Humanitarian-Development Coherence in Education:

Working together in crisis contexts

Inter-agency Network for Education in Emergencies

Acknowledgments:

Table of Contents

Acronyms

AE	Accelerated Education
AENN	Addressing Education in Northeast Nigeria
AES	Alternative Education Systems
AEWG	Accelerated Education Working Group
CBO	Community Based Organization
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DEOs	District Education Offices
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
ECHO	Directorate-General for European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations, European Commission
ECW	Education Cannot Wait
EiE	Education in Emergencies
EiEWG	Education in Emergencies Working Group
EMIS	Education Management Information System
ERWG	Education Resilience Working Group
ESP	Education-Sector Plan
GEC	Global Education Cluster
GPE	Global Partnership for Education
GRF	Global Refugee Forum
ICRC	International Committee of the Red Cross
IIEP	International Institute for Educational Planning
IDP	Internally Displaced Persons
INEE	Inter-agency Network for Education in Emergencies
LEG	Local Education Group
MoE	Ministry of Education
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NWOW	New Way of Working
OCHA	United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
ODI	Overseas Development Institute
PEIC	Protect Education in Insecurity and Conflict: Education Above All
REWG	Refugee Education Working Group
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
UNESCO	UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNHCR	UN High Commissioner for Refugees
UNICEF	UN Children's Fund
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

Executive Summary

The education sector is charged with a responsibility to ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all, per Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG4). The current trend of complex and longer-term crises, whether caused by the climate emergency, violent conflict, or a pandemic, threatens progress toward SDG4 targets. As the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic has taught us, no country or education system is immune from crisis; therefore, building resilience is the key not only to avoiding losses but to sustaining and progressing toward our shared goals in the education sector. Collective action is needed across the humanitarian-development spectrum to build inclusive and adaptable education systems that are prepared for and have the capacity to respond to crises, so that every child and young person has a chance to go to school, stay in school, and complete a full cycle of primary and secondary education.

This report is aimed at members of the Inter-agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE), which includes a broad range of humanitarian, development, government, and civil society actors who are working to ensure that all individuals have the right to a quality, safe, relevant, and equitable education. The purpose of the report is to demystify the concept of humanitarian-development coherence and to propose a set of actions and recommendations to strengthen such coherence in the education sector. The report also provides guidelines for INEE members and education stakeholders to take collective action, and to advocate for improved coherence within their own agencies and across the education sector's full spectrum of policy and programming.

This report recapitulates the concept of humanitarian-development coherence and why it is critical, provides an overview of barriers to coherence in the education sector, identifies illustrative examples of coherent action, and offers concrete recommendations for improved coherence, as summed up through a "Learn-Convene-Adapt" framework.

To explain the concept of humanitarian-development coherence, this paper adopts the New Ways of Working definition, which describes humanitarian-development coherence as working over multiple years toward collective outcomes, based on the comparative advantage of a diverse range of actors (see definitions, p. 6). The paper argues that humanitarian-development coherence is critical to ensuring that all children have access to uninterrupted quality education, which promotes their increased resilience and overall development. While education can provide significant benefits for individuals, communities, and countries, establishing resilient education systems requires multi-year planning, coordination, and investment in the education sector.

To unpack the bottlenecks to coherence in education, the paper uses the conceptual framework proposed in the USAID white paper, *Education and Humanitarian-*

Development Coherence (Nicolai et al., 2019). This framework outlines three levels of action that influence conditions for coherence: Norms, Capacities, and Operations. The barriers identified and explored in the paper are the following:

NORMS

- Balancing humanitarian and development mandates is challenging, particularly in conflict contexts.

CAPACITIES

- Coordination is siloed and without structural links to bring humanitarian and development coordination bodies together.
- Local capacity to support education in crises is mixed and requires further support.
- Specialization has led to a lack of cross-over capacity between humanitarian and development systems and programming.

OPERATIONS

- Different response timeframes separate humanitarian and development planning and action.
- Many layers of education planning, and therefore programming, occur independently.

The paper outlines six recommendations for addressing these barriers to coherence and three ways of working that are required to deliver on the recommendations, which are as follows:

1. **Use common frameworks and standards to balance the prioritization of humanitarian and development commitments.**

2. **Join-up humanitarian and development education coordination systems.**

3. **Strengthen local education actors' capacity to respond to crisis.**

4. **Build cross-over capacity so that more education actors have a comprehensive understanding of the sector, including key humanitarian and development processes.**

5. **Ensure that national education-sector plans address the needs of children and youth in crisis contexts and that humanitarian plans align with national priorities and processes.**

6. **Incorporate disaster risk reduction and education in emergencies approaches into national education systems so they are ready to respond to the needs of children and youth in crisis situations.**

To deliver on these recommendations, the paper proposes a Learn-Convene-Adapt framework. These three ways of working are common to promising practices in coherence, as they create the conditions necessary for partners to identify and work together toward collective outcomes for children and youth affected by crisis.

LEARN

Education-sector government, humanitarian, and development agencies need to learn more about the wider education system and about each other, including understanding each other's mandates and approaches. This learning includes documenting coherence approaches and interventions to inform future practice at the operational level.

CONVENE

Convening diverse stakeholders to conduct joint analyses and seek opportunities to work toward collective outcomes is critical, starting with open dialogue and finding common ground for meaningful collaboration. In multi-mandate organizations and ministries of education, systematic internal channels for dialogue and linkage between humanitarian and development divisions are also needed.

ADAPT

Coherence also requires actors across the spectrum to consider how they can adapt and lean a little toward the other side, while still maintaining their essential mandates and accountability. Such adaptation requires consideration of what new or different human and financial resources are needed to support coherence most effectively.

Introduction

When the COVID-19 crisis first peaked in early 2020, more than 1.5 billion children—roughly 90 percent of primary and secondary students worldwide—were out of school due to measures taken to control the spread of the virus (UNESCO, 2020a). Because COVID-19 compounds the many factors that contribute to the disruption of education in crisis contexts, a structured, systematic approach to collaboration between humanitarian and development partners has never been more crucial to supporting the right to education for all children and youth. Since the scale of the COVID-19 crisis affects entire national populations, education clusters and refugee education working groups (REWGs) did what made the most sense—they connected with national education response plans to ensure that the needs of crisis-affected children were included in those plans. Joint initiatives, such as the Global Education Coalition convened by UNESCO, brought diverse education partners together to find solutions.

Humanitarian-development coherence is a broad and complex topic that relates to many aspects of education, from policy and coordination to planning, financing, and programming. It brings together actors with different mandates, points of view, and institutional cultures, thus finding common ground is not automatic. It is, rather, the result of a sometimes long process of dialogue and trust-building. A recent report titled Financing the Nexus found that, although the purpose and scope of nexus approaches are not yet clear at the country level, many country-level examples of thematic, sectoral, and area-based nexus approaches offer useful lessons and the potential to scale up (Poole & Culbert, 2019, p. 6). Confirming the observations in the nexus report, the desk study and interviews conducted for this report found that there are mixed levels of understanding and engagement with humanitarian-development coherence in the education sector, and that a variety of structural barriers stand in the way of its operationalization. Nevertheless, many practical examples of coherence are being implemented at the global and country level as education partners increasingly recognize that united, coordinated action is essential if we are to meet Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG4) targets by 2030.

