

**Global  
Education Cluster**

**Executive Summary  
Joint meeting of Global Education Cluster  
and Child Protection Working Group  
Geneva - October 29-31, 2013**



The links between education and child protection sectors are many and strong, as they both focus on children and adolescents in emergencies. The organization of a joint global Education Cluster and Child Protection Working Group (CPWG) annual meeting was seen as a good opportunity to formalize and strengthen the more ad hoc efforts and help reaching out to each other. The meeting attracted 132 participants from around the world including Ministry of Education representatives, country level and global Cluster Coordinators for Child Protection and Education; a wide range of organizations, donor agencies, independent consultants, and academic partners.

Its objectives were:

- 1. to strengthen links and collaboration between Child Protection and Education;**
- 2. to facilitate dialogue and learning amongst field based coordinators and practitioners, international organizations, academics, and donors, on emerging issues, and identify areas for further learning; and**
- 3. to ensure a mid-term review of the respective work plans.**

**Global Update Session**

Common improvements achieved by both groups over the last year are:

- Improved support to the field through Rapid Response Teams (RRT) and direct and global supports;
- Following the Transformative Agenda (TA), there has been a big push for more integration within and between clusters. As a result, there are now a number of fora where global clusters come together to work on the TA and common tools that can be then tailored when responding to emergencies, especially around Information Management (IM);
- Inter-agency technical guidance has been strengthened, enabling more time to focus on elements of coordination;
- The global cross-cluster unit is beginning to provide supports;
- Co-leadership has been strengthened, and more is taking place at the country level;
- Partners are increasingly seeing the benefits that cluster work can bring, and thus intensifying their investment in those processes;
- Greater visibility of Child Protection (CP) & Education in emergencies within humanitarian response as a result of advocacy (particularly over Syria).

**Child Protection Update:** The 2013-2015 Work Plan is ambitious and covers needs and interests of the overall group, where tasks are taken by different members or associates with the support of the CPWG support unit. The work plan is framed by the *Minimum Standards for the Protection of Children in Humanitarian Action* (CPMS). \$3.2 million of funding flowed through the CPWG this year, from four main donors. In-kind donations and funds channeled directly to partners were also substantial.

The main achievements in 2013 are:

1. CPMS and programming
  - 1a. Introduce and implement CPMS
  - 1b. Improve programming, including progress on the following standards
    - 1) UASC: standard UASC registration forms and Alternative Care in Emergencies toolkit finalized; UASC Handbook in final stages of completion.
    - 2) Case Management: case management guidelines and training materials developed through Task Force and piloted in a number of countries.
2. Improve coordination: on-going, with increased time of RRT members' in-country and providing remote support. Update and disseminate a starter pack for field based coordinators and hold an updated global coordination training
3. Improve capacity: Supporting development and piloting of seven packages stemming from various task groups; using new ways of reaching practitioners through technology; and developing the post-graduate diploma in Child Protection in Emergencies (CPiE) which is now in the second phase of curriculum development
4. Strengthen Assessment & Measurement
5. Advocacy

#### Education Work Plan Update

- Update on changes to the Education Cluster unit, with more focus on communications (new website and newsletter)
- In the four areas of work:
  - Capacity development
  - Knowledge & Information Management
  - Field Operations has seen a continued expansion of RRT and deployments, with 14 crises supported and over 570 days spent in the field this year.
  - Strategy & Advocacy
- Challenges:
  - Funding limits the support unit's capacity for outreach; want to be more proactive;
  - Want to support more in-country advocacy;
  - Short IM deployable capacity.

Next year the focus will be on:

- Changes in Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) protocols.
- Maintain and intensify the efforts towards professionalisation of humanitarian coordination.
- Developing the strategic plan for 2015 and beyond.

### **The Future of Humanitarian Action**

Professor Antonio Donini highlighted main trends:

- The amount of humanitarian assistance is up in the last decade (\$17 billion), but the principle of humanitarianism is more under threat.
- Crises are lasting longer and many are being left in limbo without sufficient resolution. It is clear that we are not good at resolving crisis. The military see the humanitarian community as irrelevant or a (minor) obstacle.
- While it is difficult to measure, the level of violence against humanitarian workers has increased in real terms. That has resulted in us being behind bigger and bigger walls.
- Increase in natural disasters, though some is down to better records.

The main areas to watch are: the historical model of humanitarian compassionate, charity; Western humanitarian orthodoxy / oligopoly and its discontents; the sovereignty, nationalism and the future of Humanitarian Action and the Humanitarianism and power.

There is an emergence of new model of states (such as China, India).

And what is next? Politicization and manipulation of aid and humanitarian dialogue are here to stay. The huge growth in the industry is making it less agile and leadership is weak. Humanitarian growth has meant that it has levels of power: standards are rules of the game that leaves a number of actors outside the humanitarian arena.

