Summary Report of the
Workshop on Promising Practices for Protecting Education from Attack and Schools from Military Use

October 5-7, 2015 Istanbul, Turkey

March 2016

Global Coalition to **Protect**
Education from Attack

About the Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack
The Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack (GCPEA), an inter-agency coalition, was formed in 2010 by organizations working in the fields of education in emergencies and conflict-affected contexts, higher education, protection, international human rights, and humanitarian law who were concerned about ongoing attacks on educational institutions, their students, and staff in countries affected by conflict and insecurity.

GCPEA is a coalition of organizations that includes:
The Council for At-Risk Academics (CARA)
Human Rights Watch
The Institute of International Education
Norwegian Refugee Council
The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)
Protect Education in Insecurity and Conflict (PEIC, a program of Education Above All)
Save the Children
The Scholars at Risk Network
The United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)
The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)
War Child Holland

GCPEA is a project of the Tides Center, a non-profit 501(c)(3) organization.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

Education Under Attack 2014, a global study that examines attacks on education and military use of schools, found that education had been attacked in 70 countries throughout the world from 2009-2013, with a pattern of such attacks occurring in 30 countries.[1] Students of all ages, teachers, academics, teachers' unions, and education institutions were the targets of intentional attacks for political, military, ideological, sectarian, ethnic, or religious reasons. Additionally, schools and universities were used by parties to armed conflict as barracks, weapons storage facilities, command centers, detention and interrogation sites, firing and observations posts, and for other military purposes in 24 of the 30 countries. A more recent report, *Lessons in War 2015*, found that schools and universities had been used for military purposes in 26 countries from 2005 to 2015, the majority of countries in which there had been conflicts in the last decade. Recommendations from *Education Under Attack 2014* were incorporated into the Safe Schools Declaration,[2] developed in 2015 in a state-led process headed by Norway and Argentina and supported by the Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack (GCPEA). By endorsing the Safe Schools Declaration, states make a political commitment to adopt a comprehensive approach to protecting education from attack. Commitments in the Declaration include: collecting data on attacks on education and military use of schools; investigating allegations of attacks; duly prosecuting perpetrators and providing support for victims; developing conflict-sensitive education;[3] seeking to ensure continuation of education during conflict and the rebuilding of schools following attacks; and endorsing and utilizing the *Guidelines for Protecting Schools and Universities from Military Use during Armed Conflict* (*Guidelines*).[4] To examine how to better safeguard education in conflict, including by implementing the different commitments within the Safe Schools Declaration, GCPEA convened a *Workshop on Promising Practices for Protecting Education from Attack and Schools from Military Use* (Workshop). The Workshop was held in Istanbul, Turkey, from October 5 to 7, 2015.

The Workshop brought together more than 75 field practitioners, program managers, and Ministry of Education (MoE) officials who comprised country teams from 11 different countries: Afghanistan, the Central African Republic, Colombia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Kenya, Mali, Nigeria, Pakistan, Palestine, Somalia, and South Sudan. Additionally, practitioners from Nepal and Sudan as well as resource persons representing international non-governmental organizations (INGOs) and UN agencies that work within and across several countries participated in the Workshop. The purpose of the Workshop was to:

- *Collect and share information about promising measures that countries are currently implementing to protect education from attack and schools from military use;*
- *Identify opportunities and challenges in implementing protective measures and their suitability for adaptation to other contexts; and*

---

[1] The Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack, *Education Under Attack 2014* (New York: GCPEA, 2014), http://protectingeducation.org/sites/default/files/documents/eua_2014_full_0.pdf.

[2] The Safe Schools Declaration provides states the opportunity to express broad political support for the protection and continuation of education in armed conflict, and is the instrument through which states can endorse and commit to implementing the *Guidelines for Protecting Schools and Universities from Military Use during Armed Conflict*.

[3] For information on conflict-sensitive education, see pp. 13-15 of this report.

[4] *The Guidelines for Protecting Schools and Universities from Military Use during Armed Conflict* provide practical guidance to help parties to conflict reduce the use of educational facilities for military purposes (e.g. as barracks, bases, ammunition storage, training grounds).

- *Develop action plans within each country team to implement a promising protective measure as well as an advocacy strategy for endorsing the Safe Schools Declaration and implementing the Guidelines.*

During the Workshop, participants presented and discussed topics under the following three themes:

1) Protection measures at all levels of implementation
2) Policies that protect education from attack
3) Action planning

This report summarizes what, according to Workshop participants, are promising practices in protecting education from attack and highlights emergent considerations and challenges in implementing different protective measures.

PART 1: PROTECTION MEASURES AT ALL LEVELS OF IMPLEMENTATION

Eight workshop sessions focused on different protection measures implemented by a range of different actors (e.g. MoE, INGOs/UN agencies, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and community organizations) at all levels (e.g. national, community, school).

Armed Protection Measures

Facilitator
Ms. Emily Echessa, *Save the Children* (Deputy Head of Education)

Presenters
- Mr. Bashir Tukur, *Nigeria* (Safe Schools Initiative State Coordination Committee Secretary, Adamawa State)
- Mr. Rafiq Khattak, *Pakistan* (Director of Schools, Elementary and Secondary Education Department)
- Mr. Osman Warfa, *Kenya* (Professor/Principal, Garissa University College)

Summary of the Measure
In some countries experiencing extreme violence from parties to armed conflict, the government has "securitized" protection and taken a "top down approach" to program design and implementation, supporting measures such as armed guards at schools and at check points. Sometimes community groups have also supported armed protection measures.

Examples of the Measure
- *Armed guards.* Some schools, in coordination with armed forces, local police, or independently, have used armed guards to protect school property. Some school administrators have employed their own armed security guards.
- *Armed school escorts or vehicles.* Security forces, armed guards, or local police have escorted some teachers and students to and from school in certain countries.
- *Arming teachers and principals.* Some governments have armed teachers in some schools and provided teachers with weapons training.

