel 4W from each of the hubs and then results against these targets are consolidated at the WoS level by the WoS IM Specialist.

IRAQ HRP

The Iraq HRP is framed slightly differently from the Syria HRP, focussing on three phases of response towards the development of a fully-fledged HRP document. The three education objectives are:

1) First line Response: Provide immediate access to safe, protected learning spaces for highly vulnerable girls and boys aged 3-17.
2) Second line Response: Help improve the quality of learning for highly vulnerable girls and boys aged 3-17.
3) Full Cluster Response: Help expand and upgrade education and learning opportunities for highly vulnerable girls and boys aged 3-17.

There are 7 indicators which are monitored as part of the plan. The reporting system for the Iraq HRP is ActivityInfo and the indicators are aligned with the 3RP indicators for Iraq.
Regional Refugee and Resilience Plan (3RP)

The 3RP provides a consolidated framework to address refugee protection needs, the humanitarian needs of the most vulnerable and the longer-term socioeconomic impacts of the Syria crisis on neighbouring countries. The plan comprises two interconnected components: (i) the refugee protection and humanitarian component that addresses the protection and assistance needs of refugees as well as the most vulnerable members of impacted communities; and (ii) the resilience/stabilization-based development component that addresses the resilience and stabilization needs of impacted and vulnerable communities. In line with the No Lost Generation (NLG) Initiative, the education sectors in the five 3RP countries implement programmes in line with three objectives:

1) Scaling up opportunities for equitable access to formal and non-formal education.
2) Promoting the quality and relevance of education.
3) Strengthening education systems at national and sub-national levels.

The 3RP sector response plans are embedded in national plans and are aligned to country specific national priorities. Each county utilises different country level monitoring frameworks as the process for developing the plan is country-based. However, all 3RP countries utilise ActivityInfo as part of their reporting processes. 3RP countries use a range of indicators and produce country-specific monthly dashboards. At the regional level, a regional monthly dashboard aggregates the information from all the 3RP country-specific dashboards to highlight the regional results, achievements, challenges and opportunities. The Regional Refugee Response Plan (3RP) covers 9 regional indicators.

The Syria Crisis Education Information Management (IM) Package

In 2015, with a view of aligning the 3RP objectives with the NLG framework and ensuring coherence in reporting between countries, the 3RP education co-leads (UNICEF and UNHCR) developed a guidance for suggested outcome and output indicators for Education in Emergencies (EiE) linked to specific activities categorized along three goals: (i) access to education, (ii) quality of the education services and (iii) education system strengthening. The guidance was discussed with the country level education sector coordinators during the 2015 3RP midyear review and was then taken to implementation at country level with feedback to the regional level and suggestions for improvement, taking into considerations challenges related to different interpretation of indicators, different methodologies used for data collection, and difficulties in aligning EiE data collection with national education data collection systems.

In February 2016, the London Pledging Conference engaged all Syria crisis countries around strategic shifts that need to be taken into consideration in the education response planning, programming and reporting. This consolidated further the alignment of the response around the 3 pillars of access, quality and system strengthening and provided a more strategic focus on interventions along a humanitarian to development continuum. The Syria crisis IM workshop held in Amman in July 2016 saw the birth of the Syria Crisis Education IM Package, building on the 2015 guidance, with a coherent list of EiE indicators accompanied by an elaborate guidance on activities and methods of calculation and with greater focus on...
comparability and alignment with national data collection and management systems. Furthermore, first efforts were also undertaken to improve the indicators for quality and system strengthening. The 2016 Syria Crisis Education IM Package was further tested at country level and feedback sent to the regional level for consolidation into a final version.

4. **OBJECTIVES OF THE 2017 IM WORKSHOP:**

The 2017 IM Workshop aims at discussing and endorsing the final version of the Syria Crisis IM Package. Given the interest in the Package by other crisis countries in the MENA region, its application and mainstreaming in other crisis contexts will be also discussed and explored (the State of Palestine and Yemen will be participating at the Workshop). In addition, the workshop will continue discussing the alignment of IM tools and systems used in the crises response to national data collection and management systems, in line with the recommendation of the London strategic shifts to enhance national systems to support an EiE evidence-base response accounting for monitoring of equity, quality and inclusiveness. A session on the Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG) data processes will also explore connections between the Syria crisis IM Package and the SDG4 targets and indicators.

During the last day of the workshop, which is open to the donor community, participants will engage in discussing four emerging issues and priorities in crisis contexts: early childhood education and measuring early learning; monitoring learning outcomes, including in relation to the Life Skills and Citizenship Education (LSCE) Initiative’s 12 core skills; technical and vocational education and training (TVET); and Higher Education.

The specific objectives of the workshop are the following:

- To strengthen and endorse the Syria Crisis Education IM Package of indicators and activities together with the accompanying guidance.
- To discuss the mainstreaming of the Education IM Package in other MENA crisis contexts.
- To identify channels of alignment between the Syria Crisis Education IM Package and national education data systems and SDG4 monitoring.
- To take a deep dive into thematic issues in the emergency response in terms of definition, targeting and data collection and reporting (early childhood education, learning assessments, technical and vocational education and training, and higher education).

