



**Education Consortium Rapid Needs Assessment for DRC Response  
ECHO Top Up Funding for 2019**

**May 2019**

## Table of contents

<b>List of Tables</b> .....	<b>iii</b>
<b>1.0 BACKGROUND</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1.1 The refugee crisis in Uganda.....	1
1.2 Education for Refugees.....	1
1.3 Education Consortium and INCLUDE Project.....	1
1.4 Purpose of the assessment .....	1
1.5 Specific objectives of the assessment .....	2
<b>2.0 METHODOLOGY</b> .....	<b>2</b>
2.1 Design and sampling strategy .....	2
2.2 Target respondents, data collection methods and tools.....	2
2.2.1 Geographical focus of the assessment.....	2
2.2.3 Actual Participants Focus Group Discussions and Key Informant Interviews.....	3
<b>3.0 FINDINGS</b> .....	<b>4</b>
3.1 Overview .....	4
3.1.1 Secondary Data Review.....	4
3.2 Availability, access and quality of education services .....	8
3.2.1 Children out of school.....	10
3.3 Household financial capacity; and access to market and school requirements .....	12
3.3.1 Overview .....	12
3.3.2 Household financial capacity .....	12
3.3.3 Access to markets and school requirements in and around the settlements .....	15
<b>4.0 BINDING CONSTRAINTS</b> .....	<b>17</b>
<b>5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS</b> .....	<b>18</b>

---

## List of Tables

---

Table 2.1:	Geographical coverage by partners .....	2
Table 2.2:	Summary of data collection methods, tools and target respondents.....	3
Table 2.3:	Actual Respondent Coverage for the Needs Assessment.....	3
Table 2.4:	Average prices and availability across the settlements .....	16

## **1.0 BACKGROUND**

---

### **1.1 The refugee crisis in Uganda**

According to OPM and UNHCR press release in May, the situation on the DRC border is worrying where over 17,000 Congolese have come to Uganda so far this year alone. Reports received from various sources indicate that recent hostilities among armed groups in the DRC's North Kivu province have led to more than 100,000 people fleeing their homes in April. Of these, an estimated 60,000 people fled as a result of fighting around Kamango near the town of Beni in North Kivu. UNHCR is alarmed by this situation and the potential for a significant increase in new arrivals, further complicated by the fact that a number of the newly displaced Congolese are fleeing Ebola-affected areas, makes the situation increasingly complex. By March 2019, around 332,506 Congolese refugees are living in Uganda, including 60,000 new arrivals entering Uganda in 2018 through mainly the border points of Ishasa (Kanungu district), Nteko and Bunangana (Kisoro district). Uganda's central and southwestern districts of Isingiro (Nakivale and Oruchinga settlements), Kyegegwa (Kyaka II settlement) and Kikuube (Kyangwali settlement) are expected to receive the vast majority of Congolese new arrivals.

It is estimated that women and children will make up 78 per cent of the total population, with children alone close to 56 per cent. Limited secondary education, vocational skill training and job opportunities may lead to protection risks among mainly Congolese youth and persons with specific needs (PSNs) in Uganda, including early and forced marriage, child abuse and forced recruitment as well as negative coping mechanisms such as drug abuse, transactional and survival sex.

### **1.2 Education for Refugees**

According to UNHCR data<sup>1</sup>, the increasing number of new refugees entering Uganda has put a significant strain on the education response. School age children represent at least 50 per cent of the refugee population and only 44 per cent of them have access to formal and informal education, with a significant gender gap in enrolment, especially at secondary level, where fewer girls are in school compared to boys.

### **1.3 Education Consortium and INCLUDE Project**

The education consortium is composed of four partners including: Save the Children (SC), Finn Church Aid (FCA), Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) and War Child Holland (WCH). These partners started implementing the INnovative and inCLusive accelerated eDucation programme for refugee and host community children (INCLUDE) project in 2018. In October 2018, ECHO announced a grant for 2019 (extension), which the consortium applied for and subsequently won to implement 24 more months. It is after the start of this project that ECHO issued a top up, aimed at addressing education needs for new arrivals and those that may still have challenges enrolling and remaining in school. It is against this call that the education consortium partners embarked on this rapid needs assessment, in a bid to put up a well-grounded and strong application for the top up funding.

### **1.4 Purpose of the assessment**

Overall, the assessment provides a basic understanding of the current and future education and cash needs of out of school and/or recently arrived refugee children to be able to support them to access and attend formal primary school or Accelerated Education Programmes (AEP), with an aim of being able to return to formal education. The assessment assesses the feasibility of the current education and market facilities to support increased primary school enrolment and attendance through a multipurpose cash modality. The overall aim is to improve learning outcomes, enrolment and retention in school.

---

<sup>1</sup> Performance Snapshot (Quarter 1). Uganda Refugee Response Plan 2019-2020. UNHCR.

## 1.5 Specific objectives of the assessment

This needs assessment provides insights on the gaps and opportunities for the effective implementation of Cash Transfer Programmes (CTP) linked to education and specifically the assessment aimed at:

- *Understanding the specific locations in each settlement with the highest number of out of school children and the locations receiving new arrivals as well as the primary schools located in the specific locations*
- *Understanding the capacity of these primary schools located in the specific locations to absorb new enrollment of learners (this also involved assessing the viability of strategies such as double shift to support schools to meet future increased demand for education)*
- *Understanding main reasons for expenditures/expenditure items and approximate the times of the year these are spent on at household level especially those related to education for refugees and the viability of supporting the expenditures for the refugees and host community – challenges and risks associated with the approach*
- *To understand the market dynamics and capacity to make available locally the needs of the refugees and host community in regard to education expenditures*
- *To understand the prices associated with the commodities needed by the refugees and host communities to support quality education for their children*
- *Map out stakeholders and projects providing similar assistance to refugees and host communities*

## 2.0 METHODOLOGY

---

### 2.1 Design and sampling strategy

Based on the purpose of the assessment, the Education Consortium employed a cross-sectional study design to collect data from households, key stakeholders and market players to help understand the viability of the multipurpose approach in the selected locations. Consortium partners employed qualitative techniques to collect stakeholders' views on the challenges related to access and quality of education; as well as generate educational expenditures, costs for the different age groups, market capacities to support local needs and understand the prices associated with the education commodities. This was done in order to better understand the environment and the challenges as well as risks that will likely affect the implementation of the multi-purpose cash modality and other modalities that are likely to improve access and quality.