This report is aimed at Inter-agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE) members, which include a broad range of humanitarian, development, government, and civil society actors working to ensure that all individuals have the right to a quality, safe, relevant, and equitable education. The purpose of the report is to demystify the concept of humanitarian-development coherence and propose a set of actions and recommendations to strengthen coherence in the education sector. The report also provides guidelines for INEE members and education

stakeholders to take collective action, and to advocate for improved coherence within their own agencies and across the education sector's spectrum of policy and programming.

The report is organized simply. It begins with an explanation of key terms and concepts related to humanitarian-development coherence, followed by an analysis of the structural and operational barriers that have reinforced siloed ways of working over time. It concludes with proposed new ways of working and recommendations for addressing key barriers to coherence. It highlights examples of promising practices that are already being implemented and could be pursued more systematically in order to lay a foundation for stronger collaboration across the education sector. The report is not comprehensive or definitive; rather, it proposes ways to think about and approach humanitarian-development coherence in the education sector, which will serve as a springboard for multi-stakeholder dialogue that will help to unpack the rich complexities and opportunities in this area.

METHODOLOGY

This report was commissioned by the INEE Humanitarian-development Task Force. The content is based on a desk review of primarily grey literature on the topic, as well as informant interviews with 34 individuals who represent a range of organizations working in education in crisis and crisis-prone situations, including UN agencies, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), donors, and education networks. The informant interviews provided a sampling of organizational approaches and activities related to coherence in the sector, and they were used to identify examples of promising practices. The report relies on a couple of existing frameworks: the New Way of Working (NWOW) framework is used to explain the concept of coherence; the conceptual framework of norms, capacities, and operations, which is laid out in the USAID white paper, Education and Humanitarian-Development Coherence (Nicolai et al., 2019), is used to structure analyses of key challenges to coherence and to make recommendations. The recommendations and ways of working presented at the end of the report emerged directly from the analysis of barriers, the mapping of promising practices, and a gathering of recommendations from key policy documents relating to coherence. Drafts of the report were reviewed at several stages by the INEE Humanitarian-development Task Force members and invited external reviewers.

There are a number of limitations to the scope and depth of this report. One drawback is the dearth of documentation on humanitarian-development coherence in education, particularly at the operational level. Informant interviews were skewed to global or regional personnel; the perspectives of local-level and ministry of education (MoE) actors would have deepened the analysis. A primary limitation was the lack of opportunity for a face-to-face, multi-stakeholder consultation with INEE working group members to refine and vet key content, which had been planned but was not possible due to COVID-19 travel restrictions. Due to time and scope limitations, some key topics, such as finance, peace-building, and disaster risk reduction (DRR), are not detailed in the report. These topics should be prioritized in the coming years as the dialogue and documentation on coherence in education evolves.

The paper is an initial contribution to the INEE community from INEE's Education Policy Working Group and Advocacy Working Group. The hope is that both humanitarian and development actors will further develop and expand on what is presented here, as much work remains to be done to untangle the complexity of a coherent education response.

What is humanitarian development coherence in education?

BOX 1

Examples of global commitments promoting humanitarian-development coherence

- **New Ways of Working** and **Grand Bargain**
- **Global Compact on Refugees**
- **Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction**
- **Sustainable Development Goal 4**

Humanitarian-development coherence is not a new concept; partners in crisis and crisis-prone contexts have been working on it in various ways for years. The concept has recently gained currency due to trends in the global humanitarian emergency landscape, including unprecedented escalation in the number of forcibly displaced people and protracted crisis situations, the ongoing climate emergency, and a number of global policy commitments (see Box 1). However, while "humanitarian-development coherence" is a term used ubiquitously, what it really means and how it should be operationalized is not well understood or at least is differently understood across practitioners. This section explains the concept of humanitarian-development coherence and what it means in the education sector, as well as key terms used in the report.

BOX 2

Terms used in the report

Humanitarian-development coherence: See definition in the main text. Following the usage in the USAID White Paper (Nicolai et al., 2019, pp. 13, 17), this term describes linkages between the two types of international assistance in order to achieve more cost-effective, sustainable results for crisis-affected countries and populations. "Coherence" is an umbrella term that includes the humanitarian-development nexus, which refers more specifically to the meeting point of humanitarian and development approaches, and the triple nexus, which includes a peace-building dimension.

Humanitarian and development actors: This term refers to organizations whose mandates, ways of working, response timeframes, and funding streams are predominantly associated with one of the two forms of assistance. However, in many instances, these distinctions may be blurred. While some agencies, entities, and donors (e.g., Education Cannot Wait, Norwegian Refugee Council, the Global Education Cluster, and ECHO) have a clear mandate to provide humanitarian assistance to people in need, many multi-mandate organizations (e.g., UNICEF, Save the Children, and UNHCR, whose role in seeking durable solutions for refugees extends beyond humanitarian assistance) work in both humanitarian and development spaces. Many development-focused organizations and donors are also working increasingly, sometimes predominantly, in crisis contexts (e.g., Global Partnership for Education, USAID, and the World Bank). Governments and MoEs are the most critical actors in the humanitarian-development dynamics of education; they have the potential to harness both forms of assistance to benefit the resilience and reach of education systems.

Crisis and crisis-prone contexts: In the report, the term "crisis" is used in a general way to cover a broad range of acute and chronic crisis situations, including emergencies caused by climate events and other natural disasters, situations of violence, political unrest and conflict, forced displacement, and pandemic. The dynamics influencing humanitarian-development coherence are context specific and vary considerably, depending on the type and duration of a crisis and on pre-existing conditions. Humanitarian-development coherence is also crucial in crisis-prone situations, where preparedness and prevention can mitigate risks and ensure a rapid and effective response.

In this report, the NWOW—a global framework for humanitarian-development coherence signed by UN agencies at the World Humanitarian Summit and widely supported by states, donors, and NGOs—is used to explain the concept of humanitarian-development coherence.

Humanitarian-development coherence involves working over multiple years toward collective outcomes, based on the comparative advantage (see definition below) of a diverse range of actors.