5. **PARTICIPANTS:**

- **Country delegations** from Syria, the five host countries of Turkey, Lebanon, Jordan, Iraq, Egypt, as well as representatives from the State of Palestine and Yemen. The country delegations are constituted of sector/cluster/hub coordinators, education and IM officers in UN agencies and NGOs, as well as relevant officials from MOEs.
- **At the regional level:** Education and IM officers from UN agencies and NGOs.
- **Donor community** only for Day 3.
### AGENDA:

#### DAY 1: Monday 10 July 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Chair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.30 – 9.00</td>
<td><strong>REGISTRATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00 – 9.45</td>
<td><strong>INTRODUCTION</strong></td>
<td>Annalaura Sacco (UNHCR) and Dina Craissati (UNICEF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.45 – 10.15</td>
<td><strong>SETTING THE SCENE</strong></td>
<td>Vick Ikobwa (UNHCR) and Dina Craissati (UNICEF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.15 – 10.30</td>
<td><strong>Coffee break</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30 – 11.15</td>
<td><strong>HRP AND 3RP PROCESSES</strong></td>
<td>Elena Cibeira (UNHCR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.15 – 12.45</td>
<td><strong>HRP/3RP IM PROCESSES</strong></td>
<td>Katy Noble (UNICEF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.45 – 13.45</td>
<td><strong>Lunch break</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.45 – 14.45</td>
<td><strong>THE SYRIA CRISIS EDUCATION IM PACKAGE</strong></td>
<td>Mais Zuhaika (NRC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.45 – 15.00</td>
<td><strong>Coffee break</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Session</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.00 – 17.00</td>
<td>THE SYRIA CRISIS EDUCATION IM PACKAGE: GROUP WORK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Groups will be formed according to country delegations. Each group will be assigned a facilitator. A rapporteur will be selected from the group itself. Questions will be provided to guide the discussions. The focus will be on reviewing the IM Package.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00 – 10.00</td>
<td>THE SYRIA CRISIS EDUCATION IM PACKAGE: REPORT BACK TO PLENARY</td>
<td>Iain Murray (UNICEF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Each group reports back to plenary (30 min)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Discussion (30 min)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00 – 10:50</td>
<td>SDG4 DATA PROCESSES</td>
<td>Maria Tsvetkova (WFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Introduction to SDG4 data processes (30 min) – Gabrielle Bonnet (UNICEF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Discussion (20 min)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.50 – 11.05</td>
<td>Coffee break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.05 – 11.30</td>
<td>SDG4 DATA PROCESSES</td>
<td>Jennifer Roberts (UNHCR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Aligning the Syria Crisis Education IM Package to the SGD4 targets and indicators (10 min) – Haogen Yao and Gabrielle Bonnet (UNICEF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Discussion (10 min)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Introduction to group work (5 min) – Haogen Yao (UNICEF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30 – 12.15</td>
<td>SDG4 DATA PROCESSES: GROUP WORK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Groups will be formed according to country delegations. Each group will be assigned a facilitator. A rapporteur will be selected from the group itself. Questions will be provided to guide the discussions. The focus will be on reviewing the proposed alignment between the Syria crisis IM package and SDG4 targets and indicators.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.15 – 13.15</td>
<td>SDG4 DATA PROCESSES: REPORT BACK TO PLENARY</td>
<td>Gabrielle Bonnet (UNICEF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Each group reports back to plenary (30 min)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Discussion (30 min)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.15 – 14.15</td>
<td>Lunch break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:15 – 15:15</td>
<td>IM SYSTEMS AND TOOLS</td>
<td>Vick Ikobwa (UNHCR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• IM systems:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o 4Ws (10 min) – Magnat Kavuna (UNICEF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o ActivityInfo (10 min) – Murad Alsamhouri (UNHCR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Bayanati (10 min) – Faizah Samat (UNICEF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Discussion (30 min)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DAY 3: Wednesday 12 July 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Chair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>9.00 – 9.45</strong></td>
<td>INFORMATION MANAGEMENT IN CRISIS CONTEXTS</td>
<td><strong>Ayse Kocak</strong> (Save the Children)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Introduction of participants (15 min)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Summary of days 1 and 2 on Syria Crisis Education IM Package</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(15 min) – Irene Omondi (UNHCR) and Deema Jarrar (UNICEF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Interactive discussion (15 min)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9.45 – 11:15</strong></td>
<td>DEEP DIVE 1</td>
<td><strong>Ivelina Borisova</strong> (UNICEF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Early childhood education (30 min) – Ivelina Borisova (UNICEF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Discussion (60 min)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11.15 – 11.30</strong></td>
<td>Coffee break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11.30 – 13.00</strong></td>
<td>DEEP DIVE 2</td>
<td><strong>Katrina Stringer</strong> (DfID)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Learning assessments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Monitoring learning achievements in crisis contexts (20 min)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Gabrielle Bonnet (UNICEF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o MICS Foundational Learning Skills Module (15 min) – Haogen Yao (UNICEF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Measuring learning achievements in relation to 12 core life skills (15 min) – Alberto Biancoli (UNICEF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Discussion (40 min)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13.00 – 14.00</strong></td>
<td>Lunch break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14.00 – 15.30</strong></td>
<td>DEEP DIVE 3</td>
<td><strong>Divya Jacob</strong> (UNICEF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET) (30 min)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Patrick Daru (ILO) and Alberto Biancoli (UNICEF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Discussion (60 min)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15.30 – 15.45</strong></td>
<td>Coffee break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Session</td>
<td>Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 15.45 – 17.15 | **DEEP DIVE 4**  
• Higher education (30 min) – Vick Ikobwa (UNHCR) and Yayoi Segi-Vltchek (UNESCO)  
• Discussion (60 min) | Steve Passingham (EU)                      |
| 17.15 – 17.45 | **CONCLUSION**  
• Wrap-up  
• Way forward  
• Evaluation | Vick Ikobwa (UNHCR) and Dina Craissati (UNICEF) |
ANNEX 2: FOUR-PAGER GLOSSARY

Four-pager glossary: this four-pager is about concept(s) clarification rather than detailed definitions. For accurate definitions, consistent to UNICEF programming, here are some key references:

- Education Sector Analysis Methodological Guidelines (Volume 1 & 2), Volume 3 is forthcoming.
- Global Out-of-School Children Initiative Operational Manual
- UNICEF Data website http://data.unicef.org/topic/education/overview/
- Syrian Crisis education IM package (forthcoming)

TERMS ABOUT AGE GROUPS

Adolescent: Aged 10-19. Safe to use this term when it is about secondary education, otherwise specify age group after using this term.