There is a disconnect between the humanitarian narrative and the reality of humanitarian power. Can this be made more equal and modest as it remains very top-down.

### **Panel on the Changing Humanitarian Landscape**

Four humanitarian colleagues laid out trends in humanitarian action.

Key points are: increased need for accountability and to embrace technology effectively or be side-lined as irrelevant; a range of new humanitarian actors and the selectivity of governments; to commit clearly to using our Standards consistently and collaboratively to decrease power dynamics.

The panelists urged us to articulate our “added value” by a stronger evidence-base and strategic advocacy.

The plenary was lively, with much discussion on the use of technologies, cash transfer programmes and bottom-up approaches.

**Achieving Child Protection & Education outcomes through Economic Strengthening (ES):**

ES is based specifically on livelihood programs. There is a lot of rigorous evidence on livelihood programs' outcomes, challenges and research gaps that focus on household economic strengthening and working with older children and youth. ES programs focusing on caregivers through improved health, nutrition, and living standards have had many positive outcomes such as greater attendance in school, better living conditions, less "at-risk" or vulnerable children and lower incidence of depression and risky sexual behaviour. While there is no evidence at this stage in emergency contexts, studies found that cash transfer programs have many positive impacts on children and youth in development settings but also produce negative outcomes for example on parental behaviour in relation to incentives provided at community levels.

Looking at ES programs through CP lenses helps to identify key modalities to put in place and monitor in order to avoid inverted benefits in relation to school attendance, Gender-Based Violence (GBV) issues, child labour, etc. In general, ES programming is an after-thought of humanitarian programming but should be instead considered from the inception of the programs. Multi-sectoral, integrated ES programming is known to be a stronger delivery model. In particular, CP needs to build internal capacity in implementing and designing plans related to ES programs.

The current, identified gaps in ES research include: role of gender in ES programs; Cash and children in humanitarian settings; longer term impact of cash transfers on children; monitoring of outcomes and the use of indicators of ES programs on CP & Education; and impact of livelihood and economic programs on keeping families together.

**Evaluation of UNICEF as Cluster Lead Agency:**

The presentation was on the findings of the evaluation done by an independent consulting group. It tries to answer two questions: how is UNICEF doing as Cluster Lead Agency (CLA), and what to do to do better in the future focusing on five components: internal and external performance; human resources; scope and boundaries; and cost effectiveness.

Overall, it was deemed that UNICEF was found effective at country level and successful in involving the government and national authorities as well as the development of the Rapid Response Team made a huge difference in surge capacity. Some of the areas that need strengthening are cross-cluster coordination, soft skills development; transparency; transition from Clusters; issues on "double-hatting;" cost effectiveness in non-acute emergencies and the role of regional offices.

**Monitoring and Reporting Mechanisms:**

There was a rich discussion on the MRM successes and current status. The set of MRM tools developed by UNICEF, OSRSG, CAAC and DPKO to support the implementation were presented as well as the Watchlist initiative to enhance NGO's engagement. The MRM is a groundbreaking opportunity to use the work at field level with children, teachers and principals and strengthen the collective work on monitoring and reporting, and use it as an entry point to expand both programming and accountability work for children more globally.

**Information Management (IM) for coordination:** Explanation on how IM is present at all stages of the Humanitarian Programme Cycle (HPC) and measures the response throughout the whole process was given. Good IM starts in preparedness, but after the onset of an emergency good IM discussion needs to happen during the strategic planning phase. The types of question that needs to be answered when defining which data to collect were discussed. It is important that partners get something back from reporting. Finally, hands-on training was provided on key features of some user-friendly tools which don't require to be an IM expert.

**Unaccompanied & Separated Children:** An overview of the Inter-Agency Working Group (IAWG) on UASC that exist since 18 years was given. The following products were presented:

- common registration form which all agencies can use finalized
- rapid FTR tool which can be used on smartphone near completion
- field handbook for UASC, almost finalized
- alternative care in emergencies toolkit in progress

During the remaining time, discussions turned around the role of government, how the use of the rapid FTR affects the social workers' approach with children during registration, how to avoid double-registering and how to fill the gaps around reintegration guidance. There is a need to ensure different perspectives that come together on that last phase. It will be important to build awareness and strategy for using the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) complaints mechanism that is coming.

**Child Protection Systems (CPS):** In recent years, there has been a gradual shift in thinking from working on Child Protection issues in independent silos to understanding them as inter-connected even if translation of this into practical action has been more challenging. There was an open discussion that examined the assumptions of humanitarian actors' regarding pre-existing Child Protection systems. In general, it is assumed that governments are weak or that Child Protection systems do not exist but communities are strong so work should focus on them. We recognize that there are tensions between humanitarian and development actors (development actors have time and know the environment versus humanitarian actors who work in a vacuum) and that there is need to learn from them. The CPS TF will merge with the DRR and Resilience TF.