Summary of Panel Discussion

Nigeria

According to Mr. Tukur, a range of protective measures, including armed school guards, were implemented in Nigeria's northern states as part of the Safe Schools Initiative (SSI)[5] that began in 2014. At some primary and secondary schools in the northern states, the government dispatched former military personnel, retired police officers, and civil defense forces to serve as armed school guards. Mr. Tukur reported that armed school guards, included as part of the protective measures implemented by SSI, helped schooling continue during armed conflict in many areas and also helped some schools reopen that had been closed for more than two years.

Pakistan

According to Mr. Khattak, following the attack on the Army Public School in Peshawar, Pakistan, on December 16, 2014,[6] the government undertook a number of measures, including mandating that armed security guards be installed in some primary schools. Mr. Khattak reported that from the time armed guards were dispatched to these schools (along with the implementation of other protective measures, including the construction of school boundary walls and the implementation of early warning systems), to the date of the presentation, no major attack had taken place.[7]

Kenya

According to Mr. Warfa, beginning in 2011 in Kenya's Northeastern Province, the government provided a limited number of armed guards to higher education institutions. Following the attack on Garissa University College on April 2, 2015,[8] in which at least 147 lives were lost, the government increased the number of armed guards provided to each institution of higher education in the province. Mr. Warfa explained that prior to the attack he requested, and was denied by the provincial government, additional armed guards to be dispatched to Garissa University College. He suggested that had there been more guards, the attack might have been prevented, or students and faculty much better protected and fewer lives lost during the attack. Mr. Warfa also suggested more broadly that in Kenya, armed school guards allow students and teachers to feel more secure in schools, can provide rapid response to attacks when they occur, and possibly help to deter attacks from occurring.

Issues and Considerations Regarding Implementation of the Measure

- Use of school facilities by armed guards to defend teachers and students can increase the risk of attack if the armed guards are associated with the parties in conflict.
- Similarly, armed guards outside school buildings or at checkpoints can stop attackers from approaching but can also lead to attacks on schools, if the armed guards are associated with the parties in conflict.

---

[5] The Safe Schools Initiative was launched in 2014 by the Government of Nigeria and the UN Special Envoy for Education Gordon Brown, alongside the Nigerian Business Coalition, and implemented by UNICEF in collaboration with the three northern states' Ministries of Education. See: http://www.ssinigeria.org.ng/.

[6] See: Zama Coursen-Neff (Human Rights Watch),"Dispatches: Uniting Against the Pakistan School Massacre," Dec. 16, 2014, https://www.hrw.org/news/2014/12/16/dispatches-uniting-against-pakistan-school-massacre.

[7] According to Mr. Khattak, a limited number of schools in high-risk areas have been bombed, though the bombings happened at night and therefore did not result in any injuries or casualties. Additionally, this presentation was made before the January 20, 2016 attack on Bacha Khan University in which at least 20 lives were lost. See: Jibran Ahmad and Mehreen Zahra-Malik, "Militants Storm Pakistan University: Kill at least Twenty," *Reuters,* January 20, 2016, http://www.reuters.com/article/us-pakistan-attacks-university-idUSKCN0UY0C4.

[8] See: Human Rights Watch, "Kenya: At Least 147 Dead in Heinous Garissa Attack," April 2, 2015, https://www.hrw.org/news/2015/04/03/kenya-least-147-dead-heinous-garissa-attack.

- If armed measures are mandated by the government but not funded, schools may not be able to implement them.
- The use of armed guards and escorts for teachers may or may not increase the risk of attack.
- Armed guards might lack appropriate training.
- The presence of guns in schools might make students and teachers feel less, rather than more, secure.

Non-armed Protection Measures

Facilitator
Ms. Linda Jones, *UNICEF* (Chief of Education, Somalia)

Presenters
- Ms. Nagwa Musa Konda, *Sudan* (Executive Director, Nuba Relief, Rehabilitation, and Development Organization)
- Mr. Qais Daana, *Palestine* (Head of Al Mahawer Charitable Society)
- Mr. Abdul Jaber Ariyaee, *Afghanistan* (Chief of Staff, Ministry of Education)

Summary of the Measure
In contrast to armed protection measures, non-armed protection measures take a more "community-based" approach to protecting education, including posting unarmed guards to schools and strengthening school infrastructure.

Examples of the Measure
- *School/community safety and protection committees* that organize unarmed protection measures.
- *Physical infrastructure* such as, boundary walls, razor wire around schools, safety and security equipment, security cameras, metal detectors, and visitor screening at schools.
- *Demarcation of schools with symbols* to prevent targeted attacks.
- *Designing and constructing safe school sites,* including by building safe play areas, and using strong construction materials better able to withstand attacks.
- *Unarmed guards* from school and community used as safety patrols and escorts to and from school.
- *Teacher/student housing* near or on campus made available to reduce the risk of travel on dangerous routes to and from school.

Summary of Panel Discussion
Sudan
According to Ms. Konda, the Nuba Relief, Rehabilitation, and Development Organization has, since in 2011, developed and implemented protective measures in villages targeted by the Sudanese government. These measures include building safety bunkers in schools, digging throughout villages a system of foxholes (holes dug in the ground that people can hide in and which provide cover from aerial bombing), and building schools with natural materials in and around caves where communities seek shelter so that schools are less visible and not easily targeted. Ms. Tonga reported that the protective measures implemented by the Nuba Relief, Rehabilitation, and Development Organization help to protect students, teachers, and community members from attacks when they occur.

Palestine
According to Mr. Daana, in Hebron, Palestine in 2012, community members formed The Al Mahawer Charitable Society to provide protective presence to students while passing through Israeli military checkpoints en route to school. Mr. Daana reported that students sometimes felt antagonized when Israeli soldiers indiscriminately searched students' bags and more generally often felt frustrated by the Israeli occupation. Students would retaliate by throwing stones at Israeli soldiers who would, in response, fire tear gas canisters at students' schools. As part of the protective presence program, parents and community members accompany students to and from school and counsel students not to throw stones at Israeli military personnel in provocation or retaliation for harassment or threats by stressing the importance of education to ultimately secure the future of their country. Mr. Daana also reported that the accompaniment program in Hebron increased the number of children attending schools as parents feel their children are more secure; in addition, he stated that tear gas attacks on schools were reduced since the program began.