Child: Under the age of 18 (in other words: 0-17). Safe to use this term for MENA when it is about pre-primary, primary, or secondary education, best followed by a specified age range.

Early childhood: Up to the age of 8. Safe to use this term when it is about early learning. UNICEF’s programming and monitoring focus is 0-5 years old.

School-age children: Usually covers basic education + 1 year before primary, i.e. 5-14 for most of MENA countries, but can be extended to cover a larger age group, depending on the programme context. Best specify the age group after using this term, example: xxx school-age children (3-18) are enrolled.


Youth: Aged 15-24 (this is also the post-basic education age for most MENA countries). Safe to use when it is about upper secondary education, tertiary education, or school-to-work transition.

Young people: Aged 10-24 (a union of adolescent and youth). Suggest avoiding this term in writing.

Young adult: Aged 18 and above, can be up to 40 depending on the context.

Note: Use terms like “children and youth” or “adolescents and youth” for programmes covering a wide age group, such as life skills education and TVET.

EDUCATION CONCEPTS EASY TO BE CONFUSED

(School) Age:

For education programming the term “age” refers to “school age” unless specified.

- School age means the age when the current school year started. In a country where a school year started in September, if a child was born in November and he claimed he was 10 years old when being surveyed in December, his school age will actually be 9 years old.
- We refer to international standard classification of education (ISCED) to determine a country’s age groups for different education levels when conducting a global or regional initiative; and we look at national and/or ISCED classifications if it is a country-specific programme. ISCED and national classifications are different for certain countries (e.g.,
Sudan, Syria, Lebanon, Palestine, etc.), so we need to be clear classification when or reviewing documents, and be alerted if some documents/statements are mixing the two classifications.

**Formal vs. Non-formal vs. Informal (For more detailed explanation, please check Chapter 9, Volume 2 of Education Sector Analysis Methodological Guidelines):**

- It is advisable to **only focus on formal and non-formal unless it is emergency context**. For example, to monitor the schooling in the context of the Syria crisis, we may have the category of “non-formal/informal” in recognition of the fact that informal education (e.g. community-held teaching in shelters or tents during siege or displacement) is crucial for maintaining learning for kids when formal and non-formal education (NFE) are impossible. It is also noticeable that in some countries remedial education programmes and non-accredited learning programmes for literacy, numeracy and/or e-learning are sometimes referred to as informal education, **while they are actually NFE**.

- ‘Informal education’ is activity-based—it can range from storytelling at home, to more organized activities like museum visits or cooking competitions (integrated into formal or NFE).

- For monitoring purpose, NFE can be divided as “accredited NFE” vs. “non-accredited NFE”; and for programming purpose, it is important to keep in mind the three groups of concern, including:
  a) children before the official primary entry age (need ECE),
  b) out-of-school children of official and compulsory school age (need second-chance schools and street-school type programmes), and
  c) non-enrolled youth and adults aged 15 years and above. They need either:
     - literacy and basic-education equivalent programmes for those missing basic education;
     - vocational trainings and lifelong learning programmes for those finishing basic-equivalent education.

- Unless it is in emergency context (e.g. Syria crisis), children in NFE are considered as out-of-school, but should always be specified when data allows.

**Out-of-school vs. Not-in-school:**

Although UNESCO/UIS does not differentiate these two terms, we use ‘not-in-school’ instead of ‘out-of-school’ for children and youth of post-basic education age to highlight the fact that they are allowed to work legally and that they completed compulsory education.

However, in crisis contexts, it is allowed to apply the term out-of-school to post-basic education age if it enables better accuracy and transparency in reporting. For example, because UNHCR regularly reports the population of refugee age 5-17 on its Information Sharing Portal, it is acceptable to report for this age group.

**Out-of-school vs. at-risk:**

- For definition, out-of-school refers to students not in formal education (regardless of the level they are attending), while at-risk refers to student in formal education but at risk of dropout before reaching the last grade of current schooling level.
- For grouping, out-of-school is age-based (e.g. out-of-school of primary school age 6-11 for Egypt), while at-risk is enrolment-based (e.g. at risk of dropout before reaching last grade of primary education). Children enrolled in a certain school level may be underage or overage, therefore the denominators for out-of-school rate and at-risk rates are different. Exceptions exist in emergency contexts as it is too difficult to obtain quality data—we use ‘(population of schooling age – enrolment regardless of age)/population of schooling age’ to calculate Syrian out-of-school rates.

- Dimension 1 or “pre-primary age not in school” is only for the age one-year before official entrance age for primary. For MENA countries, it means the calculation of out-of-school for age 5.

- In a country where age-6 is the official primary entrance age, age-5 in primary school are considered as ‘in school’, but age >5 in pre-primary school will be considered as out-of-school since pre-primary is non-formal.