**Capacity-building:** This session looked at the synergies and lessons learned across the two sectors. It also looked at the bigger picture of who is the target population, what are we trying to achieve and that capacity building goes beyond training itself. An update about the products that are available or that have been revamped, developed and launched was done by each sector including training initiatives such the CPiE post-graduate diploma and a new module on conflict sensitive education.

Measuring training impacts was discussed and the fact of that it is a huge challenge was one of the conclusions the group came to. There is a need to be clear about learning outcomes. Consistency of approach in measurement across all training packages; IM person is looking at measurement possibilities for the new packages. Mentoring was also debated. While CP is looking at developing a training session on coaching and mentoring for in-country managers, INEE has Focal Points in an ad hoc manner that can be coaches, tasked with following-up key points from training.

There is a real need to learn from what has been tried before (on mentoring, F2F training, etc.). There are synergies between sectors within child rights agencies. War Child Holland gave an example that they no longer have stand-alone education programming, but run it with other efforts.

**DRR & Resilience:** Acknowledging that resilience is nothing new was the starting point of the discussion. There is a need to find concrete, realistic, sustainable entry points of integrating Conflict and Disaster Risk Reduction (C/DRR) into the work and sector plans. During the session, examples from Bangladesh, South Sudan and CPWG's global efforts were reviewed. Many areas for synergy between Education and CP were listed. There is a need to strengthen bridges with development colleagues and other sectors.

**NGO Co-leadership:** This was primarily an information session looking at the lessons learned from Save the Children’s global experience in Education, Plan International’s national experience in CP, plus a case study in DRC. In order to co-lead, Agencies must be able to identify someone to play the role of Cluster Coordinator and it is important to build their capacities to fulfil this role. Their job description must have roles and responsibilities clearly outlined. Co-leads must have access to resources and good communication channels with the lead at country level but also with other cluster counterparts and especially with the global clusters. Co-leadership role should be decided at country level where the Global level can provide guidance to analyse the accountability issue. Greater civil society voice allows greater partnership to work together especially during an emergency.

**Working with Government and Managing Transition Process:** The linkages with government by both sectors were discussed with a focus on not just linking UN, NGO and government, but also fostering the inter-government linkages between ministries especially National Disaster Authorities. Despite the existence of global guidance, discussions highlighted that transition remains difficult. The Case studies on the Philippines and oPt demonstrated a range of challenges and timelines. It was suggested to create a common tool for assessing government’s capacity and that this assessment is done from the outset and not as part of the transition.

**Needs and Capacities Assessment (NA) :** The session opened by highlighting that strong data and evidence is needed for good and contextualized programming; NA is therefore essential. The session was framed around case studies from Mali, Syria and CAR and discussed successes and challenges around secondary data review, implementation of assessments, analysis and reporting and finally collaboration between Education and CP sectors. Tools that exist in both sectors could be harmonized, learning from joint assessments processes should be compiled and both sectors could jointly take advantage of the opportunity of mobile data technology.

**Advocacy and Funding:** A recent study concluded that Protection and Education continue to be the most poorly funded humanitarian sectors. Despite increased profile and that more attention is drawn on them, resources are not forth-coming. The conclusions highlight that donors would like to see better outcome-focused evaluations and reporting and improved quality protection programming. The perception of donors about EiE is still an issue.

The discussion of lessons learned, good practices and opportunities raised the need to advocate for greater funding and the need to approach non-traditional donors and tapping on development funding, including within our own agencies. Using the Transformative Agenda (TA) is an opportunity (within its framework for integration) for advocacy using terminology and language understood by all. A results-based example came from South Sudan, emphasised practicality, using longer-term language around resilience and hope, and collaboration with more sectors.

The discussion on the collaboration between both sectors underlined the importance of framing advocacy jointly by talking about children and adolescents, that country-level provide guidance around areas of intersection to explore advocacy in practical areas such as schools are not safe and enlarging the focus of CPWG Advocacy Task Force to include education issues.

**Worst Forms of Child Labour:**

First, the conclusions of a recent review were presented. It shows significant gaps in practice, knowledge and learning (particularly hazardous labour), as well as evidence. Immediate prevention has not been followed up and organizations that work on WFCL are not usually active in the initial stages of response and the systems-building work needs to connect better with WFCL. The second presentation explored the close correlation between WFCL and children's education involvement and how children and communities place a strong emphasis on education even in crisis, highlighting that WFCL has not been raised directly as an issue within the Education Cluster.

WFCL should be included into INEE guidelines and other relevant tools, humanitarian actors should be provided simple guidance on how to improve their intervention and Ed/CP collaboration in humanitarian and development contexts should be strengthened.