Afghanistan
In Afghanistan, according to Mr. Ariyaee, the government has recruited non-armed school guards; built boundary walls, particularly around girls' schools; established school management *shuras* (councils) that assist with developing and implementing protection plans at the school-level; trained teachers on emergency scenarios; and established community-based schools or classes in a number of areas so that schools are not easily targeted for attack. Mr. Ariyaee noted that the range of non-armed protective measures in Afghanistan has helped to ensure continuity of education in areas prone to conflict.

Issues and Considerations Regarding Implementation of the Measure
• Participation by respected and diverse community members in school protection committees can strengthen safety and increase security.
• If school protection committee leaders are perceived as favoring one political or ethnic group, this might negatively impact community members' trust in the committee.
• Support from organizations and authorities at national, regional, and international levels can sometimes strengthen community protection measures.
• Accompaniment programs can sometimes put the escorts at increased risk for attack.

School-based Safety and Security Planning

Facilitator
Ms. Judith Giwa-Amu, *UNICEF* (Education Officer, Nigeria)

Presenters
• Mr. Bilal Hamadayah, *Palestine* (National Program Officer, UNESCO)
• Mr. Alvaro Sanchez Santos, *Colombia* (National Education Program Director, The Legal Option Corporation)

Summary of the Measure
Several countries have begun to implement comprehensive school-based safety and security plans designed and initiated in partnership with other education actors or alternatively by the government.

A Comprehensive School-based Safety and Security Plan Includes:
- *A strategic, comprehensive approach* to school safety planning, preparedness, and response with school safety committee and community involvement.
- *A risk assessment* that determines risk factors and assesses current security measures.
- *The planning and implementation of a range of protection measures*, which may include increasing physical security, escorts to and from school, SMS early warning systems, first aid training, evacuation drills, psychosocial support, transportation to medical facilities, and human rights monitoring.

Summary of Panel Discussion
Palestine
According to Mr. Hamadayah, in 2011 in Gaza, UNESCO, along with local partners, launched the crisis Disaster Risk Reduction (c-DRR) program in 29 schools. The goal of the c-DRR program was to make vulnerable schools safer by adopting an approach that integrated protection and education sectors, specifically by adapting the principles and good practices of disaster risk reduction to particular conflicts in Gaza. As part of the program, school-based safety committees were formed in all participating schools, and the committees helped to develop and implement school-level plans to ensure the protection of students and teachers and continuity of education when attacks occurred. Additionally, education personnel were given training courses in SMS early warning alert systems, first aid, and the Interagency Network for Education in Emergency (INEE) *Minimum Standards for Education in Emergency*.[9] Mr. Hamadayah reported evidence of success of the c-DRR program, including positive feedback from communities where the program was piloted, continued use of the SMS system when attacks take place, as well as engagement with the issue of attacks on education by the Palestinian Ministry of Education and Higher Education (MoEHE), which has demanded that Palestinian armed groups not use schools or establish military sites near schools.

Colombia
In Colombia, according to Mr. Santos, a systematic approach to protecting education was undertaken in recent years. Ministerial Directives were passed which include "Education in Emergencies" as a line item in annual education sector budgets; the national government issued the 'Governmental Guidelines for Education Assistance to Victims of Armed Conflict;' guidelines were prepared for utilization at the school-level to develop and implement disaster risk management plans; and an Education in Emergencies National Roundtable was established for the purpose of strengthening institutional and intersectoral coordination between protection and education sectors as well as between national and local actors and agencies involved in protecting education. Mr. Santos reported that these measures increased the knowledge of education personnel and students with regards to the risk of attack and different protective measures that can be implemented, and also strengthened partnerships between institutions involved in protecting education from attack at national and local levels.

Issues and Considerations Regarding Implementation of the Measure
- School-based safety and security plans can help to cultivate a "culture of prevention" of attacks on education.
- Ensure diverse and representative participation of trusted community leaders.

---

[9] Interagency Network for Education in Emergencies, *Minimum Standards for Education: Preparedness, Response, Recovery* (Washington DC: INEE, 2010), http://toolkit.ineesite.org/inee_minimum_standards/handbooks.

- Establish separate school safety committees or work within existing coordination mechanisms (e.g. Parent Teacher Associations).
- Lack of funding and coordination issues between national and local levels can impede effective implementation of plans.
- Some protective measures, such as installing security gates and signposting schools as protected civil assets, resulted in the occupation of these schools by parties to armed conflict, who viewed them as more secure spaces to set up temporary camps.

Limiting Military Use of Schools

Presenter
Mr. Bede Sheppard, *Human Rights Watch* (Deputy Director, Children's Rights Division)

Summary of the Measure
States and non-state armed groups should implement the *[Guidelines for Protecting Schools and Universities from Military Use during Armed Conflict](#)*, which provides concrete guidance to armed forces and armed non-state groups on how to reduce the use of educational facilities for military purposes and mitigate its impact, thereby protecting the safety of children and their right to education during times of conflict.

Examples of Good Practices in Protecting Schools from Military Use
- Passing legislation banning or restricting the military use of schools (e.g. the Philippines, India, Bangladesh).
- Courts issuing rulings ordering that schools used by armed forces be vacated (e.g. Colombia and India).
- Armed parties issuing military orders banning the military use of schools (e.g. South Sudan).
- Provisions ensuring that schools are vacated by parties to conflict included in ceasefire or peace agreements (e.g. Sri Lanka, Nepal).
- Armed non-state actors committing to avoid using schools for military purposes (e.g. Myanmar).
- Local governments, community leaders, and civil society negotiating agreements or codes of conduct with armed parties to end the military use of schools (e.g. Nepal, CAR).
- Communities, education actors/authorities, UN agencies, and NGOs advocating with parties to conflict to vacate schools on a case-by-case basis (e.g. Somalia).