- When quality data is unavailable, the calculation of “at-risk” can be flexible. For example, some studies may proxy at-risk using the number of repetition, overage, or low school readiness (enrolled in formal education without pre-primary schooling experience). Therefore, when seeing the term ‘at-risk’, please keep in mind it could mean different things.

**Attendance vs. Enrolment:**

- Attendance is calculated from surveys, and enrolment is calculated from administrative records (e.g. EMIS). Students enrolled in school are not necessarily attending (they can be absent), and vice versa.

- Using gross, net, and adjusted net attendance/enrolment rates: It is preferable to report ‘adjusted net attendance rate’ or ‘gross enrolment rate’ depending on the data quality and the purpose of reporting. It is also noticeable that UNICEF documents sometimes use the term ‘net attendance rate’ but actually refer to ‘adjusted net attendance rate’. A quick guide on the difference
  
a) Gross: “Attendance or enrolment at a school level (primary, lower secondary, etc.)” divided by “children of the corresponding age group”

b) Net: “Attendance or enrolment at a level for children of the corresponding age group” divided by “children of the corresponding age group”

c) Adjusted Net: Attendance or enrolment at a level or above for children of the corresponding age group for that level” divided by “children of corresponding age group for that level”

Example: In country A, there are 100 children of lower secondary age 12-14; 110 children attending lower secondary, of which 90 are aged 12-14, 5 children aged 12-14 but already attending upper secondary or college. So

- Gross attendance rate= 110/100=110%
- Net attendance rate= 90/100=90%
- Adjusted attendance rate= (90+5)/100=95%
Pre-primary vs. ECE vs. Early Learning vs. ECCE/ECED/ECDP/Preschool:

- The terms of early childhood care and education (ECCE), early childhood education and development (ECED), ECD programme (ECDP) and preschool have been used interchangeably despite the nuances.
- Suggest using ECE when it is reported by/for education section about organized learning.
- Early Learning is a broader term, to be used when talking about any form of education (ECE + other learning such as informal activities at home) for age 0-8.
- For different countries, pre-primary education and ECE can be partially or fully overlapped. The common practice in monitoring is to cover age 3 & 4 (36-59 months) when talking about ECE, and to cover the official pre-primary age defined by UNESCO (ISCED 0) or one year before primary when talking about pre-primary.
- Preschool is a term to be avoided in UNICEF programming and communication. It is for ages between 2.5 to 5, but people from different countries may have different perceptions of it. For example, in many parts of the US, “preschool” refers to the grade before pre-kindergarten and kindergarten (i.e. not “pre”-primary).

Child labour vs. Youth employment:

Child labour is a term for children aged 5-14. There are cut-offs regarding number of hours spent on economic activity/domestic work used to judge whether a child is child labour. About youth employment, UNICEF focuses on those aged 15-24 unless specified. The legal working age is 15 in most countries.

Bottleneck vs. Barrier:

These two concepts have not been clearly clarified in existing documents. We suggest treating “bottleneck” as a status and “barrier” as a reason causing the “bottleneck”. For example, the bottleneck for primary enrolment of town X is the late entrance for girls, and the corresponding barriers could be security issue (combined with long school distance and lack of affordable transportation) and households’ perception on girl’s education. To avoid confusion, “barrier” should be used more frequently in our writing.

Equality vs. Equity:

Simply speaking, equality means getting the same thing, while equity means being allowed to achieve the same thing. Examples: In access, waiving the tuition for every student is about equality, providing addition grants to the poorest students is about equity; In learning, teaching the same curriculum is about equality, offering multilingual education or additional tutoring to nomad children who are not speaking the official languages is about equity.

Technical and Vocational Education and Training:

TVET is used as a comprehensive term, which refers to different educational programmes meant to develop the skills and knowledge needed for the workplace. The term includes: (i) Technical Vocational Education (TVE), which includes formal post-basic education opportunities leading to learning outcomes certified by national authorities and that are equivalent to upper secondary or tertiary education; and (ii) Vocational Training delivered outside of the formal education system that is not necessarily accompanied by certification.
Life skills and Citizenship Education:

Life skills and citizenship education cover four integrated dimensions of learning including: (i) cognitive skills such as analytical skills, critical thinking, problem solving, creativity etc.; (ii) skills for employability and livelihoods, including decision-making, cooperation, negotiation, and others relevant to the country context; (iii) skills for personal empowerment and relationship building such as self-awareness and control (stress and emotion management), resilience, communication; (iv) skills for active citizenship including respect for diversity, empathy, participation, and core human rights values such as gender equality, social justice, participation, global citizenship, etc. Note that these four dimensions of life skills are overlapping and interrelated.

A set of twelve core skills for MENA have been defined within the Conceptual and Programmatic Framework for life skills and citizenship education; they are: communication, cooperation, critical thinking, creativity, decision-making, empathy, negotiation, self-management, respect for diversity, resilience, participation, and problem solving. These twelve core skills are interrelated and mutually reinforce each other in light of the four dimensions of learning.

Beneficiaries:

There are four types of beneficiaries. Direct beneficiaries are direct recipients of inputs, e.g. school kits, scholarships, cash incentives, school manual, etc. Intermediate beneficiaries are directly affected by downstream interventions on the school or learning environment: teacher training, school/classroom construction, teaching materials, etc. For instance, the intermediary beneficiaries of 100 teachers receiving pre-service training is 100xPTR. Long term beneficiaries benefit from the intervention after the year of intervention. Indirect beneficiaries are more broadly the users of any system or environment improved by upstream interventions (e.g. future employers can benefit from the TVET promotion). The present calculations will only include direct and intermediate beneficiaries as an extended group of direct beneficiaries. If the same population is recipient of several interventions, the beneficiaries will only be counted once (e.g. students receiving school kits and whose teachers are also trained by the programme). If, however, some beneficiaries are reached by the same intervention(s) in two different years of the project or programme, they will be counted for each year in which the programme is targeting them.