Partners developed and administered a number of qualitative tools during the rapid needs assessment. Being a qualitative study, yet in a short time, use of technology such as uploading tools on Kobocollect application was not possible, as is usually the case in the consortium for purposes of quality enhancement. The primary respondents sampled were in refugee communities especially those hosting new arrivals and those with households having children that are currently out of school.

### 2.2 Target respondents, data collection methods and tools

#### 2.2.1 Geographical focus of the assessment

The Table below (2.1) presents the allocation of partners in the respective settlements and communities, in line with our already ongoing work.

**Table 2.1: Geographical coverage by partners**

Partner	Location
FCA	Kyaka II
NRC	Nakivale
	Oruchinga
SCI	Kyangwali

Allocation of geographical areas to the partners was dependent on the current implementation of INCLUDE project, as the top up will be utilised to support the ongoing sites across the aforementioned settlements.

It is against this background that no new settlements/communities were brought on board for this assessment and neither were there new partner entries into settlements and communities.

### 2.2.2 Targeted data collection methods and tools

The consortium partners jointly developed tools for data collection. Partners conducted data collection concurrently during the week of 13<sup>th</sup> to 17<sup>th</sup> May 2019. Table 2.2 presents the general targeted data collection methods, respondents and respective tools.

**Table 2.2: Summary of data collection methods, tools and target respondents**

Data collection methods	Main respondents/sources	Tools
Key informants	OPM, UNHCR, WIU, RWCs, or other relevant local structures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KII</li> </ul>
Key informants	Primary School leaders in areas with high numbers of out of school children/recent arrivals; local market vendors in these locations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KII (using School Questionnaire Tool with Head teachers)</li> <li>• KII with local market vendors (using Market Assessment Survey Tool)</li> </ul>
Focus Group discussions	Parents, out of school/recently arrived children	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FGD questionnaires – Parents</li> <li>• FGD questionnaires – out of school/recently arrived children</li> </ul>
Secondary Data Review		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Joint Consortium Needs Assessment in the DRC 2019</li> <li>• Other secondary sources of data on multi-purpose cash, cash in education, and cash and child protection, to name a few</li> </ul>

### 2.2.3 Actual Participants Focus Group Discussions and Key Informant Interviews

Whereas Table 2.2 above presented the earlier anticipated target of respondents, partners re-assessed the realities on ground, once they arrived in their respective operational areas. Table 2.3 presents the actual stakeholders reached.

**Table 2.3: Actual Respondent Coverage for the Needs Assessment**

Partners	Coverage	Detailed description
SCI	3 FGDS with parents	20 females, 6 males
	3 FGDS with children	23 girls, 15 boys
	8 KIIs	3 Head teachers, 1 RWC, 1 OPM, 1 UNHCR, 2 market vendors
FCA	3 FGDS with parents	19 women, 18 men
	4 FGDS with children	20 girls, 10 boys
	6 KIIs	1 Head teacher, 1 Windle, 2 UNHCR (Education Officer and Protection Officer), 1 OPM and 1 WFP
NRC	2 FGDS with parents	15 female, 4 male
	2 FGDS with children	15 girls, 18 boys
	13 KIIs	2 Head teachers, 3 market vendors, 2 Windle, 2 OPM, 1 UNHCR, 3 RWCs

With experience of the actual dynamics in the field, changes in form of approaches or targeted respondents are inevitable. Teams approached key players i.e UNHCR and OPM and received further guidance on the possible stakeholders that were capable of supporting this assessment. For

example, even when FCA had originally not planned to engage WFP, the team later decided to engage them to further understand the amounts of money they offer and disbursement modalities among others being utilized or planned to be utilized for WFP's cash transfer programme. An extensive discussion was held with the officer responsible for cash transfers at WFP-Kyaka II field office, and this was added to the Focus Group Discussions with parents as they are the actual recipients of the cash. Consequently, this report presents findings in relation to beneficiaries' experience with the cash received from WFP. These continued discussions will continue at field level throughout the course of implementation and will also be taken up through the Cash Working Group in which all consortium members take part. Additionally, within the EiEWG at national level there has been a task team assembled regarding Cash for Education. All consortium members are involved in this ongoing work of documenting learnings and harmonizing approaches.

### **3.0 FINDINGS**

---

#### **3.1 Overview**

Access and quality of education for refugee children is subject to a multitude of factors. They include availability of schools that are built up and conducive for learning; availability of education related infrastructure such as classrooms, latrines and libraries among others; and availability of adequate number of qualified teachers. Equally important is the nature of community perceptions on education such as communities valuing education and the attitudes on education for girls or boys. Availability of scholastic and hygiene materials are equally important for access to quality education or lack of it. Additionally, gaining a deeper understanding of the opportunity cost of education for children and their families is crucial as well. It was therefore important for partners during this needs assessment to understand the status of the aforementioned aspects along with the previous/current work being done through a multi-sector approach pertinent to understanding the barriers to education and ways of comprehensively addressing those barriers at the household level. Section 3.2 presents secondary data reviewed to inform the current study with sections 3.2 and beyond presenting the findings.

#### **3.2 Secondary Data Review**

From the previous Joint Consortium Needs Assessment conducted in November 2019 in the same geographic locations, it was found that school fees challenges had contributed greatly to school dropout & non-enrolment in refugee settlements for the out of school children interviewed. Around 44% of the children attributed their drop out or not enrolling in school to school fees, coupled with that lack of school uniform & other materials. Domestic work at home coupled with caring for parents and siblings has prevented a number of children from attending school as 6.6% of the children responded "*I needed to work / do chores / care for family members during the day*" as the reason for failure to enroll.<sup>2</sup>

The out of school children spent most of their time supporting with household chores, 87% indicated that they supported their households with chores such as fetching water, caring for their elderly parents/guardians & younger siblings, cooking food, looking after animals and supporting in livelihood activities like digging (agriculture).<sup>3</sup> Both boys and girls spent a number of hours supporting their families when it came to household chores. Around 30% of the children (n=474) indicated that they worked more than 4 hours in a day with household chores. This was almost the same among boys and girls with no striking difference between the two (Boys 29% & Girls 31%).<sup>4</sup>

The findings showed that 13.2% (n=210) of the children at the time of the interview had a job they were doing outside their home. Out of these, 72% of the children (n=151) were employed by others and 28% (n=59) were self-employed.<sup>5</sup> Of these children, 32.4% worked for more than 3 hours, 27%

---

<sup>2</sup> Education Consortium Joint Needs Assessment for DRC Response. November 2019.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid.

worked for more than 5 hours in a day and 10.5% worked less two hours in a day with 17% working above 8 hours in a day. This indeed indicated a very high burden of work on children, hence leaving them with less or no time at all for school.<sup>6</sup>

