**EDUCATION IN EMERGENCIES SECTOR WORKING GROUP MEETING**
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| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Minutes | July 4, 2019 | 09:10Am - 11:00Am |  | Fin UNHCR (LION ROOM) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Meeting called by | Education in Emergencies Sector Working Group co-leads |
| Type of meeting | EiE SWG monthly meeting |
| Facilitator | Matthew Swift, Anaïs Marquette |
| Note taker | Anaïs Marquette |
| Attendees | See Attached List |

## 

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| AGENDA ITEMS | | | | |
| * Round of introductions * Task Teams updates on deliverables and next steps:   + AEP task team   + Cash task team   + District task team   + Inclusive education task team   + Language task team   + Secondary Education task team * Education school activities mapping – Matthew Swift, UNHCR * Child protection/Education minimum standards – Matthew Swift, UNHCR * ERP Secretariat update – Connie Alezuyo, ERPS Coordinator * Steering committee update – Matthew Swift, UNHCR * Update on the Ebola response update in schools – Semine Petersen, UNICEF * Update on the localisation paper- Rachael Corbishley and Ellen Fitton * EVD preparedness in schools – Semine Petersen, UNICEF * Montrose International Education Programme presentation – Charlotte Walker, Montrose International * AOB | | | | |
| **ITEM 1.** | Round of introductions | | | |
| **ITEM 2.** | Task Teams updates | | | |
| * **AEP task team – Rachael Corbishley, CMU**   Textbooks and teachers guides’ development is under way with NCDC, condensing materials, but there is still a lot of work to be done.  Harmonizing teachers’ salaries: all AEP teachers will be paid the same as a grade 3 primary school teacher, including NSSF and benefits. Profiles and skills of teachers we are looking for in AEP are the same as in Primary.  Feedback from partners:  Matthew Swift, UNHCR: Harmonization would avoid attracting teachers from Primary into AEP and vice versa, especially as we have more and more actors coming in.  Joyce Talamoi, NRC is conducting an assessment of the impact of AEP on student learning and a meeting last week was held to launch the project (assessment?) in Arua. The teams are currently reviewing the t the questionnaire as well.   * **Cash task team – Meron Gebre, CashCap**   The task team et Monday 1st July to look at progress and define and finalize the position paper. Cashcap is supporting the SWG with the roll out of the Minimum Expenditure Basket (MEB) with tools and approaches. There is a price monitoring and market assessment underway.  As a task team they are trying to identify barriers to education and if they are financial, create solutions involving cash transfer programming. This is a discussion on what would be the most appropriate cash modality for us education actors. They are perhaps looking at conditionality but needs to be defined further..  A finalized position paper will be presented at August meeting.  Feedback from partners:  Matthew Swift, UNHCR: WFP and REACH are conducting the VENA assessment, once completed it provide a framework on how to assess vulnerability of families and inform on cash interventions, especially in the education sector. Sector co-leads provided support and made sure education indicators are included and studied as well.  UNHCR and WFP are working on setting up refugees with bank accounts to facilitate implementation of cash transfers.  Meron Gebre, Cashcap: CashCap is also doing its own financial assessment and collecting feedback from partners before deciding on the best methodology for transfer.   * **District task team – Semine Petersen, UNICEF**   The task team was formed to support the process to making district level ERPs, to contextualize the national plan made on assumption of national averages like pupil to teacher ratio, pupil to textbook ratios, etc. So the purpose of this exercise is to contextualize and target the response as much as possible.  First meeting of the task team will be in August.  The process is going to the sub county level, in terms of participation and consultations as well. District ERP planning has been initiated in 6 districts in West Nile. The task team is co-led by Save the children, UNICEF and ERP Secretariat to continue the work done in West Nile and initiate the process in Wouth West.  The district ERP relies on accurate school level data. There will be 2 rounds of sub county consultations, to determine what are the key gaps and needs and issues at sub county level. In august there will be a call to partners to help support the Task Team with quality data, which will all inform the costing model and its revision. The costing model right now is only based on national ERP.  Timeline for 6 districts in West Nile: July data gap analysis, August national task team will convene for the first time for existing data consolidation, August-September district level consultations and prioritization (field level participation will be required), September review of district costing models  A similar timeline and process will be established for the districts in the South West and Central regions.   * **Inclusive education task team - Kjertil Reite, HI**   The task team has met 3 or 4 times now and is co-led by AAR and HI. Its main objective is to develop a common framework and standardized tools for implementing inclusive education.  **Progress to date:**  The teacher training module should have been ready already but is still underway. HI has developed a training manual, but it needs to be discussed among task team members and getting MoES on board hasn’t been done yet. The development of a training of trainers manual to follow the teacher training manual is also something that needs to be done. Meeting with MoES in 2 weeks to get them involved in the process.  The task team is also working on tools for assessment on the inclusiveness of schools. The checklist of how inclusive schools are is done, and this task is combined with the assessment of teaching methodologies. ZOA and AAR have collected tools from partners, and are now working on harmonizing one tool. Work is underway.  Assessment of children with disabilities need to discuss further: What is commonly used is the Washington group tools but it is extremely time consuming. A discussion on whether this is the tool to be used will be discussed with the task team, as the tool is supposed to be used on all children but would be very difficult. HI developed a screening tool for teachers to identify children that the Washington group can be used on afterwards.  The other 2 deliverables will be the focus of next quarter. Feedback from partners Matthew Swift, UNHCR: When are you planning on rolling out the tool?  Kjertil Reite, HI: Are planning on making the tool and there needs to be a discussion on how to use it. HI is starting to use it in Arua next week so will be able to give feedback.  Matthew Swift, UNHCR: what is the process for partners to do an assessment in settlements? How do you coordinate with other partners and stakeholders? We need to coordinate a bit better, put an assessment registry together, share data available between partners, cross check, and consolidate. As a sector, we need to work together towards this.  Milou de Bruijne, ZOA: At settlement, level most organisations collect whatever data they need in that moment. They share with another Working group like Child Protection when needed for a proposal for example.  The objective of us all using the same tools for inclusive education is that we could measure as a sector our progress towards ERP indicators, and define together what schools are accessible.  Matthew Swift, UNHCR: we need to have a common understanding about what for example teacher training means. For cash programmes as well, what is a vulnerable family, what is the best way, etc. We need to be working with the district level plans, the DEOs collect information but we need as a sector to help improve the system as a whole. School inspections need to be standardized and systematic. Same for data collection.  Windle International Uganda: There was a meeting earlier this year between partners and UNHCR about tools to collect and generate data. We agreed on a number of tools. Changes were made but the tools that were made have not been shared yet.  Action point:   * UNHCR to follow up on the data collection tools mentioned * EiEWG to create an assessment register for the sector and to share for partners to update * **Language task team**   1st deliverable, Develop a Terms of Reference for a short-term consultancy that would further investigate the language needs and current gaps within the refugee response, this is done.  2nd deliverable, Define a Bridging Curriculum in the Ugandan context: being started through the consultant. Meeting planned with the consultant to go through initial findings.  3rd deliverable, Harmonize the understanding and use of Assistant Teachers: under way. All partners that hire assistant teachers have come to a common agreement on TORs, will be circulated for feedback. Assistant teachers are there to provide support in the classroom, it is not a way to hire qualified refugees teachers. There is a separate advocacy effort for this.  Proposed rate for Assistant teachers is 300k per month, in AEP or primary schools.  4th deliverable, Develop guidance notes for language of instruction and the use of multi-lingual strategies in the classroom: The British Council will lead work on this. .  5th deliverable, Play a coordinating role across several partners in the development and implementation of a Bridging Programme for refugee hosting districts: this is ongoing.  Last 2 deliverables are pending.  Feedback from partners:  Charlotte Walker, Montrose International: Through one of our projects in South Sudan we created learning modules in 5 national languages, we will share with the language task team if useful.  Action point:   * Montrose to share project report and modules with Language task team * **Secondary Education task team – Andrea Dutrus, JRS**   The task team has made progress on the 3rd deliverables, about streamlining the equation process across partners.  A survey was sent out to organizations who do equating, 3 organisations shared information. The document produced outlines all the steps for equation, with the time it takes. Some recommendations are included as well but they still need to be discussed with the 3 partners.  UNHCR, OPM and JRS met to discuss the relevance of bringing documents to the embassy as it poses protection issues with students’ identities. Going through UNEB/SNEC would be better. This will be discussed as well.  In general the process takes about 3 months, and an additional month for registration process.  Feedback from partners:  Semine Petersen, UNICEF: A cross border assessment was done by UNICEF and UNHCR last year, and costs of equation came up, is there an advocacy effort towards the government to make it unified?  