MORE TECHNICAL CONCEPTS:

- Methods of age adjustment (how to convert natural “age” to “school age”)
- Administrative-based vs. Survey-based
- Attendance-based vs. Probability-based indicators
- Completion rate (there are three so-called completion rates in previous reporting)
- Survival rate vs. Retention rate vs. Transition rate
- Wealth vs. Income

When encountering the above concepts, it is best to consult the RO colleagues to ensure correct calculation or usage.
ANNEX 3: SUMMARY OF GROUP WORK DISCUSSIONS

Group work on finalization of the Syria Crisis Education IM Package

The final session of the first day of the workshop was devoted to group work. Participants were divided into six groups, one for each of the six Syria crisis countries. Groups were asked to compare the IM Package with country HRP/3RP Education Sector Result Frameworks for 2017-18 and fill out a provided table accordingly. Key issues to focus on were:

1) What are the reporting challenges? What can be done to improve reporting?
2) For indicators in country response matrices that are similar, but not fully aligned to the IM package based on country context, what can be done to reflect them in the IM guidance?
3) For indicators in country response matrices that are not part of the IM guidance, what can be done to align them to the IM framework?

SUMMARY OF GROUP REPORTS

Iraq identified the following challenges in its reporting:
- Confusion between non-formal and informal education, which causes double counting
- Partners reporting host community beneficiaries in ActivityInfo inflate the reported number of refugee beneficiaries
- Difficulty of collecting data on out-of-school children in off-campus settings, hence hard to address gaps in service provision
- Need for further discussion of how/if disability can be captured (e.g. as a standalone indicator, or through disaggregation)
- Partners pressuring Cluster to add more indicators outside of regional IM Package
- Partner’s confusion over what the activity is that lies behind 1.2: “provide support to formal general schools”

All of Iraq’s 3RP indicators are same as those in the IM Package, except: 1) winter uniforms, which could fall under 1.9 Education Supplies; and 2) school-based management (“# of schools with SBM”; could improve to “# of schools receiving SBM and monitoring interventions”). All Iraq HRP indicators are same as or aligned with those in the IM Package, except: 1) # of children accessing psychosocial support (PSS) services, which is a core activity for this operation; and 2) # of children re-integrated into formal education through NFE, which could be removed if necessary

Iraq requested that the following be incorporated into the IM Package: 1) psychosocial support as clear indicator, possibly under 2.3 Life Skills; 2) # of children with documentation/certification; and 3) # of children completing secondary school/G12 exams.

Syria identified the following issues with the IM Package:
- Primary school age should be 6-17 (not 5)
- Youth definition should be between 15-24 (TVET)
- SLP age bracket should be 6-19
• SLP could be used outside Syria in the refugee context; could potentially become pathway to informal education, but does not currently come with certification
• Training of education actors should include finance and administration management
• A clear definition of “education actor” is needed
• Open discussion is needed regarding whether to include BTL in the 2018 HRP
• Qualitative indicators are needed to measure outcomes—i.e. pass rates; exam scores, etc.—which could be borrowed from the Monitoring and Evaluation framework of the ECW proposal
• Indicators on coordination efficiency (total of meetings had; level of satisfaction by partners/beneficiaries) are needed; consult Global Education Cluster (GEC) on best practices
• Rephrase 3.3b (“# of Parent Teacher Associations (PTA) supported or established”) to add feedback and accountability mechanisms
• What does “accredited” education mean and what happens where children attend formal schools in non-government areas?
• Format: need to add a column with a brief indicator description
• Policies: which policies guide training? Could the package refer to something “long-term” about sustainability and government buy in/transition, along the lines of the SABER modules?
• Distinction between informal/non-formal and other categories may be difficult to render in Arabic

**Turkey** noted that it faced challenges similar to those in Iraq and Syria, but had many more problems with data entry and reporting periods:
• Data from ministries does not always treat primary education separately
• Enrolment is made up of enrolment in formal programmes (reported by MOE) and community programmes (reported by partners), so there is a difference in data quality
• Frequency of reporting: monthly reporting from ministries is not practical in Turkey
• Reporting period runs between January and December, but the school year is between September and June
• NGOs are not reporting on a timely basis
• The quality of NGO data is variable and requires extensive cleaning and checking

**Turkey** proposed the following steps to bring its current reporting into alignment with the IM package:
• Turkey will revise its age-groups in line with the IM guidance
• Terminology in guidance regarding incentives/financial compensation should be retained
• Reporting period should be adjusted to match the academic year
• There is a need to agree during which months to report baseline and final enrolment numbers
• There is a need to standardize the 3RP with IM guidance
• Turkey will standardize/clarify references to children vs. Syrian children
• Indicators for output 3 are Turkey-specific and necessary in that context
- The language of output 3.2 should be revised
- Include higher education indicators and “# opportunities awarded” in the IM guidance

**Lebanon** identified the following challenges:
- Partners reporting late or not at all
- Means of verification was not clear from beginning of this process
- Partners not reporting unregulated NFE programmes because they are not included in the regulated framework yet (the operation is working with MEHE to regulate all NFE programmes)
- Difficulty of capturing gender breakdown
- Difficulty of obtaining timely data on public enrolment, as these are official figures