The labour demands upon children to meet the extreme needs of households is well documented in Uganda. Recent efforts across sectors have shifted toward direct support to households through CTP in order to address household needs. This has generated a lot of multi-sectoral learnings and further questions regarding the Minimum Expenditure Basket (MEB). In Uganda, the *MEB Harmonization Guidance Document (Version 1)* was finalized on March 27<sup>th</sup>, 2019 and states the following:

**Education expenditures are a key priority for refugees.** Post Distribution Monitoring (PDMs) reports show that refugees use 10% of the food cash grant for education expenses. When they receive in-kind, after re-selling a share, they spend 7-10% in education<sup>7</sup>. In addition, 40,6 % of food secure refugees contracted debt to pay education costs<sup>8</sup>. Food Security and Nutrition Assessment (FSNA) data showed an 8% of the non-food item (NFI) expenditures are allocated to education.<sup>9</sup> Asked in FGDs what refugees considered as a basic need, education was reported as the priority<sup>10</sup>.

**High costs are an important economic barrier to access education.** The most common barriers to education for households with school aged children was the high cost of education. For households that had at least one child not attending school, 31% of refugee households had challenges paying school fees for the children.<sup>11</sup> High costs for education was also reported as a key barrier to education in the UNHCR Livelihoods Socio-economic Assessment in Refugee-Hosting Areas, with 26% of refugee households and 25% of host community households noting school fees as an issue. The majority of households that had school-aged children not attending school and reported high costs as a barrier noted that tuition was the primary unaffordable cost. Tuition costs were found to be the overwhelming cost barrier to education for host community households, while refugee households noted tuition, as well as scholastic materials (books, uniform, writing materials, etc.)<sup>12</sup>.

Despite education being officially free, **hidden costs and financial barriers to education do exist.** FGDs depict types of expenses refugees face challenges with:

- i. Pupils' families are being asked to pay for contributions in order for the schools to function i.e. to pay the teachers, to pay for supplies for exams and to pay for school meals when they are provided, to an amount ranging between UGX 5,000 to UGX 150,000 per term or an average amount of **UGX 63,000 per term.**
- ii. Additionally, at the beginning of the school year, parents have to purchase school supplies, school bags, uniforms and shoes which cost at least an average **UGX 72,000** in upfront costs (a school bag costs in average UGX 32,000, a school uniform UGX 20,000 and school shoes also cost in average UGX 20,000. For other school supplies, an average of **UGX 10,000 per month** should be added<sup>13</sup>.

---

<sup>6</sup> Ibid.

<sup>7</sup> WFP, PDMs, 2017/18. In line with PDMs of large lumpsum transfer (Give Directly). Male headed household slightly spend more in education, than female headed households.

<sup>8</sup> While 18,6% of marginally secure, 7,1% of the moderate food insecure and while 4,3% of severely food insecure FSNA, 2017

<sup>9</sup> The absolute number, UGX 833 (FSNA) per household does not seem to be informative, disregarding current expenditure as a useful reference to inform this section.

<sup>10</sup> Nakivale, FGD, REACH

<sup>11</sup> JMSNA, 2018 p.85

<sup>12</sup> Of the households that reported high costs as one barrier to education, 95% of the host community households mentioned tuition as one of the expenditures that the household could not afford, hence why at least one of their children were out of school. All of the assessed host community households in Adjumani, Hoima, Isingiro and Kamwenge mentioned tuition fees as one of the cost barriers. Among refugee households, more than half of the assessed households reported tuition (54%) and/or books (51%) as the main cost barrier, JSNMA, p.85

<sup>13</sup> Palorinya, Relief International, 2017



The cost of education therefore poses challenges for parents (both refugee and host population) who have few and unstable income sources. To meet those costs, parents from both communities reported taking credit at the beginning of each school term to pay all education-related expenditures and fees. In general, school enrolment data collected in the assessment is positive, however, the inability to cover school-related costs has negative impacts on students' attendance at schools and drop-outs have been reported part-way through the year or before exams when additional fees are levied. From the school side, schools are partly reliant on this additional income to pay teacher salaries (as a complement to government budget) and cover running-costs, therefore if these costs are not met, there are negative impacts on teacher motivation and the general functionality and management of the schools.<sup>14</sup>

**Education component in the MEB.** Evidence suggest that interventions increasing expenditure on education related goods and services, can contribute to increased enrolment and attendance and decreased drop-out rates<sup>15</sup>. According to the current version of the MEB Harmonization Guidance, until the sector comes up with a standardized way of collecting education expenditures the component is estimated based on triangulation of data and presented as part of the monthly needs to be able to inform multipurpose cash grant<sup>16</sup>. This is important considering the seasonality of expenses- most of them at the beginning of the year and prior to exams. Based on a calculation of 2 children in primary and 1 in secondary school, this is an average of UGX 28,666<sup>17</sup>, which is consistent with referred multiple data and national surveys.<sup>18</sup> Expenditure in education is present on a monthly basis to inform multipurpose cash grant. However, it is important to note for programming, that the size, timing and durability of the cash transfers significantly influence long-term impact in education.<sup>19</sup>

Regarding the timing of cash transfers, the *Cash and Voucher Assistance for Education in Emergencies Synthesis Report and Guidelines* gives some promising practices. UNICEF ARCC programme in DRC experimented with two different transfer frequencies. Households receiving the same amount of money in three transfers instead of one were more likely to spend it on school fees, partly due to the increased probability of one of the transfers to be received in a moment when school fees were expected to be paid.<sup>20</sup>

Across the various sectors in Uganda, 11,993 household received multi-purpose cash-based assistance (7%) in Quarter 1 of 2019.<sup>21</sup> WFP has been a leading implementer of cash-based assistance in Uganda, with 25% of refugees in country receiving cash-based food assistance.<sup>22</sup> These interventions have lead to robust market assessments in all 4 of the settlements within the scope of this current needs assessment (Kyangwali, Kyaka II, Nakivale, Oruchinga). The following are details from such assessments regarding the current impact of CTP on Kyaka II and Kyangwali and the capacity of Nakivale and Oruchinga where they are currently registering refugees but have not yet started the cash assistance.

## Kyaka II

---

<sup>14</sup> Palorinya, Relief International, 2017

<sup>15</sup> Ourworldindata.org and Elevating Education in Emergencies - Cash Transfer Programming Framing Paper, Global Education Cluster.

<sup>16</sup> Yearly expenditure divided by 12

<sup>17</sup>  $(22,000 \times 2 + 1 \times 300,000)/12$

<sup>18</sup> Number of age schooling children as well as type of schooling influence greatly the level of expenditure in Education.

