



Knowledge hub - Collection of best practices

Summary of the best practice

1. Title of the best practice (e.g. name of policy, programme, project, etc.) *

Orientations on Collecting and Analyzing Data on Attacks on Education

2. Country or countries where the practice is implemented *

Colombia, Nigeria, Central African Republic, Ukraine

3. Please select the **most relevant** Action Track(s) the best practice applies to *

- Action Track 1. Inclusive, equitable, safe, and healthy schools
- Action Track 2. Learning and skills for life, work, and sustainable development
- Action Track 3. Teachers, teaching and the teaching profession
- Action Track 4. Digital learning and transformation
- Action Track 5. Financing of education

4. Implementation lead/partner organization(s) *

Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack

5. Key words (5-15 words): Please add key descriptive words around aims, modalities, target groups etc. *

capacity building, Education Cluster, Child Protection, safe schools, data management, Ministry of Education, prevention, advocacy

6. What makes it a best practice? *

GCPEA's orientations on its Toolkit for Collecting and Analyzing Data on Attacks on Education are a best practice in supporting safe, inclusive education in emergencies. These trainings bring together key partners from government, humanitarian organizations, and local civil society to 1) harmonize and standardize definitions of attacks on education and military use 2) discuss existing barriers and opportunities for collaboration on monitoring attacks on education and reporting them 3) using data to ensure safe access to education in emergencies. Collaboration between Education and Protection Clusters, along with government, is a best practice in ensuring that school environments are protective. The trainings also highlight best practices in ethical data collection to ensure that no harm is done to schools, educators, or data collectors.

Description of the best practice

7. Introduction (350-400 words)

This section should ideally provide the context of, and justification for, the practice and address the following issues:

- i) Which population was affected?
- ii) What was the problem that needed to be addressed?
- iii) Which approach was taken and what objectives were achieved? *

Between 2015 and 2019, Education under Attack identified over 11,000 reported attacks on education which harmed over 22,000 students, teachers, and education personnel. Unabated by the Covid-19 pandemic, attacks and military use continued in significant numbers in 2020 and 2021, according to recent GCPEA data.

Despite high numbers, some attacks on education still go unreported or are covered in little detail. Incomplete reporting means there is a critical gap in information about the prevalence of attacks and the number of learners and educators killed, harmed, or missing out on school. To address this gap, GCPEA drew on a decade's experience researching attacks and expertise from specialists in the field to develop the Toolkit for Collecting and Analyzing Data on Attacks on Education.

Between December 2021 and June 2022, GCPEA ran orientations on the Toolkit for partners looking to strengthen existing data systems or build new ones. The trainings were virtual or hybrid sessions that addressed specific challenges. These orientations included presentations and interactive activities to guide participants through identifying and distinguishing attacks on education and military use; using tools for collecting, entering, analyzing, and reporting data on attacks; and reinforcing the importance of disaggregated data collection and reporting.

8. Implementation (350-450 words)

Please describe the implementation modalities or processes, where possible in relation to:

- i) What are the main activities carried out?
- ii) When and where the activities were carried out (including the start date and whether it is ongoing)?
- iii) Who were the key implementation actors and collaborators? (civil society organizations, private sector, foundations, coalitions, networks etc.)?
- iv) What were the resources needed (budget and sources) for the implementation?

*

Through consultations, GCPEA tailored each orientation to meet participants' needs, desired outcomes, and context. GCPEA hosted orientations in Ukraine, Colombia, Nigeria, and Central African Republic. The Key Collaborators were: UN agencies, Government agencies involved in Safe Schools Declaration implementation, local civil society organizations, Education Cluster, Child Protection Area of Responsibility (AoR), and other international humanitarian organizations.

GCPEA hosted the 2.5-hour orientation on Zoom, including simultaneous interpretation when necessary. Based on participants' ideas and needs, the orientation included the following suggested activities:

- introduction to the tools in the Toolkit, including jointly identifying the most relevant data collection instruments, data template, analyses, and other tools;
- overview of definitions of attacks on education and military use;
- practical exercises on data entry and analysis;
- actor mapping exercise to identify key partners in data collection as well as end users of data;
- sharing of good practices from other contexts, drawing on other Education Clusters' data collection instruments, GCPEA case studies, Education under Attack, and other documents;
- presentation from a participant on local monitoring and reporting activities;
- brainstorming and problem-solving session for overcoming hurdles to data collection, analysis, and reporting, as well as identifying new opportunities.