The NWOW has been instrumental in driving a shift from humanitarian and development actors working in silos to a more integrated and collaborative approach to reducing humanitarian need, risk, and vulnerability (OCHA, 2017, p. 7). Joint context analysis, planning, programming, coordination, and financing are key areas for coherence. Current approaches emphasize that joint humanitarian and development efforts should "reinforce, not replace" the capacities that already exist at the national and local level. This approach, known as localization, recognizes that local authorities and actors are best placed to lead and link emergency response to preparedness and recovery. Coherence is not considered a linear handing over of programming from humanitarian to development partners; rather, it recognizes that, in crisis situations, humanitarian and development actors need to collaborate and work side-by-side (OCHA, 2017, pp. 6-7). Coherence includes a continuum of activities, ranging from information-sharing between actors, to joint planning and programming, to developing a collective vision of resilient education systems.

The concept of resilience underpins humanitarian-development efforts to achieve coherence: that is, to ensure that education systems, children, youth, and communities are prepared for and can quickly recover from crisis. As a recent UNICEF guidance note on risk-informed education programming puts it, "across the continuum of development and humanitarian activities, policies and programs must be informed by risk if they are to help make populations more resilient and social services better equipped to withstand cycles of crisis" (UNICEF Education Section, 2019, p. 9). The World Bank Group's Systems Approach for Better Education Results and Education Resilience Approach highlight the need for countries to invest in resilient education systems in order to promote protection, psychosocial well-being, and additional success factors. This reflects the premise that "individuals, organizations and societies possess inherent assets and engagement capacities that—if recognized and fostered—can not only support the recovery of education systems after crisis, but can also contribute to positive student performance and learning outcomes" (World Bank Group, 2013, p. 6).

The NWOW framework is intended for and so far has been used to set desired national-level multi-sectoral outcomes. It also can be a useful and practical starting point for talking about coherence at the sector level. The following are key elements of the NWOW framework as they relate to the education sector.

- **A collective outcome** is "a commonly agreed quantifiable and measurable result or impact in reducing people's needs, risks and vulnerabilities and increasing their resilience, requiring the combined effort of different actors" (OCHA, 2017, p. 7).

  Collective outcomes are the result of multi-stakeholder dialogue, which brings government, humanitarian and development actors, local communities, and other beneficiaries together to conduct a joint analysis of children's and youth's educational needs and to identify the outcome that all actors will work to achieve. **SDG4—to ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all**—is the highest level collective outcome in education. The Education 2030 Framework for Action, which specifically refers to education in conflict settings, further links SDG4 to education in emergencies (EiE). The framework emphasizes that "urgent efforts should be made to significantly increase support for education in humanitarian responses and protracted crises according to the needs and to ensure a rapid response to conflict and crisis situations" (UNESCO, 2016, para. 107).

In emergency situations, the INEE Minimum Standards for Education are a key tool for convening education stakeholders around common standards and outcomes. Collective outcomes for education in crisis contexts can be generated at both national (see Box 3) and programmatic levels. Education actors also can contribute to efforts by actors in child protection and other sectors, leading to collective outcomes to reduce vulnerability and increase resilience.[1]

- **A comparative advantage** is "the capacity and expertise of one individual, group or institution to meet needs and contribute to risk and vulnerability reduction, over the capacity of another actor" (OCHA, 2017, p. 7).

Humanitarian and development actors bring a range of diverse mandates and expertise to the education field. Humanitarian-development coherence does not mean that humanitarian actors need to do development work, or vice versa. On the contrary, it means that each actor is able to contribute to collective outcomes by leveraging their particular specialization, expertise, and strengths before, during, and after a crisis.

- **A multi-year timeframe** involves "analysing, strategizing, planning and financing operations that build over several years to achieve context-specific and, at times, dynamic targets" (OCHA, 2017, p. 7).

Education is a multi-year endeavor; crisis response is increasingly so in many global contexts. Humanitarian-development collaboration can be especially effective in supporting education continuity through all phases of the crisis-response timeline. This requires supporting the institutionalization of emergency preparedness, as well as delivering education services in protracted crisis and early recovery situations. Multi-year planning can enable smooth transitions, which will allow programs and actors to be sequenced so that their comparative advantages are used appropriately.

BOX 3

The Education Response Plan for Refugees and Host Communities in Uganda: An example of the humanitarian-development coherence framework in action

Uganda hosts approximately 1.4 million refugees, making it the African host country with the largest refugee population. At the time Uganda's response plan was published, the country was host to more than 616,000 school-age refugee children, of which 43 percent were enrolled in education services. The basic need for classrooms and teachers was high; for example, 6,987 additional teachers were required to serve all refugee children of primary school age in the country (Ministry of Education and Sports, 2018, p. 13).

---

1   Cross-sectoral linkages between education and child protection are being addressed through parallel pieces of work by the Global Education Cluster and the Child Protection Area of Responsibility, as well as INEE and the Alliance for Child Protection in Humanitarian Action.

The Education Response Plan for Refugees and Host Communities in Uganda is a three-and-a-half-year costed plan that convenes and aligns diverse actors around collective outcomes, leveraging their complementary roles. The plan aligns with Uganda's national education-sector plan (ESP) and the national Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework. A phased approach is being followed over the multi-year timeframe.

Collective outcome

"*Ensure that all refugee children and adolescents, as well as children within the host communities, have access to good quality education at all levels, irrespective of refugees' country of origin and their location in Uganda*" (p. 7).

Comparative advantage

The plan lays out the complementary roles and responsibilities of a range of actors who will help achieve the collective outcome. The following roles and responsibilities are excerpted directly from the plan by the Government of Uganda and the Ministry of Education and Sports:

"*The overall coordination of the plan will be the responsibility of MoEs. The implementation of the plan also depends on coordination between the Office of the Prime Minister (OPM), other line ministries, departments and agencies, district local governments and municipalities, development partners, private sector, NGOs, faith-based organisations, community-based organisations, and communities*" (p. 40).

Development partners

To achieve results at scale, the Ministry of Education and Sports will engage with donor agencies, UN agencies, and other education partners to mobilize resources and coordinate the implementation of interventions most efficiently, including monitoring and evaluation.

Implementing partners

Implementing partners, such as UN agencies, international and other NGOs, private providers, government bodies, etc., will cooperate with district- and settlement-level authorities to ensure a harmonized approach. Implementing partners will need to liaise effectively with refugee and host communities to ensure the success and relevance of activities.

Public-private institutions

Because more than 20 percent of schools are private providers of early childhood education, primary and secondary education, and skills training, the private sector must be engaged in order to harness their contribution, expand the provision of services and capacities, create sustainable education approaches, and provide more resources to support the plan.

Refugee and host communities

Communities and parents play an important role in ensuring that school-age children go to school, as do school-level groups such as school management committees, parent-teacher associations, and refugee welfare committees. Parents also contribute monetarily and/or in kind to their children's education and school meals.

HUMANITARIAN-DEVELOPMENT COHERENCE: WHY IT MATTERS

Achieving collective outcomes and leveraging complementarity among actors in complex, politically sensitive settings is not as straightforward as it sounds. It is important to understand why this approach is necessary, as well as how substantially children and youth in crisis contexts can benefit from it. In this section, we present various challenges often encountered in this approach and offer four compelling reasons why humanitarian-development coherence is worth the international community's concerted investment.