<sup>19</sup> For more detail refer to Elevating Education in Emergencies - Cash Transfer Programming Framing Paper, Global Education Cluster, p.4

<sup>20</sup> Bonilla, J., Carson, K., Kiggundu, G., Morey, M., Ring, H., Nillesen, E., Erba, G., & Michel, S. (2017). Humanitarian Cash Transfers in the Democratic Republic of Congo: Evidence from UNICEF's ARCC II Programme. American Institutes for Research. Retrieved from: <https://www.air.org/sites/default/files/downloads/report/Humanitarian-Cash-Transfer-DRC-April-2017.pdf>

<sup>21</sup> Performance Snapshot (Quarter 1). Uganda Refugee Response Plan 2019-2020. UNHCR.

<sup>22</sup> Performance Snapshot (Quarter 1). Uganda Refugee Response Plan 2019-2020. UNHCR.

Information from key informants indicates that cash transfers have helped beneficiaries buy what they want despite reduced rations being highlighted as a major challenge. Reports also indicated increase in businesses and traders due to increased and reliable demand.<sup>23</sup> There is reported increase in sales and customers due to increased purchasing power as a result of the cash transfers. Also refugees resettled in other countries send remittances to their relatives in the settlement which is another source of disposable income.<sup>24</sup>

Reduced cultivation will affect refugee livelihoods as farming was major source of income for paying school fees and scholastic materials for their children, medical bills, clothing, food and other basic household needs.<sup>25</sup>

Refugees also raised concern of likely price increases due to reduced crop production in the settlement. Some of the commodities that were being produced locally like tomatoes, cabbages and onions are now collected from Kasese and Kampala resulting into high selling price at settlement level.<sup>26</sup>

Therefore, prices are expected to increase in future due to reduced land cultivation as a result of re-assigning land to new arrivals.<sup>27</sup>

## **Kyangwali**

Key informant interviews revealed that cash transfers had a big impact in the settlement starting with increased number of traders, construction with iron sheets, businesses, sales and high dependence on markets.<sup>28</sup>

It is believed that cash transfers boost businesses while in-kind food increases food availability within the settlement.<sup>29</sup>

62% of the traders interviewed in Kyangwali settlement said that their businesses had benefited from the cash transfers mainly due to increased demand. The 38% said that they have not yet benefited because cash transfer beneficiaries mainly buy from wholesalers (big businesses) due to lower prices charged by the latter. Some traders said that they are located in areas occupied by new arrivals who have not yet benefited from the cash transfer programme.<sup>30</sup>

## **Nakivale**

The markets around the settlements are far better than the markets in some settlements that are already receiving cash transfers. In total the whole settlement has about 528 traders and 50% indicated that they serve about 50 customers a week while the other half can serve over 100 customers. Therefore, the markets around the settlement have capacity to serve approximately 50,000 customers a week which is a good platform for the introduction of cash transfers.<sup>31</sup>

## **Oruchinga**

---

<sup>23</sup> Rapid Needs Assessment Report – Kyaka II and Kyangwali. WFP. June 2018.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid.

<sup>27</sup> Ibid.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid.

<sup>29</sup> Ibid.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid.

<sup>31</sup> Market Assessment Report Nakivale, Oruchinga, Rwamwanja, Kyaka II and Kyangwali Settlements. WFP. December 2017.

There are two main markets that are accessed by refugees and nationals in Oruchinga settlement i.e. Kajaho and Kalerema (Dubai). Kajaho is located along the main road with accessibility to bigger towns like Mbarara and the Tanzania border.<sup>32</sup>

Majority of the traders interviewed (56%) serve between 50-100 customers a week. Therefore, Kajaho trading center alone with about 100 shops can serve between 5,000 – 10,000 people a week.<sup>33</sup>

Sales are always low due to low purchasing power of the buyers. The introduction of cash would boost the purchasing power of the refugees and stimulate market development as well as production for the host community.<sup>34</sup>

Important to note is that gradual introduction and expansion of cash transfers is the best strategy as it gives markets ample time to grow concurrently with the increase in demand.<sup>35</sup>

### 3.3 Availability, access and quality of education services

The current study revealed that significant efforts have been taken to increase access to education services in target settlements. Indeed, consortium are supporting many of the schools through the AEP. There is also a general presence of community and government aided schools in the refugee settlements, which are currently being supported by various organisations. Nevertheless, the assessment revealed immense challenges with regard to access to education. **Schools remain inadequate** in the settlements, exposing children to very long distances that they have to travel in the quest for education. In an FGD with out-of-school girls in Kyaka II, one of them explained:

*“We are not able to enrol into AEP and vocational skills training because such schools are very far from our community. The distance to get there is so long which us girls cannot manage. Even the only available road passes through a forest which is scary, if you don’t pass there many people at ago”.*

This opinion was generally shared across the group, and it is evidence that distance is a real concern for children especially younger ones and girls. Therefore, it presents a strong threat to enrolment and attendance.

The situation is precipitated by **inadequate classrooms that often lead to very high numbers of learners in classrooms**. For instance, parents from all the three locations in Kyangwali refugee settlement cited distances and limited classrooms in available schools as key factors that have inhibited children from accessing schools. They reported that limited accessible roads to those schools has made it very difficult for them to access schools. Similarly, in Kyaka II refugee settlement, parents noted that there was a severe inadequacy of classrooms, and this had resulted into accommodation of very big numbers of learners in the available classrooms. Parents were able to articulate the link between congestion in classrooms and the quality of learning. One of the parents in an FGD at Sweswe primary school explained:

*“There are very big numbers of learners in the classrooms because we have limited classrooms, which force teachers to combine children in classes. At times, you find 200 children in one class. In such a situation, even if some children are playing somewhere*

---

<sup>32</sup> Market Assessment Report Nakivale, Oruchinga, Rwamwanja, Kyaka II and Kyangwali Settlements. WFP. December 2017.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid.

<sup>35</sup> Ibid.

*in the corner of the classroom, the teacher cannot see them. They are actually able to keep playing throughout the lesson. Also with the big numbers, it is very easy for some children to sneak out of the classrooms and go home or go to play out there. In these conditions, the quality of education cannot improve”.*

During this FGD, all parents agreed and raised similar or related concerns and unanimously noted that this was a serious challenge to access to education in the settlement. Most importantly, the above voice connects the limited infrastructure to various education related challenges such as failure of children to learn, low attendance, hence eventual dropouts. It also builds a strong linkage between access and quality of education services that are provided in the target refugee settlements.