Lebanon made the following recommendations regarding the IM package:
- Certain details need to be added, including information on health checks in schools
- There is a need for an output level indicator for BTL campaigns
- There is a need for inclusive education indicators (Lebanon can recommend some)
- Indicator 3.3b should also include some informal networks that support education
- There is a need to capture information about corporal punishment

**Jordan** noted the following challenges to its reporting:
- Too many indicators, which is causing confusion
- Fluctuations in the data reported
- Confusion regarding the definition of certain indicators and responsibilities for reporting
- Not enough time for quality assurance of data because of strict deadlines

It proposed the following solutions:
- Choose pre-defined indicators in next Jordan Response Plan (JRP) process
- Customize IM guidance for Jordan context
- Provide ongoing training on indicators and reporting responsibilities
- Consider modifying ActivityInfo IM system
- Disaggregate by project
- Modify site to include Informal Tented Settlements (ITS), host communities, and camps

It suggested the following amendments to the IM package:
- **Quality:**
  - Add reduction of violence in school
  - Clarify 2.3b and 2.3c: non-formal vs. informal distinction
- **Access:**
  - Add outcome indicator to reflect children aged 18 and above
  - 1.7: add indicator on # persons reached through BTL campaigns
• 1.10: tertiary; add indicator of # of children 18 and above supported by scholarships

**Egypt** identified the following reporting challenges:

• Some partners have statutory duties (how they see themselves, based on donors’ expectations, etc.). A lot of interventions are happening, but partners are unable to report on them. ActivityInfo is only for those who appear under 3RP, but there is no one size fits all.

• Partners not reporting on time or on all activities

• Variable quality of data received and difficulties in verifying it

• The MOE statistics only reflect those registered; need to harmonize this data with the data generated by development partners

**Egypt** suggested the following ways of addressing these issues:

• Development of an information gathering tool that can capture all activities (possible 4Ws)

• Further streamline timeline of needed inputs to reduce reporting requirement from monthly to bi-monthly, where greater frequency is not necessary. Encourage other creative reporting.

**Egypt** proposed the following amendments to the IM guidance:

• # of children (3-17) receiving education supplies (formal and non-formal)

• Disaggregate indicator by age group (early childhood education can be applicable to pre-primary age of 3-4 years) and then adjust for 5-17 years

• Add reporting component to capture supplies; e.g. school bags etc.

• Clarify terminology of 3.2a (“# of programmes implemented to improve crisis-sensitive data collection”)

• 1.8a (# of classrooms constructed, established or rehabilitated) does not take into account work on other facilities (e.g. playgrounds, computer labs, etc.)

• Add reporting component on disabilities

• Terminology needs to be further streamlined

• Add a more explicit indicator on protection/violence in schools

• Further contextualization to Egypt (e.g. 20 is beyond Egypt’s school age)

**Group Work on SDG4 Data Processes**

Participants were broken up in groups and asked to consider how the Syria crisis response work aligns with SDG4 processes, using the following questions to guide their discussion:

1. Consider the different SDG global indicators and thematic indicators. Are some of these not supported by any of the Syria Crisis IM indicators?

2. **Relevance:** among those, which ones are relevant to the Syria Crisis response, and what activity/output indicators would adequately reflect our action in support of these global and thematic indicators?

3. **Priority:** which of these activity/output indicators should we prioritize for consideration by countries and agencies considering both relevance and feasibility of measurement within a reasonable timeframe?
Groups were referred to a table of proposed thematic indicators for SDG4 (see Annex 2) and advised that there were two ways of examining the alignment between the Syria Crisis IM Package and SDG4: one in terms of national and regional level monitoring, and the other in terms of SDG4.5 parity indices for the conflict affected populations. Participants were reminded that the objective of closer alignment with SDG4 does not mean adopting identical indicators for both processes and that both the IM Package and SDG indicators were still in development, but nearing finalization.

**SUMMARY OF GROUP REPORTS**

**Turkey** organized its report according to SDG4 thematic indicators:

- **4.1:** The group discussed how to assess whether “a minimum proficiency level” has been achieved and considered standardized testing for refugees. It highlighted the need for country-level indicators, given that in some countries, primary education lasts four years and in others five.

- **4.2:** Turkey noted the difficulty in collecting data on this indicator.

- **4.3:** Although Turkey is not actually reporting on the IM Package’s 1.5a indicator (“# of youth 15-17 years, girls/boys, enrolled in formal TVET”), it noted that these indicators and targets matched.

- **4.4:** The group noted that collecting data on this indicator is not currently feasible.

- **4.5:** Turkey did not understand how this indicator was meant to function, given that disadvantaged populations change according to country. It emphasized the need for a clearer definition of what falls under this indicator.

- **4.6:** The group noted the similarity between this indicator and 4.1 and felt it could be useful.

- **4.7:** Turkey felt that this indicator is not relevant in the context of the Syria Crisis.

- **4.8:** The group also felt that the environmental indicator is not relevant in the Syria Crisis context and that it would also be difficult to collect data on it.

- **4.b:** Turkey felt this indicator demonstrated the need to track scholarships within the IM Package.

**Lebanon** agreed that most of the IM Package indicators were in line with SDG4:

- **4.1:** The group recommended disaggregating by age group and education level in the IM Package. It noted that some tracking of proficiency level in reading and mathematics was already happening in Lebanon, but that this process mostly relied on data from end-of-year national exams.

- **4.2:** Lebanon has three indicators related to ECE that cover this aspect.

- **4.3:** The group noted that Lebanon has TVET activities and indicators to measure these.