Access to uninterrupted quality education is a right for all children and youth, including those affected by protracted crisis and conflict.

At the UN Sustainable Development Summit held in September 2015, member states formally adopted the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, including SDG4, which ensures "inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all" (UNESCO, 2020b, para. 1).

Despite this commitment, the international community is currently failing millions of children and youth living in crisis- and conflict-affected settings. Even before the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic, an estimated 75 million children and youth were out of school due to conflict or crisis (ODI, 2016). As a result of the pandemic, it is likely that millions more young learners will never return to school, or will need alternatives to formal education if they want to complete their education.

A commitment to sustained education services to ensure that all children and youth can complete their educational journey from pre-school to basic to higher education—even if their education has been impacted by crisis or conflict—is a critical element of the global community's SDG commitment. It must be upheld.

The only way to honor crisis- and conflict-affected learners' right to uninterrupted quality education is to respond to their immediate education needs, while planning at the same time for continuity of education in the face of increasingly complex and protracted crises—as set out in INEE's Minimum Standards for Education. Based on the premise that education is a fundamental human right for all people, the Minimum Standards (INEE, 2010) highlight a number of key actions that can be taken in situations of crisis and throughout the relief-development transition in order to ensure education continuity, including education planning that incorporates community participation (Domain 1, Community Participation Standard 1), strong coordination mechanisms (Domain 1, Coordination Standard 1), and law and policy formation that prioritizes education continuity (Domain 5, Standard 1), among others.

Honoring SDG4 requires planning ahead, since risks are inherent features of life even in stable development contexts, and they must be accounted for in education-sector planning. Only such planning will enable us to limit disruptions to quality education when crisis or conflict occurs (e.g., pandemic, civil unrest and violence, natural disasters). Crisis-sensitive education planning is critical to reducing the negative impact that crises have on education, and to promoting the development of education policies and programs that will help prevent future crises. Key parts of crisis-sensitive education plan-

ning include overcoming inequality and exclusion in education, developing strategies to respond adequately to crises, and ensuring access to education even in challenging contexts (UNESCO IIEP, n.d.).

Education is a cornerstone for individual, family, community, and societal resilience, and therefore is essential to overall development.

Due to the growing length and complexity of modern crises, many crisis- or conflict-affected children and youth will age-out of formal schooling opportunities without ever having set foot in a classroom; others' education will be cut short or fragmented, which likely will result in poor learning outcomes and no certificate of completion. Yet we know that sustained access to quality education is truly a lifeline, particularly for crisis- and conflict-affected learners, not only because it affords a sense of stability and hope for the future but because it offers learners a productive pathway out of the crisis- or conflict-related challenges they must endure, through no fault of their own. Education improves indicators of poverty reduction, health, child protection, livelihoods, and civic participation (UNESCO, 2014). In particular, enabling young people to complete the full cycle of basic education up to the secondary level brings significant benefits to individuals, communities, and countries, such as higher earning capacity and lower infant mortality rates (UNESCO, 2014).

Building resilient education systems capable of sustaining learning for children and youth requires multi-year planning, coordination, and investment.

Due to its orientation toward risk and protection, humanitarian action has the potential to build resilience capacities at various levels of the education system. At the same time, the longer-term planning orientation of development action can support preparedness and responsiveness to the education needs of children and youth during a crisis. If **humanitarian and development approaches are combined, more resilient education systems could result**. The World Bank Group's Education Resilience Approach is one effort that links humanitarian response to rebuilding education systems in crisis-affected contexts with longer-term education system development, emphasizing that in conflict- and crisis-affected contexts, "quality and relevant education—guided by a resilience lens—can also enhance the opportunities for broader social transformation" (World Bank Group, 2013, p. 16). This can help to improve learners' safety, socioemotional well-being, and academic success.

International commitment to the UN 2030 Agenda recognizes that achieving the SDGs, including SDG4, requires sustained collective action and investment by governments. Because sustained access to quality education for learners affected by crisis and conflict is only possible through coherent multi-year humanitarian and development planning, the SDG commitment to collective action makes particular sense for the education sector. Government education strategies are designed with targeted goals tied to 2030 Agenda commitments and, typically, 10-year planning cycles. To support their implementation across humanitarian and development actors, a locally led, joint contextual analysis must reflect the current education system's strategic priorities and plans, and articulate how education reform efforts and investments will interact with contextual risks. This is a key component of conflict-sensitive education, which is the process of "(1) understanding the context in which education takes place; (2) analysing the two-way

interaction between the context and education programmes and policies (development, planning, and delivery); and (3) acting to minimize negative impacts and maximize positive impacts of education policies and programming on conflict, within an organization's given priorities" (INEE, 2013, p. 12). Acute response and recovery efforts thus can be linked to and advance long-term local education priorities.

This synergy can only be achieved through coordination and cooperation among national education authorities, humanitarian and development actors, and beneficiaries and host communities. Such efforts must leverage comparative strengths, build on the capacity of local systems where needed, and work together at different phases of the emergency to weave a net of support for children and youth so they will be able to continue through the full education cycle.

Leveraging the comparative advantage of education stakeholders across humanitarian-development spaces is more efficient and cost-effective.

Governments and multilateral donors spend hundreds of millions of dollars to fund humanitarian and development efforts to deliver critical education services to crisis- and conflict-affected learners. However, due to differing and sometimes conflicting timeframes, contractual requirements, and accountability structures, humanitarian and development education financing often is at cross-purposes. At best, these differences result in an uneven patchwork of education opportunities; at worst, they result in wasted time and money when humanitarian-funded gains aren't carried over to development-funded programming, or when development-funded education gains are rapidly eroded due to a failure to account for acute education needs that emerge when a sudden crisis erupts. **A coherent approach to education financing that includes (1) crisis-sensitive education planning and preparation, (2) rapid-response education services that are developed with long-term educational opportunity in mind, and (3) post-crisis uptake and coordination of relevant education services is the only way to ensure that governments and multilateral donors receive the return on investment that their stakeholders deserve and expect.**

Barriers to humanitarian-development coherence in the education sector

© J Arredondo, IRC
Colombia

While there is, in theory, a compelling case for humanitarian-development coherence, in practice, a cascade of structural and operational barriers effectively compartmentalize the two forms of international assistance. Siloed approaches begin with distinct mandates and extend to separate coordination, expertise, planning, financing, and programming. This section provides an overview of the key barriers to humanitarian-development coherence in the education sector. The good progress made in addressing these challenges and examples of promising practices are outlined in Section 5.