**INEE Global Consultation:** Firstly, background information on Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE) global consultations was provided. Secondly, the discussion that followed permitted to receive feedback on the process for 2013-2014. Global consultations are planned to start in the coming weeks with an online survey, and with regional consultation in 2014. INEE hope for members-driven consultations in country including consultation within the different organisations. INEE will use the consultations to develop the strategic plan 2015-17 and it will also feed into the new strategic planning of the Global Education Cluster.

**Family Interventions and Early Childhood Development:** It is widely accepted that immediate caregivers play a critical role in the protection and development of children. However, we don't see this strongly supported in the emergency context. There is growing evidence of how parenting programmes impact children's well-being in emergencies and that needs to be on CP, Education and donor agendas. This can be expanded by using the existing programmes, as well as health, as entry points and to build the evidence base. WVI shared some of its programme learning. Programs that work best are integrated services that deal with parents and children together.

**Mental Health and Psychosocial Support (MHPSS):** A wide-ranging discussion followed a brief introduction to Psychological First Aid, the IASC MHPSS Reference Group, its products, successes and challenges, and IRC's Healing Schools toolkit. The four layers of the IASC pyramid were presented. Issues such as MPSS goes beyond CFSs, the importance of contextualizing the Guidelines in country, how interventions in the second layer should be defined and measured and finally, there is still much confusion around the third layer, were raised. The emerging post-2015 framework stresses measuring "learning outcomes" with little on CP or PSS. Strong advocacy is needed.

CPWG is carrying out research on "hard-to-measure issues." There is still the need to strengthen the research methodologies. There is growing interest in a "waiting list" approach to research by staggering program implementation and introduce interventions at different phases. Despite donors working towards more integrated programming (even within specific sector proposals), children still need to be seen more holistically. Many agencies are involved in referral and PSS over distance; how can we best provide technical oversight? What is the role of clusters in linking referral systems to ensure children's services are linked?

**CFS and Community-Based Mechanisms:** Many common themes arose: challenges on overlapping terminology; unclear definition leading to unclear roles and responsibilities for actors on the ground; grey area on who does what; what CBMs mean; challenges for effective coordination and collaboration between actors; issue of effective phasing out. The issue of effective transitioning and phasing out questions how “community-based” are we. The draft CFS training package which makes many inter-sectoral links and the Child Centered Services model were explained. The need of better inter-sectoral platform to discuss and collaborate on this issue was agreed.

**Adolescents & Youth (A&Y) falling between the cracks:** is an issue that falls between the cracks, despite representing significant numbers. The group had presentations on returnees in Burundi (RET); Plan International’s latest global report ‘Because I am a girl’; and Youth and livelihoods initiative in urban refugee context by Women’s Refugee Commission. The brainstorm on why A&Y falls within the gaps noted: the lack of disaggregated data; a problem of definition (no commonalities across agencies); lack of legal framework; tools for primary education only; little recognition of the great resources of A&Y; a lot of programming for adolescents girls but that shouldn’t be at the expense of boys; lack of good practices and evidence-base; and a negative perception: are they children or adults? The establishment of youth Task Forces across all clusters would be a way forward. To take advantage of young people’s potential, A&Y must be included in the post-2015 agenda through: flexible and holistic planning to answer variety of needs as young people have different needs; real youth inclusion; enhancing and supporting youth leadership at all levels; results-oriented and evidence-based programming; increased funding; and more effective coordination and cross-sectoral action.

In addition to the parallel sessions on technical topics, there were simultaneous sessions on major crises (**Syria, Mali and Central African Republic**). These proved an opportunity for updates, for global and field level personnel to exchange challenges and opportunities, and to undertake some action planning between the sectors.

**Next Steps:** The perspectives of our roving “eyes and ears” on gender, information management and inter-sectoral collaboration need to be factored into the proposed action points. These will be reviewed by the Global Education Cluster and the global Cluster Coordinators. They will be prioritised with the “quick wins” actioned in the coming weeks.

**Closing Remarks:** Speakers from the global protection cluster and UNICEF EMOPS urged the group to increase its collaboration and accountability. Together, there is an opportunity to articulate and implement protective programming, but we must improve including its measurement. The CPWG Coordinator closed the meeting by stressing that this time together has created new friendships, links and opportunities. It has also given us clear evidence of how important and powerful it is to work and speak together; let’s speak about children as a whole. We have opportunities to advocate as one on attacks on schools and also fundraise together. There is room for a powerful alliance where we build the evidence jointly; but there is a long to-do list and we need to think about to best implement it. The various panels and discussion groups highlighted integration across sectors, but especially with livelihoods colleagues, and government (in order not to duplicate existing systems). This in itself is transformative.