Issues and Considerations Regarding Implementation of the Measure
- The *Guidelines* are a practical tool relevant to all parties to conflict, be they national armed forces, non-state armed groups, or international forces, and regardless of whether the party has formally endorsed them.
- Armed forces may need to be sensitized to the short and long-term risks created by the use of educational facilities for military purposes. This is particularly important because the military may be unwilling to exercise restraint in relation to military use of schools, given that this practice does not necessarily go against the laws of armed conflict. This may be particularly challenging if other parties to the conflict do not exercise the same restraint. In some situations, state security forces may feel that using schools for military purposes is justified during conflict to protect the community as a whole.

Negotiations as a Strategy for Protecting Education

Facilitator
Ms. Melinda Smith, *GCPEA* (Consultant)

Presenters
- Ms. Jyoti Rana Magar, *Nepal* (Coordinator, World Education)
- Mr. Abdul Jaber Ariyaee, *Afghanistan* (Chief of Staff, Ministry of Education)
- Mr. John Oyech Lwong, *South Sudan* (Founder, Fashoda Youth Forum)

Summary of the Measure
One strategy for protecting education from attack and schools from military use is to negotiate with parties to armed conflict to keep schools safe during armed conflict.

Examples of the Measure
- *School and community leaders negotiate agreements* with government forces and armed non-state groups using consensus and dialogue processes.
- *Third party intervention* is usually involved whereby parties trusted or acceptable to all actors, such as religious or community leaders, conduct direct dialogue or shuttle diplomacy.
- *Agreements* may ban weapons, prohibit political propaganda at schools, restrict military use of schools, or establish codes of conduct for military and armed groups.
- *Enforcement mechanisms* and consequences for non-compliance should be incorporated into negotiated agreements.

Summary of Panel Discussion
Nepal
In Nepal, according to Ms. Magar, a number of stakeholders have provided support and coordination for the Schools as Zones of Peace (SZOP) initiative,[10] including UNICEF, Save the Children, the national Coalition for Children as Zones of Peace and Protection, the National Human Rights Commission, local human and child rights groups, as well as national and local government. School management committees led community-wide consensus processes with community members, political parties, and armed groups to negotiate agreements to safeguard schools against military or political use. Ms. Magar reported that negotiations were successful in establishing and maintaining the SZOP initiative, which resulted in the reduced use of children in political events; the cessation of military use of a large number of schools and the reopening of many of these schools; and greater support and commitment from political groups and civil society to respect schools as zones of peace.

---

[10] SZOP involved local NGOs working with school management committees to hold community meetings that included school personnel, parents, and representatives of parties to armed conflict, including armed non-state actors and the army. These meetings resulted in agreements that all parties signed that restricted military and political use of schools. For more information, see: The Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack, *The Role of Communities in Protecting Education from Attack* (New York: GCPEA, 2014), p. 41.
http://www.protectingeducation.org/sites/default/files/documents/the_role_of_communities_in_protecting_education_from_attack.pdf

Afghanistan

In Afghanistan, according to Mr. Ariyaee, the national government has established national and provincial level peace councils as well as helped to establish and support school management shuras that assumed primary responsibility for initiating communication and dialogue with local opposition groups. Agreements were reached in several areas that schools would not be targeted for attack, used by parties to armed conflict, or used for political purposes.

South Sudan

In South Sudan, Mr. Lwong reported that the Fashoda Youth Forum (an NGO) has initiated negotiations with parties to armed conflict to vacate or stop attacks on schools. Agreements were reached in several areas that schools will not be targeted for attack, used by parties to armed conflict, or used for political purposes.

Factors Involved in Negotiations

Groups who engaged in negotiations in all three countries employed a similar approach, which included the following:

- Know all the facts (e.g. how schools are being attacked or occupied, by who, why, and for how long);
- Find points of mutual interest between those perpetrating attacks and those negotiating for the cessation of attacks;
- Identify the appropriate person(s) to carry out negotiations; and
- Remain flexible, reasonable, persistent, and non-confrontational throughout the process of negotiations.

Issues and Considerations Regarding Implementation of the Measure

- There are risks and security dangers for third parties and participants at the local level, since perpetrators must agree to participate in good faith.
- Conduct a risk assessment before negotiations to protect teachers and civilian populations.
- Safety must be ensured for parties undertaking education and negotiation roles.
- Negotiators must be viewed as impartial by all parties and appropriate for the context.
- Negotiations might not be an appropriate measure in some contexts, for example with parties to armed conflict such as Al-Shabaab[11] or Boko Haram,[12] because there might not be mutual interest.
- The negotiating process changes during and after conflict because the motivation of parties to armed conflict as well as of negotiators change; continuing to appraise the situation for evolving points of mutual interest is critical.

Psychosocial Support

Facilitator

Ms. Brenda Haiplik, *UNICEF* (Senior Education Advisor, Emergencies, New York Headquarters)

---

[11] For information regarding the group Al Shabaab, see: Human Rights Watch, *Al Shabaab*, https://www.hrw.org/tag/al-shabaab-0.
[12] For information regarding the group Boko Haram, see: Amnesty International, *Boko Haram at a Glance*, https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2015/01/boko-haram-glance/.

Presenters

- Ms. Camilla Lodi, *Palestine* (Education Program Manager, Better Learning Program, Norwegian Refugee Council)
- Mr. Asghar Khan, *Pakistan* (Senior Education Manager, Healing Classrooms Initiative, International Rescue Committee)

Summary of the Measure

Psychosocial support helps teachers, students, and parents cope with impacts of attacks on schools and protracted violence and conflict, and supports the resilience and well-being of children through community organized, structured activities conducted in safe, child-friendly environments.

Examples of the Measure

- *Temporary educational activities* set up in non-formal learning spaces or schools during conflict. Education activities should be rapidly re-established if schools have been occupied or destroyed.
- *Provision of structured and appropriate learning activities* to enable children to grow mentally and emotionally, play, acquire contextually relevant skills, and receive social support.
- *Referral systems* that link education personnel with mental health, social services, and psychosocial support in the community.