The ease of collaboration among government, humanitarian, and development actors is influenced by the strength of the education system in question, and the type and phase of crisis. A joint report by the International Committee of the Red Cross and Protect Education in Insecurity and Conflict (ICRC & PEIC, 2019, p. 12) notes that "weak education systems are less able to absorb and adapt to the shocks of conflict and other crises, making it difficult both to create sustainable 'education in emergencies' (humanitarian) programmes and to maintain the progress of development." In general, conflict environments and refugee situations tend to be politicized and volatile, which complicates efforts to unite humanitarian and development approaches. When emergencies associated with natural disasters occur in conflict-affected contexts, response efforts and efforts to mitigate risk can also be complicated by political dimensions and weak systems. Achieving coherence in protracted crisis settings has received a lot of attention, as both early recovery and the need for longer-term education solutions offer obvious opportunities for a joint response. However, investing in more resilient education systems and preparedness during periods of stability is equally important.

To more fully understand the bottlenecks that inhibit coherence in education, the conceptual framework proposed in the USAID white paper on humanitarian-development coherence (Nicolai et al., 2019, pp. 29-30) is used to highlight the drivers of the humanitarian-development divide. The framework outlines three levels of action that influence conditions for collaboration:

Norms guide education response in crisis contexts, and shape and define humanitarian and development assistance. Examples include principles, goals, standards, mandates, strategies, and expected outcomes.

Capacities address who leads and coordinates education support and identify key actors, coordinating groups, staff knowledge, and skills.

Operations address how education programs are planned and provided, including approaches, assessment processes, planning, finance, and monitoring.

NORMS

Balancing humanitarian and development mandates is challenging, particularly in conflict contexts.

Norms can be powerful drivers in both unifying actors and reinforcing silos. The distinct roles, accountabilities, and mandates of humanitarian and development actors are at the heart of the humanitarian-development divide and key drivers of the compartmentalization of capacities and operations. While development actors are committed to supporting national governments in reaching development goals, humanitarian actors are guided by the fundamental protection principle of "do no harm" and by the four humanitarian principles enshrined in UN General Assembly resolutions—humanity, neutrality, impartiality, and independence. These principles are essential to the ability to access and deliver humanitarian assistance to people affected by crisis.

Balancing longer-term development objectives with the urgency and impartiality required in providing lifesaving humanitarian assistance is a major challenge for humanitarian-development coherence. A report by Oxfam (2019, p. 4) explains it well: "Where long-term development goals are prioritized across the whole system, there is a risk that immediate humanitarian needs do not receive adequate responses. An increased emphasis on the role of state-led institutions risks squeezing out the acceptance and delivery of independent and impartial assistance. On the other hand, prioritizing humanitarian assistance across the response (as happens in many protracted and cyclical crises) risks failing to strengthen local systems to accountably provide essential social services." In many situations, humanitarian impartiality is at odds with the political dynamics that influence governments' and development partners' agendas.

MoEs, with their oversight and accountability for national education systems, are in the best position to coordinate the preparation of humanitarian and development actors to respond to emergencies and support recovery. However, working with and supporting MoEs (and other non-state education authorities in some conflict contexts) in situations where the government is a party to conflict can be complicated, and in some cases highly constrained. A joint humanitarian-development response can be difficult to achieve in conflict-affected contexts where control is fragmented between government and non-state armed groups or authorities: "Not only is access restricted by poor security conditions, but issues such as the payment of teachers and curriculum content can become particularly sensitive. The question of who holds responsibility for education services is also delicate and can affect the relationship between humanitarian/development agencies and the government" (ICRC & PEIC, 2019, p. 6).

In the case of the Syria response, members of the Education Dialogue Forum, which was set up to facilitate exchange between humanitarian and development partners, note that discussions often centered on negotiating between applying humanitarian principles to all children who require assistance and the political restrictions and sanctions on funding from development partners (K. Bryner, personal communication, April 30, 2020). In the Rohingya refugee response in Bangladesh, a policy banning use of the Bangladeshi curriculum required continuous advocacy with the MoE to try to change their stance, as well as difficult negotiations between partners on a suitable short-term curriculum option (Human Rights Watch, 2019). Successful solutions were negotiated in both cases, but it required considerable time and energy.

Besides the key challenge of negotiating priorities between humanitarian principles and development commitments, the two systems' distinct mandates have far-reaching consequences that also influence capacities and operations. Humanitarian agencies' mandate to provide impartial assistance to all those in need is protected and implemented through a separate humanitarian architecture, including coordination systems, planning, financing mechanisms, and programmatic approaches, which over time have shaped the structural, operational, and attitudinal divides between humanitarian and development actors.

CAPACITIES

Coordination is siloed, without structural links to bring together humanitarian and development coordinating bodies.

In crisis contexts, different country-level coordination systems exist to ensure accountability of the emergency response to population groups with distinct needs. Sector coordination is led by the MoE through an education-sector group, referred to in this report as the local education group (LEG), which is the mechanism commonly set up in countries where the Global Partnership for Education (GPE) is financing ESPs. The LEG coordinates development aid and policy dialogue for the sector and takes the lead on education-sector planning. The Global Education Cluster (GEC), co-led by UNICEF and Save the Children under the Inter-Agency Standing Committee Cluster System, coordinates education for settings with internally displaced persons (IDPs) and local emergency response. REWGs, led by UNHCR and MoEs, coordinate refugee education under the refugee coordination model, which has a specialized role in ensuring international protection of the rights of refugees. Joint coordination arrangements may be used in mixed settings where both refugee and IDP responses are under way.

The Global Partners Project, a collaboration between the GEC, UNHCR, and INEE, found that, in many settings, all three main coordination systems tend to function independently: "Humanitarian and development coordination systems for education are not systematically connected, and as a result, crisis affected children and youth may be invisible in national sector planning and processes" (INEE et al., 2020, p. 13). Several case studies on coordination conducted by the Overseas Development Institute (ODI) found an absence of structural links and a lack of designated leadership to ensure linkages between the coordination bodies. The Ethiopia case study, for example, notes that "a major challenge for coordination is that there is currently no official mechanism whose role it is to coordinate across the refugee and national education systems, as well as an absence of individuals or positions to fulfil this function" (Wales et al., 2020, p. 46).

Furthermore, the Chad and Democratic Republic of the Congo ODI studies show that coordination mechanisms tend to work independently of one another, despite the fact that many of the same agencies participate in both Education Cluster/REWG and LEG meetings (Wales et al., 2020; Dewulf et al., 2020). This disconnect is symptomatic of the internal compartmentalization between humanitarian and development teams within multi-mandated agencies, which in many countries lead and participate in both the LEG and Education Cluster and/or REWGs.

Disconnected coordination results in missed opportunities for information-sharing, joint analysis, and planning. Siloed coordination systems also contribute to a lack of visibility and accountability on either side—LEGs are less likely to take responsibility for education in crisis situations, whereas Education Cluster and REWGs may compromise education continuity and other quality inputs and resources for their beneficiaries.

Local capacity to support education in crises is mixed, thus it requires additional support.