Andrea Dutrus, JRS: We met with OPM this week about this issue. Students and organizations should not pay for this, but no common decision. We collected cost info from organizations but we are not sharing it yet, as it needs to be discussed with partners first.  Emmanuel Curuma, Windle: We worked with the embassy last year and this year we worked with the SNEC. Going through the Embassy is more expensive but faster. So this should be harmonized. UNEB is also encouraging us to start this process earlier.  Lameck Ageta, Windle: We need to pay attention to the timeframe of equating. If we have to do this earlier, we have to plan for it and that can be an issue for funding. Can UNHCR allow pre-financing to get the equating done in P3 for example so that the equating is done and ready for when it is needed?  Matthew Swift, UNHCR: it needs to be in the plan when you develop your agreement with us.  Andrea Dutrus, JRS: it is tricky to do earlier equation as some students might drop out.  Action points:   * UNICEF to share cross-border report | | | | |
| **ITEM 3.** | Education school activities mapping – Matthew Swift, UNHCR | | | |
| Activity Info deadline is tomorrow. There can be some flexibility for few extra days but if that is your case please reach out to us co-leads.  School mapping exercise: we have consolidated a list of schools and mapped them out. This is the very simple first stage. From extracted activity info data we are putting together a consolidated data base from the schools, to establish which activity each partner is doing in which schools. When we are talking about coordination, this is what we need to improve: for example, multiple partners paying salaries in the same school.  The excel data will be transferred onto the map and dashboards.  **Reminder to everyone to please report on activity info!**  Action Point:   * UNHCR to share excel matrix | | | | |
| **ITEM 4.** | Child protection/Education minimum standards – Matthew Swift, UNHCR | | | |
| Child protection and education partners met yesterday for the second time. If any partners missed these meetings and still want to get involved, please get in touch.  There are a lot of policies, assessment tools about child protection in schools. The group will be consolidating what is out there, looking at MoES policies. Secondly the group will do a mapping of what activities are happening in schools and around schools. Partners need a secondary data review, and then a harmonization of tools as HI is doing.  The end goal is to put together minimum standards of child protection we need in schools, protection in general, trainings, personnel, facilities, etc.  UNHCR will communicate on next steps and meeting dates so that everyone can be involved. | | | | |
| **ITEM 5.** | ERP Secretariat update – Connie Alezuyo, ERPS Coordinator | | | |
| Connie thanked all partners for contributing to the review consultations. Waiting for feedback from the steering committee before sharing.  Revision of the ERP is ongoing, consultations last week in South West and next week in West Nile. Very useful and active discussions at district levels so thank you for your involvement.  The Secretariat should be settled in MoEs Legacy towers by the end of the month  This week Joseph Kajumba from MoES is representing Uganda at an IGAD meeting in Addis, to look at costed response plans for education in emergencies. Lessons learnt will be shared with the sector at our August meeting.  Feedback from partners:  Rachael Corbishley, CMU: what is the process for revision? What are the next steps and the timeline?  Connie Alezuyo, ERPS: Targets for revision were set in 2017, we are looking at the priorities that were set then, and deciding if they are still relevant at district level. The ERP is a rolling plan so every year it will be reviewed and priorities re-assessed. An important part of the revision is to bring these priorities down to district level. Timeline: we’re a bit late, this should have been done before June, due to long administrative processes. But we are working on it. We have a limited amount of funding for the ERP and we want it to be used for the right priorities. The revision should be done by end of August. We will produce an addendum to the ERP to show the shift in priorities. | | | | |
| **ITEM 6.** | Steering committee update – Matthew Swift, UNHCR | | | |
| Steering Committee is meeting early August, there will be more update after that.  Feedback from partners:  Emmanuel Curuma, Windle: the NGO representation on the SC was supposed to be annual, so it is time to change it.  UNHCR took note. | | | | |
| **ITEM 7.** | Update on the localisation paper- Rachael Corbishley and Ellen Fitton | | | |
| During the ECW funding call, there was only one direct proposal from a Ugandan organisation so for the next call there should be better participation of local organizations. Have asked organizations to endorse the paper.  Through the writing process, local organisations were asked to think about the barriers to accessing this kind of funding call. The main points that came out is that the application deadline is too short, minimum funding of 500k is intimidating, fear of due diligence process, fear of not being able to compete with INGOs.  There is also a general need for a better inclusion of local orgs in sector working groups, nationally and at district level.  **Recommendations:**  A task team should be created to work on localisation, and its first task will be a mapping of local NGOs and that should be quite complex as it needs to be done at district level.  Organisations who endorse the localization paper commit to actively include local orgs, partner with them, and to actively advocate for more funding to go directly to local NGOS.  The paper will be shared again today and need feedback before Friday July 5 COB. It will then be shared with wider networks and donors.  Feedbcak from partners:  This is a very important exercise. The paper should be shared with the national NGO platform so they can give feedback as they are also working on the same process. | | | | |