Summary of Panel Discussion

Palestine

In Palestine, according to Ms. Lodi, the Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) began implementing the Better Learning Program in 2010 in Gaza and the West Bank. The program targets school-aged children affected by protracted conflict suffering from nightmares (utilized in this research as an indicator of trauma) and exhibiting other signs of trauma (e.g. behavioral issues in school) through a psycho-educational school-based intervention that includes training for teachers and school counselors and parent-support groups. Children exhibiting significant signs of trauma, particularly those who experience frequent nightmares, also receive one-on-one and group therapy. An external evaluation of the program conducted in 2014 found that for participants who had received one-on-one and group therapy, approximately two-thirds reported that their nightmares had been reduced from between four and five per week at the beginning of the program to between zero and one by the end of the program. Additionally, the evaluation found that teachers reported feeling more effective when teaching students exhibiting signs of stress and students reported feeling an increased sense of motivation towards school.[13]

Pakistan

In Pakistan, according to Mr. Khan, the International Rescue Committee (IRC) began implementing in 2015 a redesigned Healing Classrooms Initiative that builds upon previous IRC Healing Classrooms Initiatives implemented in Pakistan since 2006. The redesigned initiative

---

[13] Additional findings include: decreased levels of conflict and "negative student behavior in school;" strong positive impact overall on children's "psychosocial well-being;" increased use by teachers of methodologies that are more inclusive and engaging; an improved sense of teacher motivation and professionalism; greater parental involvement in schools; and increased motivation and confidence of school counselors. See: Ritesh Shah, *Evaluation of the Norwegian Refugee Council's Palestine Education Programme 2010-2014* (Oslo: NRC, 2014), pp. 8-26, http://www.nrc.no/arch/_img/9182688.pdf.

focuses on training teachers to work with students exposed to protracted conflict and insecurity to create positive classroom spaces. Techniques in which teachers are trained include: co-creating rules with students; assigning meaningful classroom tasks that students can take an active role in completing; giving praise and encouraging goal setting; utilizing group work; and connecting assignments to students' lived experiences. Mr. Khan reported that an internal evaluation of the IRC's Healing Classrooms Initiative found examples of increased ownership amongst teachers, students, and parents of their schools and classrooms and in turn an increased commitment by these stakeholders to safeguard schools and classrooms from attack.

Issues and Considerations Regarding Implementation of the Measure
- Train teachers and community members to recognize and respond to the psychosocial needs of students and threats to their protection and avoid punishment of students whose performance suffers due to mental health or psychosocial problems.
- Address psychosocial needs of teachers through training, classroom management strategies, and coping with their own stress.

Monitoring and Reporting and Accountability for Attacks on Education

Facilitator
Ms. Ratna Jhaveri, *UNICEF* (Child Protection Specialist—MRM Children and Armed Conflict Child Protection in Emergencies, New York Headquarters)

Presenters
- Ms. Ratna Jhaveri, *UNICEF* (Child Protection Specialist—MRM Children and Armed Conflict Child Protection in Emergencies, New York Headquarters)
- Mr. Gilles-Philippe Page, *Watchlist on Children and Armed Conflict* (Partnerships Program Officer)
- Ms. Mera Thompson, *Palestine* (Education Cluster Coordinator, UNICEF)
- Mr. Tyler Arnot, *Education Cluster* (Cluster Coordinator, Rapid Response Team)/Mr. Landon Newby, *Education Cluster* (Information Management Officer, Rapid Response Team)

Summary of the Measure
Monitoring and reporting of attacks on education, both when parties are listed by the Secretary General in his report on children and armed conflict and subject to the UN Monitoring and Reporting Mechanism (MRM), including action plans, and when parties are not listed and monitoring is conducted by informal mechanisms, are key for accountability and advocacy on the need to take action against attacks and perpetrators. The UN MRM on Grave Violations against Children in Armed Conflict was established in 2005 through Security Council Resolution 1612[14] to end and prevent six grave violations, including attacks against schools and hospitals and related personnel. In Resolution 1998,[15] issued in 2011, the UN Security Council made attacks against schools and hospitals a trigger for parties to a conflict to be listed in the annexes of the UN Secretary General's Annual Report on Children and Armed Conflict. Once listed, in order to be de-listed, a party to conflict must enter into an action plan with the UN and ensure its full implementation to end and prevent the violation. Military use is not a trigger for listing a

[14] United Nations Security Council, Resolution 1612 (2005), S/RES/1612 (2005), http://www.refworld.org/pdfid/43f308d6c.pdf.
[15] United Nations Security Council, Resolution 1998 (2011), S/RES/1998 (2011), http://www.securitycouncilreport.org/atf/cf/%7B65BFCF9B-6D27-4E9C-8CD3-CF6E4FF96FF9%7D/CAC S RES 1998.pdf.

party to the conflict. However, in Resolution 1998, the Security Council requested the Secretary General to continue to monitor and report on military use of schools.

Examples of the Measure
- *Participation in monitoring* by school personnel and school management committees.
- Monitoring and reporting of attacks as a *strategy for increasing accountability for perpetrators of attacks and for obtaining data needed for advocacy* on ending attacks.
- *Use of* monitoring and reporting systems to strengthen early warning, rapid response, and program planning.

Summary of Panel Discussion

Monitoring and Reporting of Attacks in Countries subject to the UN-mandated MRM
Ms. Jhaveri explained that one of the most important ways in which monitoring and reporting activities are translated into action is through the initiation of UN dialogue with the listed party to the conflict, leading to the preparation and implementation of a time-bound action plan. The action plan is signed by the party with the UN and sets out the party's commitment to ceasing and preventing the grave violations committed against children. The action plan includes several measures to be undertaken by the listed party to conflict to end and prevent the violation and can include commitments regarding UN access for monitoring and verification activities, disciplinary measures against perpetrators, and the designation of a high-level focus person responsible for the fulfillment of the commitments laid out in the action plan.

Mr. Page, speaking on behalf of the Watchlist on Children and Armed Conflict, noted that there are currently nine parties from six countries listed for attacks on schools in the annex of the UN Secretary General's Annual Report on Children and Armed Conflict.[16] The countries the parties are from are: Afghanistan, the Central African Republic, the Democratic Republic of the Congo (three parties listed), Iraq, Syria (two parties listed), and Nigeria. Mr. Page also explained that data collected as part of monitoring often includes how and why violations are taking place, which can and has been utilized to help in the development and implementation of appropriate protective measures.