Localization—"making principled humanitarian action as local as possible and as international as necessary" (IASC, n.d., para. 1) is a global commitment under the Grand Bargain, a global agreement between donors and humanitarian organizations to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of humanitarian action. The localization agenda recognizes that local authorities and actors are best placed to lead and link emergency response to preparedness and recovery. Localization supports national education systems' and actors' capacity for response and represents an important effort to address the systemic imbalance in power, finances, and decision-making in the aid architecture (Cornish, 2019).

In some countries, MoEs have the capacity and political will to lead emergencies, while basic resourcing and political sensitivities around crises prevent MoE engagement in others. ODI's synthesis report, *Strengthening Coordinated Planning and Response in Crisis Contexts* (Nicolai et al., 2020, pp. 34-35) notes that, "while national governments—typically in the form of the MoE—are responsible in all circumstances, there is wide variation in their willingness and capacity to take on leadership of education coordination." It recommends focusing on both "centralised capacities and localization, and on strengthening MoEs to better lead and support coordination in both name and practice." Local NGOs and civil society organizations (CSOs) often are denied humanitarian or development funding, as they lack the financial and management systems to meet donor requirements. However, these local actors often have a critical understanding of local contexts and thus are able to provide more appropriate and coherent support to communities where national government capacity is lacking.

Ultimately, a weak MoE and poor local capacity risk a reliance on fragmented international assistance; conversely, strong MoE leadership and high-capacity local actors are better placed to ensure linkages between preparedness, emergency response, and sector-plan objectives.

Specialization has led to lack of "cross-over" capacity.

Another challenge related to capacities is the systemic disconnect between humanitarian and development departments within and between agencies, and the subsequent lack of "cross-over" capacity—that is, people who have experience and expertise in navigating both humanitarian and development systems and programming.

Many government and development actors lack knowledge and understanding of humanitarian principles, architecture, and EiE approaches. To address this gap, some agencies, such as the Swiss Development Cooperation, have engaged in systematic EiE training to build the capacity of development-focused education staff. Conversely, EiE practitioners often lack knowledge of key education-sector systems, plans, and processes. The Global Partners Project report notes that "there is a critical capacity gap amongst EiE coordinators and practitioners to confidently engage with the LEG and development partners to advocate for education needs of crisis affected populations to be taken into consideration and explicitly addressed in sector planning processes" (INEE et al., 2020, p. 14). In addition, institutional capacity for longer-term programming in humanitarian agencies is limited, such as multi-year costing or resources for the large-scale institutionalization of programs, whereas conducting an agile rapid emergency response may be difficult for development agencies. Collaborating across the humanitarian-development divide also requires soft skills, such as negotiation, mediation, and managing a range of diverse actors around the delivery of collective outcomes.

The lack of cross-over capacity has a number of negative effects. The lack of understanding of the distinct humanitarian and development accountabilities, ways of working, and processes means that key opportunities for collaboration are often not visible or are overlooked. Lack of cross-over capacity also slows down collaboration, as finding common ground requires time for dialogue and building mutual understanding.

OPERATIONS

Different response timeframes separate humanitarian and development planning and action.

Humanitarian and development actors are separated by different operational, planning, and funding timeframes. Many humanitarian actors typically work within a narrow timeframe from the onset of a crisis to early recovery stages, whereas development actors focus on long-term, multi-year approaches. Opportunities for humanitarian and development linkages appear most obviously in protracted crisis situations, where emergency response blends into longer-term planning and solutions, as is the case in many refugee situations. The Global Humanitarian Overview (OCHA, 2019, p. 17) from the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs notes that, although climate change is expected to be a major driver of humanitarian need in the coming years, "climate adaptation efforts are not prioritized as a part of humanitarian response." However, climate adaptation, DRR, and emergency preparedness in some regions are still generally not well integrated into national systems and thus tend to "fall between the stools" of the response timeline. The

UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP) (2011, p. 13) offers guidance for MoEs on mainstreaming both conflict and DRR measures into education policy, planning, and programming in order to mitigate the risks posed by conflict and disasters associated with natural hazards. It also highlights the fact that reduction of conflict and disaster risk "not only saves lives, it is also cost effective: every US$1 invested in risk management before the onset of a disaster prevents US$7 in losses." Preparedness and DRR have been successfully integrated at the school and systems level in South East Asia, partly due to a regular cycle of crisis and recovery from environmental disasters, such as floods and cyclones, and to the high-level commitment of governments in the region to address this issue.

The gaps between response timeframes can have a critical impact on continuity of education, such as extended periods when children and youth are out of school due to a lack of preparedness or early recovery linkages between humanitarian and development interventions.

Many different layers of education planning, and therefore programming, occur independently.

Planning, which is closely linked to siloed coordination systems, also often occurs independently. At the national level, as shown in Box 4, there are several layers of planning for different purposes that cover different timeframes and population groups, and that are supported by distinct funding streams. The plans, which are associated with different coordinating bodies and processes, in many situations are designed independently of one another, resulting in inefficiencies, fragmented accountability, and gaps in long-term response. Poor coordination between humanitarian systems and the LEG hampers joint planning. In Cameroon, for example, UNHCR was able to contribute to the new ESP, including field knowledge, expertise on forced displacement, and data on children affected by crisis. However, there were challenges in staying abreast of the different steps of the sector planning, as there was limited coordination and communication between coordinating bodies. Joint planning processes are likely to be further hampered by the lack of cross-over capacity described above, as well as staff availability and overload.

BOX 4

Multiple education-related plans at country level (depending on types of active crises)

Multi-sector plans that include education	Timeframe	Description
UN Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework	Multi-year	Developed in partnership with the government; represents the UN development system's collective offer to support countries in addressing key SDG priorities and gaps
Humanitarian Response Plan informed by Humanitarian Needs Overview	Annual	Prepared for a protracted or sudden-onset emergency that requires international humanitarian assistance. The plan articulates the shared vision of how to respond to needs of the affected population and communicates the scope of the emergency response to donors and the public. The Humanitarian Needs Overview is a coordinated approach to the assessment of an emergency and to the prioritization of the needs of affected people, which lays the foundation for a coherent and efficient humanitarian response.
Refugee Response Plan	Multi-year	UNHCR-led, inter-agency planning and coordination tool for large-scale or complex refugee situations

Education-sector plans	Timeframe	Description
National ESP	Multi-year	A national policy instrument that presents the long-term strategic direction for accomplishing key policy priorities for the national education system
Transitional education plan	Multi-year	In situations where longer-term planning or the implementation of an existing ESP is compromised by contextual uncertainties, a transitional education plan enables the state and its partners (development, humanitarian, and civil society) to develop a structured plan that will maintain progress toward ensuring the right to education and longer-term educational goals.
National Education Cluster Strategy	Multi-year	Outlines the Cluster's approach and operational plan for responding to an emergency.
Refugee Education Strategy	Multi-year	Outlines the REWG's approach and operational plan for responding to a refugee crisis.
Multi-Year Resilience Program facilitated by ECW	Multi-year	Bridges the gap between emergency response and long-term development. Programs have a specific focus on reaching the most marginalized and vulnerable children and youth.