FGD participants expressed concerns over **the low quality of education across schools in the settlements, with low literacy and numeracy levels**. They reported that many of their children could even hardly pass routine class tests and some parents purported that children themselves often say that they are not learning much from schools. Whereas the above factors agreeably contribute to the low quality of education, language also emerged as a strong factor behind the poor quality of education. Majority of refugees in southwest come from Congo, Burundi or Rwanda, which are francophone countries. The children are therefore nurtured in French speaking communities, and local languages that are not closely related to the Ugandan languages. In Kasonga and Maratatu (Kyangwali refugee settlement), parents indicated that children are not getting good quality education because they were being taught in French before they came to Uganda, yet in Uganda they are taught in English. This has repeatedly made it so hard for the children to learn and catch up with other fellow learners.

A similar situation was evident in Kyaka II refugee settlement as one parent at Sweswe primary school retorted:

*“The other challenge that make it difficult for children to attain education is language. When new refugees arrive, they go to school and find that teachers use English and Lutooro (the local language). In the learning process, children cannot say anything. Even when you ask a child what they have studied, they can only show you what they copied from the chalk board, but they cannot communicate anything logical about what they have studied”*

The above reports on low learning resonate well with the many challenges such as inadequate classrooms, big numbers of children in classrooms, and low teacher numbers among others, as the challenges are interwoven and do re-enforce each other. The interconnection between these challenges is therefore evident in schools across the target refugee settlements.

Findings from KIIs reveal **inadequate teaching materials and scholastics**. The study also indicate that inadequacy of teaching materials is worsened by overcrowded classrooms. When asked about the possible remedies to these challenges, key informants in Kyangwali noted that they would prefer recruiting more children to double shifting, rather than other expensive ventures such as building completely new schools.

Access to education is reportedly complicated by **limited household livelihood options**. Refugees reported very limited opportunities available for them to earn a living, which eventually push education towards the bottom of household priorities. In Kyaka II, an FGD participant noted:

*“We used to have bigger sizes of land for cultivation, but it reduced very significantly because of new arrivals. Whenever new people come, our pieces of land are cut into pieces to create space for newcomers, hence we are now unable to cultivate and earn money. This had made our lives very difficult, even causing many of our children to drop out of school. These days we only to wait for support from agencies to survive. Our only assured survival is the UGX 31,000 that we receive from WFP for each person in the household”*

### 3.3.1 Children out of school

The study revealed that there are big numbers of children that are out of school in the target settlements. For instance, out of all FGDs conducted with parents in Kyaka II, parents cared for 147 children in total, and only 51 (35%) of them were enrolled in school, leaving the remaining 65% of the children to remain in the communities either struggling to work and earn a living or just stay at home.

Respondents throughout the target areas contended that there were children that are out of school in their communities. In Kyangwali for instance, there were reports of so many children especially boys that were out of school, especially those above 12 years. In one of the communities, the community members mentioned about 80 boys and 55 girls that were out of school.

In Kyaka II refugee settlement, all the 8 members had a total of 29 children. Out of these, 16 children were out of school, whereas 13 were in school. Important to note is that there were 3 cases of parents who did not have any of their children in school. For those that had children in school, the numbers out of school were in most cases bigger than the ones in school. This implies extremely low capacity of parents to enroll their children into school.

In an FGD with out-of-school girls in Kyaka II, all participants revealed that they had more than one girl that were out of school in their families. This is evidence that the challenge of out of school children is far-reaching. When asked why they were unable to enroll into schools, they mentioned that the main reason is lack of money for school fees and other requirements. However, some parents could have afforded to take children to school, but it is not their priority to enroll children into school, especially girls. One of the participants noted:

*“My father says educating girls is a wastage of money. So, in our family, boys are studying, while us girls we remain at home and just go to work for food and money. These days he even says I should leave his home, that I make him fail to live in peace”*

When asked about the reasons for children not being in school, respondents in Kyangwali indicated that the main reasons were that some of them have lost hope and interest in education, traumatised, and over aged to attend classes with the young children. It was also mentioned that some of the children are out of school due to lack of food. This does not just emerge as a challenge of inability to feed children at school, but it also reiterates the challenge of limited household livelihoods, which render parents unable to support their children with food both at home and at school.

The above responses indicate that the reasons for children remaining out of school go beyond money. They are varied and they do rather extend to limited awareness by parents and children, inadequate food and livelihoods as well as inadequate infrastructure for education.

### 3.3.2 Children in school

There is evidence that big numbers of children have been enrolled into schools. For instance, in Kyaka II refugee settlement, FGD participants had 35% of all their children in school. Whereas the proportion (35%) may look too low, it should be noted that these were purposively selected parents that had some of their children out of school, hence the proportion of the children in school would be low.

Even when some children are in school, it is important to note that the new arrivals are likely to increase the number of children out of school, since it is common of refugee children not to enroll immediately on arrival in the refugee settlements. As explained in the above section, the available schools have severe shortages of infrastructure; hence, they do not necessarily translate into adequate access to education services in the respective settlements.

It is also common for more girls to drop out of school or fail to enroll as compared to boys, mainly due to limited livelihood options for their households. In Kyaka II refugee settlement, children work mainly to get food and a few personal needs. In most cases, they work in the host community to receive physical food and not necessarily money. Though some boys are also out of school in this community, girls are much more affected. In many cases, girls drop out of school, whereas boys remain studying. There are reports that girls are in many cases expected to go and work for food for boys. Moreover, when it is time to work, they usually work full day, leaving them with little or no time to attend school or even relax or play like any other children. Worse still, there are however no assured work opportunities, they just go and keep looking for work and are able to work when there is an opportunity. In an FGD with out-of-school girls in Bwiriza community (Kyaka II refugee settlement), one participant remarked:

*“We go and work while boys remain in school studying, because our parents believe that we can remain out of school and get married. My father has even told me to leave home and find a man or go and work somewhere else. I cannot tell boys to go and work like me as they cannot accept. Actually if you keep asking them to go and work for food, they can even beat you.”*

The above voice is not only evidence of how girls keep working at the expense of school, but also the male dominance even at a young age. Boys are not only given preferential treatment by their parents, but they also exercise supremacy over their female counterparts. The excessive working hours that the girl child is forced to spend are almost similar to the findings of November 2018 joint needs assessment, in which around 30% of the boys and girls (n=474) indicated that they worked more than 4 hours in a day with household chores. This further elaborates the magnitude of this challenge as children evidently work excessively both in and out of their homes, at the expense of enrolling and attending school.