| **ITEM 8.** | EVD preparedness in schools – Semine Petersen, UNICEF | | | |
| Communication packages have been translated in all local languages, circulated to schools through MoES.  Availability of materials: there could be stocks at district level, UNICEF has distributed everything.  Engagement goes through government structure, there is a plan made by the national EVD preparedness task force; go through village health teams and a dedicated team of risk communication facilitators.  Household mobilization coupled with wider broadcasting mass media interventions.  300,000 HH visited in 11 months, 88% coverage in the 21 border districts.  3,474 teachers trained. 79% of schools that were initially identified as high risk in border districts, about 1,200 schools. Also using DEOs and district structures to reach teachers.  Handwashing facilities reached 962 schools. Detailed list of schools can be provided by UNICEF.  Key priorities for educations: strong coordination between DEOs and DHOs. All schools need to be embedded in the planning and risk communication work. In case of outbreak, the budget for thermometers to screen children in schools for example, sits with MoH.   * School to school sensitization. * Integration of EVD awareness into all training events for teachers   All partners to get in touch with district DEO or DHO, either district staff or Ugandan RC will provide appropriate staff and training.  Lessons learnt from the West Africa outbreak: schools were not major points of transmission. So priorities for wash interventions are not going to be schools, health centers are the priority. But we can reinforce good hand washing practices at school level.  The education sector is advocating to keep schools open for the longest possible. Schools have the potential to be a platform for trainings and knowledge sharing and provide a safe space and a sense of normalcy for children.  Action point:   * UNICEF to provide list of locations and schools reached by trainings and handwashing facilities distribution | | | | |
| **ITEM 9.** | Montrose International Education Programme presentation – Charlotte Walker, Montrose International | | | |
| No education in emergencies in Uganda but a lot of overlap with Montrose programmes.  Montrose was contracted by Cheshire Services Uganda to evaluate the Girls Education Challenge Transition project in Kampala.  Tools used to collect the data are: EGRA EGMA, interviews, lesson observation.  Tools had to be adapted to different disability types: visual, hearing, communication, physical, disabilities, for example, increasing letter sizes, using non-white paper, giving children enough time. Most of the time it is more an issue of the assessment format not being adapted, then a knowledge or skills issue.  **Findings:**  Barriers to earning: schools not using adapted learning materials even if they have them because classrooms are congested, large amount of corporal punishment, lot of negative attitudes towards children with disabilities (“they shouldn’t be in mainstream schools”).  Montrose also conducted a survey on economic empowerment and how much parents with disabled children can afford or want to pay for education/school fees.  UNHCR: There is a dropbox for the SWG, we’re going to start an assessment registry, what have people done, and wat are people planning to do in the future  Action points:   * Montrose International to share 1 pager and economic empowerment survey * Co-leads to put together an assessment registry | | | | |
| **NEXT MEETING** | **1 August 2019 – UNHCR** | | | |
| Action items | | responsible | Deadline | STaTUS |
| Ministry of Education to share AEP tools with the task team | | MoES | 14/06/2019 | PENDING |
| Share resettlement location for new arrivals | | UNHCR | 4/07/2019 | PENDING |
| Share the new teacher policy with the SWG | | MoES | 14/06/2019 | PENDING |
| MoES to share with partners dates and arrangements made for visit to the settlements | | MoES | 21/06/2019 | PENDING |
| Electronic copy of RRP received by UNHCR, will be shared with the group | | UNHCR | 14/06/2019 | PENDING |
| UNHCR to circulate the contact list for field level EiE SWG | | UNHCR | 14/06/2019 | PENDING |
| UNHCR to follow up on the data collection tools mentioned | | UNHCR | 15/07/2019 | PENDING |
| Montrose International to share project report and modules with Language task team, 1 pager report presented at EiE SWG meeting and Economic empowerment survey report | | Montrose International | 15/07/2019 | PENDING |
| UNHCR to share excel matrix on school activities | | UNHCR | 15/07/2019 | PENDING |
| UNICEF to provide list of locations and schools reached by trainings and handwashing facilities distribution and share cross-border report on equation | | UNICEF | 15/07/2019 | PENDING |
| Co-leads to put together an assessment registry | | UNHCR + FCA | 15/07/2019 | PENDING |