Fragmented planning across the sector means that planning, programming, and financing cannot be effectively coordinated, sequenced, or layered to effectively support continuity of education through all phases of a crisis. Separate international humanitarian and development funding streams are typically allocated for short-term emergency response and longer-term development projects, and while flexibility is improving, better coordination among donors is needed. In politically sensitive conflict situations in particular, essential recurrent costs such as teacher compensation continue to be difficult to finance, due to restrictions on humanitarian funding for institutional costs and sanctions that restrict development donors.

Disconnected planning also promotes siloed approaches to key processes, such as data collection and programming. Education data in crisis contexts are typically collected by humanitarian partners and are not systematically included in national education management information systems (EMIS), which renders children in crisis contexts invisible in national planning and budgeting.

Finally, many of the barriers described in this section contribute to disconnected humanitarian and development education programming. Risk-informed and crisis-sensitive education programming is insufficiently integrated into national systems. For example, teachers working with displaced populations generally lack specialized pre-service or in-service training and support to cope with multi-level, multilingual, and multicultural learners (Mendenhall et al., 2019, p. 14). Program areas such as psychosocial support and accelerated education (AE) are frequently provided in crisis contexts, but they are not institutionalized by national education systems. The Comprehensive School Safety framework (GADRRRES, 2017) highlights the need for education stakeholders to come together around risk reduction and resilience in the sector. Systematic cooperation around planning between humanitarian and development partners will ensure that plans and processes are linked, streamlined, and aligned.

Recommendations to strengthen humanitarian-development coherence in education

Despite the systemic gaps between humanitarian and development action described in the previous section, good practical progress has been made toward bridging the divide, as more development and humanitarian partners find themselves seeking solutions for crisis-affected children.

This section offers six recommendations for addressing the barriers to coherence outlined in the previous section, and three ways of working that are necessary to deliver on these recommendations.

These three ways of working are common to promising practices and successes in humanitarian-development coherence. They create the conditions necessary for partners to identify and work together to achieve collective outcomes for crisis-affected children and youth.

LEARN

In humanitarian and development contexts, education practitioners from government, humanitarian, and development agencies need to learn more about the wider education system and about each other. Mutual understanding of each other's mandates and approaches is an essential prerequisite to collaboration. They also need to document coherence approaches and interventions at the operational level more fully, learn more about conditions that promote success, and understand the impact of such efforts.

CONVENE

Convening diverse stakeholders to conduct joint analyses and seek opportunities to work toward collective outcomes is at the heart of humanitarian-development coherence. Although challenging, bringing partners together across the divide to open dialogue and find common ground is where meaningful collaboration starts. Systematic internal channels for dialogue and linkage between humanitarian and development divisions are also needed in multi-mandate organizations and MoEs.

ADAPT

Coherence requires humanitarian and development partners to consider how they can adapt and "lean" a little more toward the other side while maintaining their essential mandates and accountabilities. Humanitarians may need to adapt to longer-term planning and consider shifting from service delivery to systems strengthening. Development actors may need to build robust contingency plans, flexibility, and agility into crisis response. These adaptations call for a consideration of what new or different human and financial resources are needed to achieve coherence most effectively.

The six recommendations presented below, along with illustrative examples of recent or current initiatives, respond directly to the barriers to coherence outlined in the previous section. They gather recommendations from several different sources (e.g., Nicolai et al., 2019; INEE et al., 2020; Mendenhall, 2019) in one place, and reflect areas where efforts toward coherence are already beginning to occur and could, if systematically implemented, form a foundation of collective action for resilient education systems.

These six recommendations are interconnected and mutually reinforcing. For example, coordination should facilitate the alignment of national and humanitarian planning. The examples presented highlight such successes, but many also reflect considerable investment in relationship- and trust-building over time between humanitarian, development, and government partners. This is a key condition for successful coherence, along with multi-stakeholder engagement, political will, and incentives related to funding and to the need to find solutions to persistent problems.

RECOMMENDATION 1:
Use common frameworks and standards to balance the prioritization of humanitarian and development commitments

Humanitarian-development coherence initiatives in complex settings require constant negotiation and balancing of political considerations, development commitments, and humanitarian imperatives. While the mandates and structures of humanitarian and development organizations have the potential to divide their response efforts, a range of current global, regional, and national policy commitments, frameworks, and standards can be powerful tools to convene partners around collective outcomes and find complementary ways of working.

At the global level, the Global Refugee Forum (GRF) is a good example of how UNHCR has mobilized an unprecedented commitment to collective outcomes for refugee education from a diverse range of partners (see Box 5). At the country level, the ESP is the common framework that should unite humanitarian and development partners. In politically sensitive situations, coherence may be supported by advocacy and negotiations based on a commitment to child rights, using frameworks such as the Safe Schools Declaration. The INEE Minimum Standards for Education and the INEE Conflict Sensitive Education Pack have been effective tools for engaging partners in joint context analysis and in a shared commitment to apply the standards.

BOX 5

Global Refugee Forum: Convening partners around a global commitment

The Global Compact on Refugees, affirmed by the UN General Assembly in 2019, introduced a new comprehensive refugee response model that includes a commitment to address education for refugee children and youth. The GRF brings states and other actors together every four years to share good practices, and to contribute financial support and technical expertise to help reach the goals of the Global Compact.

In the lead-up to the first GRF, which took place in December 2019, UNHCR formed an Education Co-Sponsorship Alliance made up of UN member states, UN agencies, international organizations, financial institutions, national and local organizations, the private sector, philanthropists, and refugees themselves. This multi-stakeholder group met several times to conduct joint needs analyses and to agree on the following collective outcome:

"To foster the conditions, partnerships, collaboration and approaches that lead to all refugee, asylum seeker, returnee and stateless children and youth and their hosting communities, including the internally displaced in those communities, to access inclusive and equitable quality education that enables them to learn, thrive and develop their potential, build individual and collective resilience, and contribute to peaceful coexistence and civil society" (UNHCR, 2019, p. 6).

The GRF Education Co-Sponsor Alliance jointly produced a Global Framework for Refugee Education, which includes calls to action in areas such as funding, national policies, and early childhood. The purpose of the framework is to mobilize concrete pledges and contributions to inclusive and quality education at all levels for refugee and host-community children and youth.

This joint action and multi-stakeholder dialogue mobilized diverse partners around a common goal and resulted in an unprecedented level of commitment to address education needs for displaced children and youth. The work of 67 co-sponsors led to more than 204 education pledges for the GRF (out of some 1,400 pledges overall) by states, international organizations, civil society, academics, and refugee groups to contribute resources and expertise to education for displaced children and youth. Some organizations noted that the GRF pledges provided an opportunity for internal dialogue and collaboration between humanitarian and development divisions within their own organizations.