The above challenges notwithstanding, there are some few success stories that the project could learn from to promote education in the settlement. There is evidence that some parents have stood against the odds and educated their children. A Refugee Welfare Committee Member in Sweswe community (Kyaka II refugee settlement) explained:

*“Personally, I have 2 children in secondary school and 4 in primary schools. Though it is extremely difficult to maintain them in school, I have been doing my best and I have managed to keep all my children in school. We used to get money from farming when we were getting bigger plots of land, but these days we only depend on aid. These days, when I get money from WFP, I buy some food and ensure that I save some of it for my children’s school fees and buying other things for my family. This money is not enough, but it gives a good starting point to sustain my family. I go and do manual work in the host community to be able to get adequate food and pay school fees for all my children”*

The above response does not only explain that it is not impossible for refugees to educate their children, but it also shows that if given some cash, households can budget sparingly and have some of their money allocated and sacrifice to cater for their children’s education. It is therefore important to build on such success stories and generate synergies for the project either by using such people as role models or learning from them on how they have made it so as to tailor project interventions and accrue maximum benefits from them.

### **3.4 Household financial capacity; and access to market and school requirements**

#### **3.4.1 Overview**

In conducting the data collection across the 4 locations (Kyangwali, Kyaka II, Nakivale and Oruchinga), the realities of limited household financial capacity became strikingly clear. Due to continued influx of refugees into these areas, agriculture and farming which had previously been sole sources of income for families are now no longer viable options. This has resulted in limited household capacity to meet basic needs, including education. Current cash programmes to provide cash support for food assistance are beginning to help but are not enough to meet the needs. Parents, children and key informants indicated that if given the opportunity to receive cash, they would prioritize it for both education and livelihoods in the hopes of creating more sustainable sources of income for the family.

Local markets for accessing education related items were relatively consistent, though they did depend on the time of the year in some cases with first term being the priority time of demand as well as a likely time to observe price increases. In some cases, the distances to the markets was quite far from the school/villages.

#### **3.4.2 Household financial capacity**

During FGDs with parents in Kyaka II, it was revealed that none of the participants had any income generating activity. Sometimes when there is need they help neighbours or host community members with agricultural work. When asked about the viable livelihood options, all participants mentioned starting up small business enterprises as the most suitable option. This has become the major option, as they no longer have bigger plots of land that can allow them to cultivate their own food for consumption and sale. This was hitherto their main source of livelihood.

During FGDs with parent in Kyangwali, the majority of the parents interacted with, many of whom were women, indicated that they do petty/casual work to earn some money, for example, they dig in other people’s farms (majority), do small business ventures like selling firewood/charcoal, vegetable selling and fish mongering. Most refugees coming from DRC used to be farmers but the land given to each household by UNHCR in the settlements has been reducing with every influx, and now the plots given are 30x30 feet (yet it used to be 100x100 feet).

Those not having income generating activity have to rely on the cash given by WFP. One FGD respondent in Kyaka II stated,

*“We used to have bigger sizes of land for cultivation, but it reduced very significantly because of new arrivals. Whenever new people come, our pieces of land are cut into pieces to create space for new comers, hence we are now unable to cultivate and earn money. This had made our lives very difficult, even causing many of our children to drop out of school. These days we only to wait for support from agencies to survive. Our only assured survival is the UGX 31,000 that we receive from WFP for each person in the household.”*

During FGDs with parents, it emerged that everyone has an increased likelihood of debt due to the tighter situation with regard to livelihoods. The limited livelihood options have forced them to slide deeper in debts. At times, they even have to give out their forms for receiving cash from WFP as security to their creditors, which poses a risk of losing their cash benefits. More importantly, these debts are usually for the very basic needs such as food; hence, education comes as a secondary need.

In Kyaka II, many parents go out to work because there are very limited livelihood options in the settlements. There are however, no assured work opportunities; parents go out, keep looking for work and are able to work when there is an opportunity. This search for work extends to the children within the households as well. During FGDs with children in Kyaka II, it was learned that children work mainly to get food and a few personal needs. In most cases, they work in the host community to receive physical food and not money.

Though some boys are also out of school in this community, girls are much more affected. In many cases, girls drop out of school, whereas boys remain studying. Girls are in many cases expected to go and work for food. During FGDs with out of school children in Kasonga village, located in the basecamp of Kyangwali, children indicated that they sell water, potatoes, and eggs - sometimes they wash people's clothes to earn some money any time in a week depending on availability. They also said that averagely, they get 4,000 UGX daily from such activities

In Kyaka II, when asked if given 50,000 UGX what they would do with it, all women stated they would start a business; buy fish, soap, home items, cooking oil, charcoal, thrift clothes to resell. All participants would invest first, and spend some of the return on investment on education. If the money given were higher, like 300,000 UGX, they would spend 100,000 UGX on education expenses, and invest the rest, to be able to generate their own support for the longer term. This is a positive suggestion from beneficiaries as it literally posits to their own capability to plan for sustainability.

Out of school children in Kyangwali indicated that if their parents got extra cash, they would enroll them into schools. They indicated that on average 300,000 UGX could address all their needs for them to stay in and regularly attend schools in a term. A few of the children also indicated that 50,000 UGX could be enough to support their school needs through the school term. The items parents would buy or pay for included; scholastic materials, clothes, uniform, school fees and food at school.

Regarding the possibility of cash transfer assistance and the viable means by which this could be done, one parent in an FGD in Kyaka stated that,

*“.....mobile money would be good, but these days it comes with costs. For instance, if the UGX 31,000 we receive (from WFP) was given to us through mobile money, we could even end up getting less than UGX 30,000 after the withdraw charges. If someone could give us the financial support through the mobile phones and top it up with the transaction costs, it would be the best channel to transmit such money.”*

Further FGD responses indicated differing levels of connectivity via mobile phones. In Kyangwali, nearly 70% of the parents interviewed owned mobile phones with registered numbers. In terms of networks, the mobile telecom companies operating are MTN, Africell and Airtel networks. Whereas



Airtel network has the best reception in Kyangwali, the refugees used it only for communications and used MTN for mobile money transactions. In Kyaka II, FGD responses indicated much more limited accessibility of phones. Banking options were more limited across all locations with banks being located in main towns. However, mobile money agents were numerous across the settlements as the communities use the services for their day-to-day transactions. This is consistent with the financial sector deepening reports. According to the Finscope Report (2018), 23% of Ugandans save part of their money through mobile money (on their mobile phones), whereas 82% of the 10.1 million Ugandans who send or receive money to someone elsewhere in the country do so through mobile money services. These national studies project a huge potential for mobile money services. It is therefore important to start thinking about mobile money as a potential channel for disbursement of cash transfers during programming.