Monitoring and Reporting of Attacks in Countries not subject to the UN-mandated MRM
In countries where a formal UN-led MRM has not been established, monitoring and reporting on attacks against schools and related personnel, as well as the military use of schools, is an important activity undertaken by protection and education actors. Ms. Thompson, Education Cluster Coordinator in Palestine, explained that a working group (including the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), UNICEF, and Save the Children) was voluntarily formed in 2007 to monitor grave violations against children in Israel and Palestine. The working group monitors six core violations as well as additional violations specific to the Israeli/Palestinian context (e.g. arrest and detention of children, ill treatment and torture, and forced displacement). Israeli and Palestinian Ministries of Education, through regional education bureaus and school principals, help to collect data on school-level attacks and violations that is

---

[16] United Nations Office of the Special Representative of the Secretary General for Children and Armed Conflict, "Annual Report on Children and Armed Conflict," A/69/926-S/2015/409, June 5, 2015, http://watchlist.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/080615-SG-report-on-Children-and-armed-conflict-revised.pdf.

then verified by both Save the Children and UNICEF before the validated incident is included in a database.

The Global Education Cluster

The Global Education Cluster[17] also assists in monitoring and reporting of attacks on education in countries with and without a UN Security Council-mandated MRM. Mr. Newby and Mr. Arnot explained that the Education Cluster utilizes the Education Cluster Monitoring Tool, which monitors attacks on education as part of on-going monitoring of education programming, including attendance of students and teachers, information related to school infrastructure (e.g. quantity of school supplies as well as damage to school buildings), and response information (e.g. activities of I/NGOs and UN agencies when attacks occur).

Issues and Considerations Regarding Implementation of the Measure
- Make decisions about the purpose of monitoring and what data should be collected.
- Training is needed in data collection and methods for persons participating in monitoring and reporting.
- Ensure information collected is reported through appropriate channels and used to trigger responses. Elective monitoring reports can be submitted to UN agencies.
- Use monitoring and reporting findings to advocate for local responses, including prevention and recovery measures.
- There can be challenges with regards to coordinating monitoring and reporting of attacks amongst different partners, particularly reaching consensus amongst partners regarding what information should be collected and in which format it should be presented.
- A standardized reporting tool should be developed and utilized by data collection teams in countries where there is concern, in relation to attacks against schools and related personnel and the military use of schools, to address challenges of coordination and harmonization among the varied reporting mechanisms.

PART 2: POLICIES THAT PROTECT EDUCATION FROM ATTACK

Two workshop sessions focused on different policies implemented by a range of different actors (e.g. MoE, I/NGOs, UN agencies, and community organizations) at all levels (e.g. national, community, school).

Conflict-Sensitive/Risk-Informed Programming

Facilitator
Ms. Margaret Sinclair, *PEIC* (Technical Advisor)

Presenters
- Ms. Brenda Haiplik, *UNICEF* (Senior Education Advisor, Emergencies, NY Headquarters)
- Mr. Morten Sigsgaard, *UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP)* (Assistant Program Specialist, Technical Cooperation Unit, Paris)

---

[17] The Global Education Cluster provides operational support to country clusters. Country clusters are open, formal forums for coordination and collaboration on education in emergencies. Country Education Clusters bring together NGOs, UN agencies, academics, and other partners under the shared goal of ensuring the provision of education for populations affected by humanitarian crises.

- Mr. Victor Dut Chol, *South Sudan* (Deputy Director of Planning and Budgeting, Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology)

Summary of the Measure
Developed by education policymakers and planners at all levels, conflict-sensitive and risk-informed policies and programs "do no harm" and are intended to address underlying grievances that drive conflict. Establishing conflict-sensitive policies and programs increases education's contributions towards a peaceful society, thus hopefully reducing the likelihood of attacks on education and military use of schools.

Conflict-Sensitive Risk Informed-Programming Means*:* Ministries responsible for education or education partners (e.g. UN agencies or I/NGOs) *review* education policies and programs for how they might contribute to conflict and *reform* education policies and programs so that they maximize contributions towards peace. The three steps of risk-informed programming are as follows: 1) Plan the risk analysis; questions should include: who, what, where, when, why, and how (e.g. who are the parties responsible for carrying out attacks on education? Why are attacks taking place? What measures can be put in place to prevent attacks from occurring?); 2) Analyze the risks, including hazards, level of exposure, vulnerabilities, and capacity to prevent or respond; and 3) Use the findings of the analysis to devise "what if" scenarios for training and preparedness for education personnel and students and develop school-based safety and security plans that consist of a range of protective measures, including plans for continuity of education if attacks occur and monitoring and evaluation of attacks.

Summary of Panel Discussion
UNESCO IIEP and *PEIC*
Mr. Sigsgaard explained that manuals and guidebooks developed by UNESCO IIEP and PEIC identify five areas of conflict-sensitivity in education policymaking and programming and urge states to: 1) mobilize political will and capacity amongst all stakeholders to make education conflict-sensitive; 2) promote equitable access to all levels of education for all school-age children; 3) make curriculum, teaching, and language conflict-sensitive by reviewing these materials for how they might cause tension and revise these materials where necessary; 4) strengthen emergency preparedness and include measures intended to protect education in emergency plans; and 5) identify and address other issues that, through education, might be causing conflict (e.g. corruption, exclusion of refugees from education programming).[18]

UNICEF
According to Ms. Haiplik, UNICEF's "how to" guidance for conflict-sensitive education policymaking and programming help to support UNICEF staff and partners (including ministries of education) to analyze risk and understand how to adapt education policies and programs to build the resilience of communities, school systems, and children. The "how to" guide outlines seven steps for persons conducting a risk analysis: 1) define the scope of the risk; 2) identify all stakeholders who can respond to the risk; 3) identify hazards and expose vulnerabilities and capacity (of responders); 4) identify which risks pose the greatest threat; 5) plan and budget for different scenarios and contingencies; 6) adapt existing programs to be sensitive to risk; and 7) conduct on-going monitoring and evaluation of education programming.