GCPEA reviewed participants' existing data collection forms and provided follow-up support after the orientation as they collected new data and ran analyses.

GCPEA secured funding from UNICEF and Education Cannot Wait to pay for translation of documents and materials and simultaneous interpretation during sessions. GCPEA also purchased a version of Zoom that enabled interpretation.

9. Results – outputs and outcomes (250-350 words)

To the extent possible, please reply to the questions below:

- i) How was the practice identified as transformative? (e.g., impact on policies, impact on management processes, impact on delivery arrangements or education monitoring, impact on teachers, learners and beneficiary communities etc.);
- ii) What were the concrete results achieved with regard to outputs and outcomes?
- iii) Has an assessment of the practice been carried out? If yes, what were the results? *

- 1) Organizations reported that the sessions enabled intersectoral communication and collaboration on the topic.
- 2) Organizations reported using GCPEA Toolkit to inform indicator development for use across sectors, particularly in the West and Central Africa Region, where the regional EiE-WG used the Toolkit to create regional indicators on attacks on education.
- 3) In Ukraine, the UNICEF staff responsible for tracking attacks on education used the toolkit tools to create a database and to assess reports of attacks on education coming from media and other sources.
- 4) In CAR, GCPEA had follow up meetings with humanitarian organizations to support the national Technical Committee on Safe Schools Declaration Implementation.
- 5) In Colombia, Education Cluster partners used portions of the Toolkit, including definitions, to collect and report data, making new data available to GCPEA and Global Partners. This reporting was also used to support advocacy for Colombia to endorse the Safe Schools Declaration.

10. Lessons learnt (300 words)

To the extent possible, please reply to the following questions:

- i) What were the key triggers for transformation?
- ii) What worked really well – what facilitated this?
- iii) What did not work – why did it not work? *

- 1) Key Trigger for Transformation: collective identification of gaps and desired outcomes with regards to attacks on education data; acute needs and GCPEA being able to provide much needed support, as in the case of Ukraine where a system was being built from scratch
- 2) What worked well: intersectoral communication, which facilitated actor mapping and identification of needs and barriers to achieving them. When GCPEA members in countries supported ongoing follow up on the trainings, it ensured a longer term
- 3) The virtual format of orientations made it difficult to engage with local organizations due to connectivity issues. However, in CAR and Nigeria, international organizations opened space for local organizations to participate in their offices, which mitigated this. Also, many staff in humanitarian organizations and at the Clusters are overburdened with requests to collect data - so GCPEA had to assess appetite at the national level, which required a lot of work and outreach.

11. Conclusions (250 words)

Please describe why may this intervention be considered a “best practice”. What recommendations can be made for those intending to adopt the documented “best practice” or how can it help people working on the same issue(s)? *

This intervention was considered a best practice because it took the "gold standard" of data collection tools and made them available to range of key stakeholders in some of the most affected countries. This was a best practice because it engaged both child protection and education actors, from international organizations, government, and local civil society, and encouraged enhanced collaboration. This is key to safe, equitable education.

Recommendations include:

- capitalizing on the virtual format to expand reach to new partners that might otherwise be harder to access
- capitalizing on organizational expertise and existing best practices
- training of trainers to ensure that GCPEA products can be more widely shared within organizations working in affected countries
- We encourage any interested party to reach out to GCPEA if they would like to learn more or require any support related to collecting and analyzing data on attacks on education

12. Further reading

Please provide a list and URLs of key reference documents for additional information on the “best practice” for those who may be interested in knowing how the results benefited the beneficiary group/s. *

<http://toolkit.protectingeducation.org/resources/download-the-toolkit.html>

<https://protectingeducation.org/wp-content/uploads/GCPEA-Toolkit-1pager.pdf>

<https://protectingeducation.org/wp-content/uploads/EWIPA-Afghanistan-2021.pdf>

<https://protectingeducation.org/publication/measuring-the-impact-of-attacks-on-education-in-palestine/>