- **4.4:** Lebanon does not have similar indicator in its log frame, but does have many partners who are embedding ICT training into the Lebanese curriculum. It proposed adding this to its log frame after assessing whether it could measure this at national level.

- **4.5:** The group proposed adding parity in tuition fees. Lebanon has country indicators that are aligned with the regional indicators for this category. Regarding disability, the group felt it would be difficult to measure at present, as MEHE’s inclusive strategy is not yet in place. It further noted that the thematic indicators for this category are more relevant to government activities.

- **4.6:** Lebanon has a youth Basic Literacy and Numeracy (BLN) programme, but the adult literacy component is managed by the Ministry of Social Affairs, not MEHE.
• 4.7: MEHE is currently developing a peace education curriculum, on which data will be gathered.

• 4.a: Lebanon’s indicators on this point are all aligned with SDG4. The group proposed including an indicator on violence in schools (which already exists in Lebanon’s log frame) to the IM Package.

• 4.b: Lebanon’s education actors tracks number of scholarship opportunities provided by partners, but do not track development assistance, as this needs to be tracked by the line ministry itself.

• 4.c: The group noted that Lebanon’s approach is perfectly aligned to SDG4 regarding teacher training. A counselling department in MEHE tracks the number of trainings provided.

Iraq began by noting the complexity and multiplicity of the education response in Iraq.

• Prioritization: The Kurdistan and federal government have produced a National Strategic Education paper (Vision 2020). The Kurdish government has a project with the World Bank, into which some of the SDG projects are embedded. The relevance of these two plans to the humanitarian response is not necessarily clear.

• Relevance of SDG indicators:
  o 4.1 and 4.6: Both of these indicators look at proficiency, which cannot be measured under Iraq’s existing plans, but could be built into Vision 2020. Save the Children is notably looking to introduce a proficiency monitoring system. It would be possible to look at graduation and completion rates as a proxy for these indicators, but the two different education systems pose challenges (one is K-12, while the other is 6, 3 and 3 years).
  o 4.2, 4.4 and 4.7: The group felt that ECE, ICT and life skills were not priorities in the Iraq context. It did note that some ICT projects were already underway.
  o 4.5: Regarding disaggregation by different categories, the group expressed a need to define why these indicators are being used: for upwards or downwards accountability? Iraq’s data on enrolment needs to be further broken down, but the two different data bases (one for IDPs and one for Syrian refugees) have resulted in double counting.
  o 4.a, 4.b and 4.c: Iraq is conducting WASH and related projects, has a limited scholarship programme for tertiary education and provides teacher training.
  o Where the IM Package’s indicators do not necessarily relate to SDG4, these gaps could be addressed by building indicators into the National Strategic Education paper.

Jordan

• Relevance:
  o 4.1: Syrian refugee children now have access to the formal education system. Jordan’s focus has primarily been on enrolment. It may be possible to track completion and progression rates, but this would need to be discussed with the government and should be included in the IM Package.
  o Jordan echoed Lebanon’s call for further disaggregation within the IM Package to better align with SDG4.
  o 4.4: The current JRP does not include indicators relating partners’ ICT courses, but this could be tracked and should be included in the IM Package.
4.6: Jordan’s MOE has a nationally accredited formal adult literacy programme, but refugees may not have access. There are some informal projects, but these are not currently captured by the IM Package.

- Prioritization: The group emphasized the need to include disaggregation by age and completion/progression rates in the IM Package.

**Egypt:**
- 4.1: Egypt also called for further disaggregation by the level of education.
- 4.2: The group noted that ECE is a priority because of gaps in readiness for school and that Egypt has indicators that align with SDG4.4's participation indicator very well.
- 4.5: The group reflected on the difficulty of obtaining certain data on excluded children. It emphasized that not only policies, but also their impact on access to education was important.
- 4.7: Egypt felt that the indicators for life skills did not adequately show content of programmes and that further disaggregation of the different skills was needed.

**Syria**
The group felt that many of the SDG4 indicators are very well aligned with those in the IM Package, but others were not at all. It pointed out that the IM indicators mostly track outputs, which then feed into SDG4 outcome indicators.

- The group felt that it would be helpful to include indicators on the environment, bullying and average teachers’ salaries in the IM Package, in line with SDG4.
- It was not sure how to trace newly enrolled children from non-formal to formal education and it was noted that donors would like data on this outcome. There is no attendance tracking currently within the IM package, which makes it difficult to feed into SDG4.1.
- Regarding TVET and Life Skills, Syria asked for further guidance on how to track both and what the difference is between the two.
- 4.5: The group noted that it would be easier to contribute to this indicator if FTS was regularly updated, but this is not the case. Syria felt this was a missed opportunity.

**Palestine and Yemen**
The group divided the SDG4 global indicators into what is relevant, a priority and/or feasible.

- 4.1: Both Yemen and Palestine felt that 4.1 and 4.a are relevant, priorities and feasible for their operations.
- Neither Yemen nor Palestine felt that 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, or 4.6 was relevant, a priority or feasible for their operations.
- Yemen did not think that 4.2 was relevant, a priority or feasible for its operations, but Palestine did.
- Both Yemen and Palestine felt that 4.5 was partially relevant, partially a priority and feasible for their operations.
- 4.7: Palestine felt that 4.7 was relevant, a priority and feasible for its operations, but Yemen felt it was only partially so, excluding global citizenship.
ANNEX 4: SUMMARY OF THE SYRIA CRISIS EDUCATION RESPONSE IM WORKSHOP EVALUATION

At the end of the last session of the meeting, an evaluation form was distributed to provide the participants with the opportunity to evaluate and comment on the design and content of the meeting. Out of a total of 87 participants, 45 duly filled the evaluation forms.