---

[18] These resources are available at http://education4resilience.iiep.unesco.org/.

South Sudan
According to Mr. Dut Chol, the South Sudan Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology (MoEST) is working with UNICEF and UNESCO IIEP to integrate conflict-sensitive education into national education policies. Specific examples include the South Sudan Draft National Policy, which integrates life skills and peacebuilding[19] components; endorsement of the 'Learning Spaces as Zones of Peace'[20] initiative; the provision of psychosocial support for child soldiers and ex-combatants; integration of c-DRR into Education Sector Planning; community-level emergency preparedness plans that include measures intended to allow for education continuity in conflict-affected areas or when schools are directly attacked; and the establishment of a monitoring and evaluation working group to collect ongoing data on the impact of these initiatives.

Issues and Considerations Regarding Implementation of the Measure
- Review national education policies and programs to determine whether and how they contribute to conflict, peace, or both.
- Foster trusting relationships between national and local Ministry staff and school communities by consulting with people from diverse identity groups about how best to protect education.
- Integrate conflict-sensitive curriculum and establish conflict-sensitive language of instruction and access policies.

Advocacy with States to Encourage them to Endorse the Safe Schools Declaration and Implement the *Guidelines*

Presenter
Ms. Veronique Aubert, *Save the Children* (Senior Conflict and Humanitarian Researcher and Policy Adviser)

Summary of the Measure
By joining the Safe Schools Declaration, states are endorsing and committing to use the *Guidelines for Protecting Schools and Universities from Military Use during Armed Conflict* and committing to implement other measures to protect education during armed conflict.

What are States Committing to in Endorsing the Safe Schools Declaration?
Ms. Aubert discussed how, by joining the Safe Schools Declaration, in addition to endorsing the *Guidelines*, states are committing to take other concrete measures to better protect education; these commitments include collecting data on attacks on education, providing support to victims, investigating unlawful attacks on schools and universities and prosecuting those responsible, promoting conflict-sensitive education, and supporting the efforts of the international community to protect education from attack. 51 states have already endorsed the Declaration as of November 2015. Different government entities can be involved in the decision to join the Safe Schools Declaration and implement the *Guidelines,* but typically the three main entities are:

---

[19] UNICEF defines peacebuilding as a system wide undertaking across multiple sectors, including but not limited to education, that include a multidimensional range of interventions that aim to solidify peace and prevent the lapse or relapse of conflict. See: http//learningforpeace.unicef.org.
[20] The Learning Spaces as Zones of Peace initiative is similar in design to Nepal's SZOP initiative. For more information on SZOP, see p. 8 of this report.

- *Ministry of Foreign Affairs.* Because the Safe Schools Declaration was developed in an international setting, endorsement is typically formalized through this Ministry;
- *Ministry of Defense/armed forces*. Because the *Guidelines* concern military activities, this ministry will be implementing them; and
- *Ministry of Education*. Because both the Declaration and the *Guidelines* aim to protect education, this Ministry will likely be willing to act as an advocate within the government to encourage endorsement.

Elements Involved in Advocacy
- Research an acute issue that needs to be changed (e.g. military use of schools) and raise awareness on the issue by highlighting where and how it is happening and how endorsing the Safe Schools Declaration and implementing the *Guidelines* can help to address it;
- Mainstream discussion of the Safe Schools Declaration in conversations related to child protection;
- Initiate inter-departmental and cross-sectoral dialogues on the issue;
- Identify advocacy targets in the Ministry of Defense, Ministry of Education, and Ministry of Foreign Affairs and request briefing meetings with them; and
- Mobilize civil society and donors to also help raise awareness about the Safe Schools Declaration.

PART 3: ACTION PLANNING

The final Workshop session involved each country team developing an action plan for implementing a promising protective measure as well as an action plan for advocating for endorsement of the Safe Schools Declaration and implementation of the *Guidelines*.

Development of Action Plans

During this session, participants worked with their country teams to develop action plans that country teams would implement in their own countries following the Workshop. Each country team developed action plans on advocacy for endorsement of the Safe Schools Declaration or, if their state had already endorsed the Declaration, for implementation of the *Guidelines,* and a plan for developing and implementing a priority measure(s) for protecting education from attack. At the time of the Workshop, the following participating countries had endorsed the Safe Schools Declaration: Afghanistan, the Central African Republic, Kenya, Nigeria, Palestine, and South Sudan. **Table 1** summarizes country teams' Action Plans.

TABLE 1: ACTION PLANS FOR ADVOCACY AND PRIORITY MEASURE(S)

Afghanistan	Strengthen monitoring and reporting systems at national and local levels by: *-Reactivating a tracking system for attacks on education formerly implemented by the Ministry of Education; and* *-Designing a rapid response system for when attacks occur.* Implement the Safe Schools Declaration by: *- Advocating for legislation that prohibits military use of schools; and* *-Integrating a paragraph on the Guidelines into the National Education Strategy Plan.*