In conducting KIIs with an RWC member in Kyangwali, the respondent identified some of the likely challenges that cash transfer will have. These included the money not benefitting the children who the support is intended for. This might happen when the parents spend the money on other things rather than education. The RWC member also expressed concern regarding domestic violence at the household level especially when the money is given to either the mother or father and not both.

Reaction from children across all the settlements regarding cash transfer was mixed with some children generally preferring material support rather than cash given to the household because they didn't believe their parents would buy the requisite materials if they receive the physical cash. During an FGD with out-of-school girls in Kyaka II, about half of participants expressed skepticism in their parents (specifically fathers), as they believed the money was likely to be spent on other things. One of them used an example of the cash transfers that WFP currently disburses to their family. She reported that her father usually tells them that he has already budgeted for the money whenever he receives it. He reportedly buys some little food and spends the rest on other things including drinking alcohol. These findings present a vivid reminder that money is susceptible to misallocation and reiterate the need for intensive sensitization, close monitoring and support if the cash transfers are to serve their intended purpose.

Potential and real challenges notwithstanding, many children also reported categorically that a cash transfer intervention would improve their access to education and would have them back to school in the shortest time possible. Among the reason they gave was that having cash in the family empowers the parents, especially the mothers, who would choose to send them to school rather than going to look for casual jobs to tender the family needs.

FGDs with parents as well as KIIs with head teachers revealed a wealth of information regarding the costs that households face as barriers to education. In Kyaka II on average, a parent pays about UGX 80,000 to keep a child in school for a term. However, all parents contended that their children survive on the very bare minimum, in deprivation of some of the most basic needs. In many cases children are just sent to school without the requisite materials or fees and they study until they are sent back home by the school administration. Even when they are in school, they spend many days out of the school whenever they are sent away for fees or other requirements.

One Head Teacher in Kyaka II indicated the following fee structure:

- PTA Fund- 2500 UGX
- Examination fees - Lower Primary: P1-P3= 1500 UGX, P4-P5 = 4,000 UGX, P6 =10,000 UGX, P7 = 35,000 UGX (PLE exam -10,000 UGX and Remedials - 25,000 UGX) The charges are per individual child. Therefore, the more children you have, the more the costs.

In Kyangwali on average, all the parents indicated they pay between 20,000UGX - 30,000UGX each term to the school depending on the school charges. The payments go towards examination fees, PTA development fees, school feeding if you cannot provide food items direct to the school and school fees especially for private schools. All parents pay money at school in cash and most of the

payments usually come at the beginning of the first school term while other costs come in between terms.

All parents requested for support with scholastic materials to enable their children to stay in school. These materials include books, pens, pencils, shoes, sanitary kits, school bags, mathematical sets, among others and if they cannot be supported with those materials, financial support should be given to help them purchase the requirements for their children. In terms of financial support, all parents requested between 50,000 UGX - 100,000 UGX for each household in order to send children to school and they stay in school.

According to the school head teachers, the current funding is very low for fulfilling planned priorities for school improvement and development. If given cash for school development, all the schools preferred to spend on classroom construction, feeding teachers, constructing houses for staff accommodation, fencing the schools and buying furniture.

The head teachers indicated that both cash and physical items are welcome in case of support depending on the purpose and also indicated if schools were to be supported for larger amounts of money then banks should be used as a delivery mode and that for small amounts direct cash/mobile money is viable.

In all schools, there are few/no teacher's accommodation. Where accommodation exists like Kinakyeitaka and Kasonga primary schools, the houses are not enough for all the teachers and therefore some rent on their own. Teachers who rent for accommodation, pay between 30,000-40,000 UGX monthly. In terms of teacher's payment, on average teachers are paid a monthly salary of 400,000 UGX as their take home.

### **3.4.3 Access to markets and school requirements in and around the settlements**

In all the locations, markets are available though not always so near to schools and surrounding villages. For example, in Kasonga, Kyangwali, the market is one kilometre from the school and the villages where refugees were settled while in Maratatu/Nyambogo the market is two kilometres from the nearest primary school. For the Kinakyeitaka, the market is 3 kilometres from the school. In Kyaka II, markets have everything they need (sweet potatoes, green bananas, clothes, domestic animals), but prices fluctuate a lot due to seasons (planting season, prices are high, harvest season, they decrease). The market is about 1h from the school, so 2h to go and come back.

In Isingiro in the 3 locations assessed, markets are available though not so near for most of the available schools around the community. In Rubondo community (Nakivale refugee settlement), the market is 17 kilometres from the school and the villages where refugees are settled, in Kibwera community, the distance to Kabingo market is also 17 kilometres, and from Kabahinda to Juru market, it is 3 kilometers. It is common though for many of the respondents to access the same markets through different means at different spaced times. Scholastic materials, food, soap and other small domestic items are accessible in small shops though not in big quantities but they all felt that if they start buying more materials this will stimulate market and supply would increase. In other shops at a distance, materials are available and in enough quantities and replenishing of supplies is done often since they are able to find most of the items they require.

These distances especially Rubondo to Nakivale market which is 17 kilometres exposed children to various risk since it involves crossing over swampy and lonely areas where bandits can hide and attack children on their way. In terms of cost from Misera to Nakivale market, it's about 8,000 shillings to and from the market, while Oruchinga to Kabingo by taxi it costs 4,000 shillings to and from. This implies that besides the cost of requirements, it is important to think of the transport costs as well, since beneficiaries may need to travel to access some items such as school uniforms occasionally. In

Kyaka II; there were very few tailors that could make school uniforms, and the same applied to shops where one could pick a pair of shoes for the child. When asked, FGD participants mentioned that at times they travel to Kyegegwa town (14 kilometres away) or Mubende (56 kilometres away) to access some of the things they need.

The markets mainly sell food stuff like fresh foods among others but the traders sell more items beyond food stuff including scholastic materials like books, pens, shoes, school bags and even clothes. The traders come from within the settlement and neighbouring village. Prices in the markets are not stable according to all the groups of parents interacted with, it keeps on fluctuating but mainly its always on the increase especially for the food stuff and sometimes even the scholastic materials. Prices keep fluctuating between February, March, April and May according to parents. This is mainly during the planting seasons and when schools are opening for first term.

