

Executive summary of the INEE Minimum Standards Update

Online Consultation

The INEE Minimum Standards Update Online Consultation was held from 25 April to 30 June 2009. 183 respondents participated in the survey, of whom 113 completed it entirely. The consultation was carried out in Arabic (15 respondents), English (141 respondents), French (14 respondents), Portuguese (1 respondent) and Spanish (12 respondents).

The online consultation aimed to check whether participants agreed with recommendations received since 2004 on updating the INEE Minimum Standards Handbook, and to solicit further feedback and recommendations on how best to update it. The key findings, summarised below, largely validate the feedback received so far. They will be incorporated to the coming stages of the process, and reflected in the updated Handbook launched in 2010. For further information about the update process, and how to participate further, please go to <http://www.ineesite.org/standardsupdate>.

In relation to format, decisions will need to be taken on font size, how best to identify indicators (bullet points or other), the number and type of tools to be included in the updated handbook, and on moving the Coordination standard. In terms of content, there will need to be decisions on the inclusion of case studies and on whether or not to change the title of the INEE Minimum Standards.

The decision to carry out a limited update of the INEE Minimum Standards rather than a full overhaul (see section I.1) is validated by the majority of respondents in favour of 'some updating' for most key areas. This will also help in finding a balance between strengthening the content while not creating a larger handbook. Focal points will take into account the specific points made in comments relevant to their thematic area or category.

The Online Consultation has proved a valuable opportunity for a range of INEE Minimum Standards users to contribute their views and ideas to the update process. Our thanks go to them for their participation, and we look forward to continuing to work together.

Summary of key findings

- **Format**

Key finding 1: font size for the updated handbook (key question 4.1)

The results show that the majority of respondents prefer to keep the updated handbook as small as possible, and therefore not to increase the font size. On the other hand, comments highlighted that many respondents are concerned about the effect that the small font has on the useability of the handbook. There was strong demand for improved layout and design of the handbook to address this.

Key finding 2: Making the INEE MS easier to use (survey question 4.2)

The options rated most highly (highlighting indicators most relevant to acute emergency, an index, a more detailed table of contents, and highlighting sections of the handbook on the edge of pages) are supported by the comments. They show the importance of making the updated handbook easier to refer to in a practical setting, by improving the layout and presentation of current version. "Add illustrations such as photographs, diagrams" is considered the lowest priority, which could reflect concern not to take up too much space.

Key finding 3: Identification of indicators (survey question 4.3)

The small majority of respondents in favour of keeping indicators with bullet points, reflects the concern to avoid any suggestion of prioritisation. However, as shown in the comments, this is balanced by the need to be able to identify indicators more easily. The use of letters could be an alternative.

Key finding 4: inclusion and number of tools (survey questions 4.4 and 4.5)

There is close to consensus on the need to include tools in the updated handbook. However this is tempered by the concern, expressed in key finding 1, not to have a large handbook. There is certainly a need for tools, but they should not overwhelm the reader. The selection of tools for inclusion in the handbook itself, as opposed to being available elsewhere, will be critical.

Key finding 5: printed version of the INEE MS (survey questions 4.6 and 4.7)

There is a strong preference for the printed version of the handbook for a majority of INEE MS users. Although electronic versions of the handbook can be shared easily and quickly in some contexts, this requires logistics in terms of access to computers, internet and electricity that are often difficult to find in emergency and post-crisis environments. The importance attached to the printed version of the INEE MS, also reinforces the need to update the format in ways that make it easier to carry around and to use.

Key finding 6: moving the Coordination standard (survey question 4.8)

There is a large majority in favour of moving the Coordination standard to the first chapter, Standards common to all categories. Comments highlight that this whole chapter needs updating; concerns regarding exactly how coordination is presented within it need to be taken into account.

- **Content**

Key finding 7: Reflecting developments since 2004 (survey question 3.1)

Most respondents agree that most of the key areas need 'some updating' rather than 'substantial updating'. The exception is the area of Intersectoral linkages, which received the highest percentage in favour of substantial updating. This may reflect awareness of the recently formalised relationship between INEE and the Sphere Project, in a Companionship Agreement that will reinforce cross-referencing between the two handbooks.

Key finding 8: Incorporating the experience of INEE MS users (survey question 5.1)

A majority of respondents agreed that the inclusion of case studies at the end of each category would be positive. However there is concern about the effect this would have on the size of the handbook; selection of a range of brief case studies would be critical.

Key finding 9: The title of the INEE MS (survey question 5.2)

For the highest percentage of respondents (39.4%), the first choice was to keep the title of the current Minimum Standards Handbook as it is: *INEE Minimum Standards for Education in Emergencies, Chronic Crises and Early Reconstruction*. However there was also strong support for the option of *INEE Minimum Standards* as the main title + *Education in Emergencies, Chronic Crises and Early Recovery* below as a subtitle. In making a decision on the title, it is important to remember that the meaning of the acronym 'INEE' is not necessarily known, particularly for speakers of languages other than English. The title should therefore be self-explanatory without the acronym.