Central African Republic	Establish a Working Group within the Education Cluster to coordinate the implementation of the *Guidelines*. Engage in negotiations with armed groups to end military occupation of schools.
Colombia	Strengthen school-based safety and security planning by: *-Strengthening existing monitoring and reporting systems to facilitate rapid response to attacks; and* *-Establishing community-based mechanisms to provide oversight and accountability for implementation of school risk management plans.* Advocate for endorsement of the Safe Schools Declaration.
Democratic Republic of the Congo	Advocate for endorsement of the Safe Schools Declaration by: *-Integrating messages regarding the importance of endorsing the Safe Schools Declaration and implementing the Guidelines at national celebrations (e.g. Child Rights Day).*
Kenya	Develop and implement school-based safety and security plans by: *-Working with school communities (including teachers, parents, and education personnel) to develop local strategies to protect schools from attack; and* *-Developing and implement an early-warning/SMS alert system.* Implement the *Guidelines.*
Mali	Develop and implement conflict-sensitive, risk-informed education policies and programs by: *-Promoting peace education in schools.* Conduct negotiations with parties to armed conflict to stop military use of schools. Advocate for the endorsement of the Safe Schools Declaration.
Nigeria	Develop and implement policy guidelines to support schools as zones of peace by: *-Presenting policy documents to national assembly to enact as national law.* Strengthen existing monitoring and reporting systems.
Pakistan	Advocate for endorsement of the Safe Schools Declaration.
Palestine	Strengthen monitoring and reporting systems by: *-Providing training/refresher course on the MRM to education personnel.* Strengthen school-based safety and security planning by: *-Preparing contingency plans to ensure continuity of access to education for schools that are at high risk of attack; and* *-Conducting an assessment on which protective measures (e.g. boundary walls, protective presence, emergency preparedness training for education personnel) are most needed and developing and implement the measures identified.* Scale-up and strengthen the protective presence community initiative in Hebron and support other similar initiatives in Palestine.

	Implement the Safe Schools Declaration by: *-Providing advocacy, technical support, and capacity development to ensure understanding of the Safe Schools Declaration amongst key stakeholders.*
Somalia	Advocate for endorsement of the Safe Schools Declaration. Implement the *Guidelines.*
South Sudan	Develop and implement school-based safety and security plans at the national and local level by: *-Conducting a risk analysis; and* *-Working with school communities (including teachers, parents, and education personnel) to develop local strategies to protect schools from attack.* Implement the Safe Schools Declaration by: *-Holding national events to raise awareness of the Safe Schools Declaration and disseminating the Guidelines.*

Concluding Remarks

Over the course of the three-day Workshop, participants had an opportunity to share information about promising measures to protect education currently being implemented in countries impacted by attacks and military use of schools; identify challenges faced in implementing protective measures; and develop action plans for each country team for developing and implementing a promising protective measure as well as an advocacy strategy for encouraging their state to endorse the Safe Schools Declaration or implement the *Guidelines*. Looking within and across Workshop presentations and discussions, a number of interrelated points of consideration emerge.

- First and perhaps foremost, context matters. What might "work" as a protective measure in or within a particular locale in one country might not work or easily transfer within or across countries. Nonetheless, participants found commonalities in their contexts and identified elements of the different practices shared that could be adapted to their own circumstances to better protect education from attack.
- Second, comparatively few countries or UN agencies/INGOs/NGOs implementing measures intended to protect education have conducted evaluations on the impact of those protective measures over time. Developing an empirical evidence-base of the contexts and conditions under which particular protective measures work is important for timely and targeted implementation of these measures as well as for deepening an understanding of the conditions under which policies and programs developed and implemented in one context might be appropriately transferred and implemented in another. Nevertheless, there is an anecdotal knowledge base amongst policymakers and practitioners of what works in their own context.
- Third, there is recognition among policymakers and practitioners that many protective measures bring both opportunities and risks. Participants offered examples of protective measures (e.g. armed school guards) intended to mitigate attacks that in some contexts conversely provoked further attacks—a phenomenon that underscores the need for further research on the processes of developing and implementing protective measures as well as the impact and outcome(s) of those measures following implementation.
- Finally, there is extraordinary work being undertaken by individuals and organizations in situations of extreme adversity, with very limited resources, and that sometimes involves

personal risk. But perhaps most importantly, there is a great willingness to work together, share information and resources, and continue to collaborate across sectors, organizations, and countries to protect education from attack and schools from military use. Country teams drew upon the information shared during Workshop presentations and discussions from a wide range of countries and contexts to develop their action plans. As of March 2016, progress on implementing these action plans had already been made and includes:

- o In Afghanistan, the Ministry of Education issued an internal directive to the rest of the government highlighting the fact that the government had endorsed the [Safe Schools Declaration](#) and that armed forces should therefore not use schools for military purposes.
- o Country team members from the Central African Republic included in the country's 2016 Humanitarian Response Plan monitoring of attacks on education as well as advocacy and dissemination of the Safe Schools Declaration. Additionally, plans are underway to strengthen an existing SMS system used both for early warning and monitoring of attacks.
- o In Colombia, UNICEF, the Ministry of Education, and the PLAN Foundation reached an agreement to strengthen existing provincial education offices' risk management programs in schools. As part of this new plan, these organizations will coordinate how they report on attacks on education, including by specifying the types of attacks as well as how and when attacks occurred. Additionally, UNICEF is conducting a risk analysis on attacks on education and military use of schools that will inform the development of country guidelines on the protection of schools. Finally, there are efforts underway to centralize reporting of attacks into a system that is shared amongst a number of stakeholders (e.g. UNICEF, the National Victims Unit, the Colombian Agency for Reintegration) in order to better coordinate responses to attacks.
- o Country team members in Mali worked with the Education Cluster to develop a comprehensive strategy to protect education from attack that includes key actions and recommendations on three levels—political, school, and community.
- o In Nepal, World Education-Nepal staff carried out advocacy for endorsement of the Safe Schools Declaration with the Department of Education.
- o In Nigeria, country team members conducted advocacy with the Ministry of Education on the implementation of the Safe Schools Declaration in Yobe and Borno states. Advocacy focuses on reduced visibility of soldiers (in military uniforms and with arms) from the Education Corps of the Army who are engaged in the distribution of education supplies in schools located in camps for internally displaced persons.
- o Somalia endorsed the Safe Schools Declaration just three weeks after the Workshop and country team members are conducting advocacy on the cessation of military use of schools.
- o In South Sudan, country team members presented the action plans at an Education Joint Sector Review meeting. Additionally, the Peacebuilding through Education Technical Committee agreed to prioritize advocacy for implementation of the Safe Schools Declaration through raising awareness amongst a range of stakeholders of South Sudan's endorsement, and of commitments included in the Safe Schools Declaration.

It is hoped that these are the first of many Workshop outcomes that will help to strengthen protection against attacks on education, limit military use of schools, and effect lasting change in the lives of students, educators, and communities in conflict zones throughout the world.