The evaluation forms consisted of seven sections. Below is the summary of the cumulative results, while more details on each section follows.

- **Interest and relevance of the sessions**: the results of the evaluations show that the content of the sessions were relevant and of interest to the participants. Average interest across all sessions was 4.15 while average relevance was 4.05 (both out of 5).

- **Topics learnt during the meeting**: respondents cited that the three key topics learned during the meeting were ‘IM Package and indicators’ (67 per cent), ‘Early childhood education and related indicators’ (3 per cent), and ‘SDG4’ (24 per cent).

- **Objectives and contents of the meetings, resource persons’ contributions and group work**: Eighty per cent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the resource persons’ contribution was useful. Sixty-nine per cent agreed or strongly agreed that the content of the workshop met the needs, and 53 per cent agreed/strongly agreed that the meeting objectives were met. A majority of 80 per cent of respondents cited that they felt encouraged to take an active part during the discussions and group works.

- **Venue and logistics**: Seventy-eight per cent of participants ranked the venue as ‘excellent’ or ‘very good’. Meals and refreshments were reported as ‘excellent’ or ‘very good’ by 89 per cent of the respondents. The overall organization was reported as ‘excellent’ or ‘very goof’ by 91 per cent of the respondents.

- **Meeting understanding**: Seventy-eight per cent of the participants cited that the meeting helped understand IM processes in the WoS and the HRP and 3RP.

- **Other comments**: respondents thanked the organizers, highlighted the importance of gathering and sharing information, and confirmed the importance of follow-up actions and continuous efforts.

**Interest and relevance of the sessions**

Participants were asked to express the degree of interest and relevance of all the sessions. The average interest across all sessions was 4.16 (out of 5), indicating that resource persons’ presentations had high levels of attention and curiosity among the respondents. In detail, the
highest rated session was the ‘Syria Education Crisis IM Package’. Next in ranked sessions was the sessions on ‘ECD’ and ‘TVET’.

The evaluation results revealed that the average score on the relevance of the session stands at 4.05. The highest score (4.51) was assigned to the session on ‘Syria Education Crisis IM Package’. The top 3 sessions with high interest and relevance rates were: 1) Syria Education Crisis IM Package; 2) EDC; 3) TVET.

**Interest and relevance of sessions (by scale of 1-5)**

**Topics learnt during the meeting**

Participants were asked to list the three most important topics they learnt during the meeting. 30 respondents (67 per cent) indicated that learning about the Syria Crisis Education IM Package and the indicators were main interesting topics that captured their attention during the meeting. They also expressed that the sessions on ECD (33 per cent of respondents) and SDG4 (24 per cent of respondents) were very useful.

**Contents of the meeting and expert contributions**

Participants were asked to evaluate session contents and experts’ contributions, and whether the objectives set for the meeting were met. Also, whether they felt encouraged to participate or not, and if the groupworks were useful and interesting. These were evaluated through agree/disagree rating scales.

The results show: sessions’ contents met the needs of 69 per cent of participants. And, experts’ contributions were useful for 80 per cent of respondents who either agreed (49 per cent) or strongly agreed (31 per cent) with the first statement. Fifty-three per cent of participants agreed or strongly agreed that the meeting objectives were met while only 4 per cent disagreed. The two group work sessions were useful for an average of 66 per cent of participants. Only 8 per cent of the respondents disagreed.
Content tailored to needs

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- No Response

Contribution of resource persons

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- No Response

Meeting objectives achieved

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- No Response

Participants encouraged to take active part in discussions

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- No Response
Venue and logistics

Participants were asked to rate the venue and the logistics of the meetings in both locations on a scale from 5 ‘Excellent’ to 1 ‘Poor. The Meeting space was evaluated by 78 per cent of respondents as ‘excellent’ or ‘very good’. Meals and refreshments were rated as ‘excellent’ or ‘very good’ by 89 per cent of respondents. And, the overall organization received an evaluation of 91 per cent as ‘excellent’ and ‘very good’.

Understanding the challenges and opportunities of education provision for children affected by the Syria crisis

Participants were asked to what extent they agreed or disagreed that ‘the meeting helped understand the challenges and opportunities of education provision for children affected by the Syria crisis’, using a scale from 5 ‘strongly agree’ to 1 ‘strongly disagree’. Seventy-eight per cent of the participants agreed or strongly agreed that the meeting was successful in helping them understand the challenges and opportunities of education provision for children affected by the Syria crisis.

The meeting helped the participants understand the challenges and opportunities of education provision for children affected by the Syria crisis

Understanding and defining the way forward

Participants were asked to what extent they agreed or disagreed that ‘the meeting helped understand and define the way forward’, using a scale from 5 ‘strongly agree’ to 1 ‘strongly disagree’.
Sixty per cent of respondents indicated that the meeting helped them understand and define the way forward. Although none of the respondents disagreed, 11 per cent of the participants did not express any opinion.

The meeting helped the participants understand the way forward

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- No Response

Other comments

Participants were asked to indicate in an open-ended question if they had any other comments to share with the organizers. While some of the comments were to thank the organizers and the excellent opportunity given to the participants to exchange their experiences, other comments included:

- Allocate more time to the group work and discussions.
- Reduce the time of sessions, as some of them were extremely long and participants may lose focus.
- Some presentations were difficult to see from the end of the room, and some included too much text to follow.
- The distribution of material really helped follow the sessions and be able to actively participate.