**Table 2.4: Average prices and availability across the settlements**

Item	Availability (yes or no)	Seasonality (when is the item purchased?)	Average price
<b>Necessary scholastics for a child to access school</b>			
Pencils (unit price)	Yes	1 dozen per term	2,500
Pens (unit price)	Yes	1 dozen per term	10,000
Exercise books (unit price)	Yes	10 counter books per term	35,000
Rubbers	Yes	5 per term	10,000
Toilet rolls	Yes	5 per term	10,000
Brooms	Yes	1 per term	2,000
Sanitary pads (pack)	Yes; but part of the dignity kit currently being provided	Ongoing	3500
<b>Important items that would not prevent school access but would encourage</b>			
Item	Availability (yes or no)	Seasonality (when is the item purchased?)	Average price
Mathematics set	Yes	Annually	3,000
School bag	Yes	Annually	25,000
Footwear (basic pair of shoes)	Yes	Annually	30,000
Uniform	Yes	Annually	50,000
Handkerchief	Yes	Termly	2,000
Soap (per bar)	Yes; but some provided as part of the dignity kit currently being provided	Ongoing	2000
Knickers	No; but part of the dignity kit currently being provided	Commonly bought at beginning of term	2000

Traders and vendors were interviewed across the settlements. From the interviews and observations in the shops, it was very evident that the vendors have education products. The products included

books, pencils, pens, schools bags etc. (see details from table below). The traders indicated that they buy education items from nearby large towns and Kampala; the small retail traders even buy from the wholesale traders within the settlements in some instances. The traders have customers for all education items and they indicated of demand changes especially at the beginning of the term and during harvesting periods.

#### **4.0 BINDING CONSTRAINTS**

---

##### **a) Financial related challenges (with regard to education)**

- Inability to meet basic household needs prior to education related costs. With very low capacity to afford food for the family, it is difficult to tackle education related expenses.
- School fees, examination costs were extremely difficult for the already impoverished households to cover and keep their children in school. This situation exacerbates irregular attendance and eventual dropouts.
- Cost of the necessary school related items is high, yet it is reported to increase year by year, hence making it difficult for the poor families to keep their children in school.
- Opportunity cost of attending school – children are engaged in several hours of household work per day to support the family as well as finding additional opportunities to bring income to the household. Sacrificing this time to attend school is an opportunity cost that is not well factored into any existing MEB calculations.

##### **b) Physical access to educational facilities**

- Infrastructure challenges with inadequate classrooms that eventually lead to congestion, very little benefits with regard to learning outcomes and eventual dropouts of children.
- Distances to schools remain a challenge due to few schools in the settlements. This renders younger children and girls unable to enroll and attend regularly.
- Overcrowding that partly results from inadequate schools and classrooms in already existing schools as well as inadequacy of teachers in the available schools.
- Few teachers in school contribute to overcrowding in classrooms and minimize the benefits that children attain in terms of learning outcomes. It is also a common perception in the community there is no need to send children to school, since there are not teachers.

##### **c) Challenges that inhibit learning (for those in school)**

- Language barriers as they speak different mother tongues and most of them have attended school with a French as the language of instruction, unlike Uganda that uses English.
- Overage enrollment in lower classes as most children have spent time out of school after arriving in Uganda (an average of 2-3 years). Older children are likely to drop out when placed in a classroom with much younger learners.
- Few learning materials in the schools; lack of print rich environments

##### **d) Challenges in accessing physical school items**

- Proximity of markets, with parents and guardians having to travel long distances in some cases.
- Availability of necessary items, with higher value items such as school uniforms being available in far off markets and towns where demand is higher to attract bigger business enterprises.

## 5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

---

### a) Financial related challenges (with regard to education)

- **Inability to meet basic household needs prior to education related costs** – provide multi-purpose cash to households where current cash related MEB interventions are not being undertaken by other ECHO consortia (Nakivale/Oruchinga); in locations where current cash-related MEB interventions are being undertaken, work in close collaboration with this consortia to ensure newly arrived refugees/households within the catchment areas of primary schools are prioritized for intervention (Kyangwali, Kyaka II); continued work within Cash Working Group and EiEWG Cash Task Team to share and document learnings and best practices
- **School fees, examination costs** – ensure the CTP amounts recommended for education expenses based on the robust research are given termly instead of monthly to ensure maximum likelihood of household prioritization of said amounts for education related expenses; continued work within Cash Working Group and EiEWG Cash Task Team to share and document learnings and best practices
- 
- **Cost of the necessary school related items** – for newly arrived/enrolled learners under this action, ensure that scholastic materials are provided directly to further alleviate the burden of provision of scholastics from the household level and to add an additional assurance of ease of access to school
- **Opportunity cost of education** – robust community dialogues and ongoing work with RWCs to ensure households understand the intention behind CTP to support education and provide financial literacy sessions to households receiving cash so that they understand and prioritize the long-term impact of education for the wellbeing of the household; continued work within Cash Working Group and EiEWG Cash Task Team to share and document learnings and best practices

### b) Physical access to educational facilities

- **Infrastructure challenges** – support schools to develop and prioritize school improvement and find ways to promote community participation in school improvement planning; utilize a double shift model in primary schools where classrooms are not enough to accommodate the numbers of children
- **Overcrowding** – utilize a double shift model using the Double Shift School System Guidelines developed under ECW First Window funding (nearly finalized through MoES) to minimize overcrowding in schools
- **Few teachers** – hire additional teachers to support new learners enrolled in a double shift model; ensure continuous professional development is provided to head teachers and deputy head teachers to provide instructional leadership in a double shift model (proper timetabling, ensuring time on task, ensuring effective utilization of teaching force, etc.)

### c) Challenges that inhibit learning (for those in school)

- **Language barriers** – further support language learning opportunities and work in collaboration with other ongoing efforts to promote greater understanding of and programming around language and learning particularly in the Congolese response (EiEWG Language Task Team, bridging programme development, remedial programme development and roll-out, etc.)

- **Overage enrollment in lower classes** – continue to work with primary schools and other education partners to ensure that those significantly overaged are placed in an appropriate programme such as AEP rather than placed in lower primary classes where they are more at risk of drop out and face more opportunity cost of education due to their older age
- **Few learning materials in the schools; lack of print rich environments** – provide additional materials for making and displaying instructional materials in the classroom; ensure that teachers in a double shift model continue to prioritize display of instructional materials and utilize low-cost means of displaying/storing them for continued use

**d) Challenges in accessing physical school items**

- **Proximity of markets** – it is anticipated that this challenge will no longer persist due to just to the forces of demand and supply as the purchasing power of refugee communities is strengthened through the cash transfer programme. This has been observed and documented across settlements where CTP has been implemented.
- **Availability of necessary items** – the availability of necessary items will increase, as was mentioned by local resident tailors and traders spoken to during this rapid needs assessment, since there will be increased demand for the items.