Sources: UNHCR (2019, 2020)

RECOMMENDATION 2:
Join-up humanitarian and development education coordination systems

Linking education coordination systems is a key step in convening humanitarian and development actors in a structured way to conduct joint needs analysis, align planning, and identify collective outcomes. EiE participation in LEGs and education-sector groups can ensure that crisis-affected children are accounted for and, conversely, that EiE actors are working in line with national priorities. Joint coordination in Myanmar (see Box 6) demonstrates how systematic linkage between the LEG and the EiE Working Group (EiEWG) has led to several positive outcomes for crisis-affected children, and how it has increased the resilience of Myanmar's education system. In the Philippines, which is affected by a range of disasters associated with natural hazards and conflict, the Department of Education of the Philippines' Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Service is supported by a multi-stakeholder forum, the Education Resilience Working Group (ERWG). During non-emergency periods, this group convenes partners around collective outcomes for disaster prevention and mitigation, climate change adaptation, and EiE. The ERWG emerged from a review of the national Education Cluster's Terms of Reference in 2016, which identified a gap in the response timeframe and the need to "institutionalize inter-agency coordination and collaboration, primarily during non-emergency period[s], to promote a culture of safety and strengthen the resilience of the education sector" (Republic of the Philippines, 2017). The ERWG is an excellent example of an innovative coordination mechanism that helps to bridge the gap in humanitarian-development response timeframes when addressing preparedness.

While establishing coordination is the responsibility of lead coordinating agencies, education partners, particularly those with multi-mandate programming and participation in various coordination groups, can also advocate for and support joint coordination. UNICEF, which co-leads the Education Cluster and is the coordinating agency for the LEG in many countries, and MoEs play an important role in linking education coordination systems, starting with internal information-sharing and identifying opportunities for further linkages. Linkages between education and other sectors, such as child protection and health, also provide opportunities to promote a holistic response and the safety and well-being of learners throughout humanitarian-development interventions.

BOX 6

Linking EiE-sector coordination and the LEG in Myanmar

The prolonged chronic emergencies in Myanmar (in Rakhine, Kachin, and Northern Shan states) require an increased focus on planning for a transition from EiE to longer-term programming, while ensuring that critical and immediate humanitarian needs are met.

Over the past few years, the Myanmar EiE Sector Group, which coordinates partners supporting education for IDPs and those affected by the onset of natural disasters, has worked to enhance coordination with the MoE and development partners. Stepping stones in this process have been as follows:

- Investment of time and effort to build relationships and trust with key government counterparts and education development partners and donors, along with familiarization with the Myanmar education system, ongoing sector-reform processes, and the modalities for engaging in these processes
- Active participation in the regular education development partner meetings, including establishing space to provide EiE sectoral updates as a standing meeting agenda item
- Identification of and engagement in relevant MoE fora and processes, such as the MoE annual budgeting and planning processes, annual joint-sector review meetings, and ESP review development processes
- Collaboration with education development partners on the design of GPE programs, including consultation with and technical input from the EiE sector on Myanmar's COVID-19 Accelerated Funding program and a component of the Education Sector Plan Implementation Grant that is focused on displaced and migrant children

These efforts to unite EiE-sector coordination have led the MoE's short- and long-term sector-planning processes to integrate the education needs of children affected by crisis. Examples of outcomes of joint EiE-sector coordination in Myanmar include the following:

- MoE appointment of EiE focal points at the national and sub-national level in five conflict-affected and disaster-prone states (Rakhine, Kachin, Northern Shan, Kayah, and Kayin)
- Earmarking of an EiE budget line for the first time in the MoE 2019-2020 fiscal year budget
- Development of a joint MoE-EIE-sector contingency/emergency preparedness and response framework, with the technical support of UNESCO IIEP (in process).

Sources: Myanmar EiE Sector Group; GEC

RECOMMENDATION 3:
Invest in capacity strengthening to respond to crisis

MoEs, local NGOs, and school communities are the frontline actors in connecting humanitarian and development initiatives on the ground, and in building resilient systems. While in some cases there are gaps in MoE and local actors' resources and capacities, at the same time many local and national education authorities have developed adaptive and transformative capacities that make the education system more resilient. The USAID white paper, Transforming Systems in Times of Adversity: Education and Resilience, describes how displaced children in Mali were integrated into local schools: "In many instances, schools provided the structure to bring families and communities together, often through community-school management committees. At a systems level, the flexible policies of the Ministry of Education allowed displaced teachers from the north to find temporary positions in schools in the south and also provided a system-wide structure that fostered school-community interactions during the crisis" (Shah, 2019, p. 37). The examples in Box 7 show how USAID-funded FHI 360 and Save the Children programs are working with national education authorities and local communities in Northeast Nigeria to support localization.

Enhancement of MoE capacity to prepare for and respond to crisis situations could include the establishment of a dedicated EiE division, secondment of EiE staff, and strengthening capacity on EiE coordination and crisis-sensitive planning. This will require focused investment and could have potential cost implications. Support to local NGOs, CSOs, and school communities is also needed to enable them to take the lead in planning, program design, and implementation. Strengthening local NGOs' and CSOs' capacity in EiE and financial management is needed to enable them to access funding and to support education continuity at the community level.

BOX 7

Investing in local capacities in Northeast Nigeria

Northeast Nigeria remains in a state of crisis due to the nation's ongoing conflict and associated poverty; the crisis has put additional pressure on an already fragile education system. Estimates are that nearly 60 percent of primary school-age children in the region are not attending school. Children and teachers require psychosocial support to cope with the impact of significant protection risks, which include attacks on education (OCHA, 2018).

In 2019, the USAID Addressing Education in Northeast Nigeria (AENN) program conducted a consultative process with education authorities at the local, regional, and national level to understand institutional barriers to system resilience, including planning and preparedness. A key challenge that emerged is the lack of quality data on the impact of the crisis on education. In response, AENN, together with the state government, has developed a Data Hub model tailored to the needs and capacities of state and local education authorities. Key elements of the program include:

- Physical Data Hubs are being established using a rapid assessment and collaborative design process; they include a room equipped with computers, internet access, maps, and charts, where users can access and utilize education data for education planning and management.
- The Data Hubs feature simple, functional dashboards that are populated with data from rolling assessments, including (1) secondary humanitarian data, (2) bi-weekly phone survey data with community-level actors, and (3) school-level data.
- The data dashboards will be used as a coordination tool by the State Universal Basic Education Boards and EiEWG for emergency education response plans and education-sector planning.

Under the AENN program and with additional support from the EU, FHI 360, with Save the Children, supports the state governments and local communities to provide internally displaced children with access to accredited, non-formal education. Given the complex nature of supporting education projects in Borno and Yobe states, where insecurity and suspicion that outsiders are affiliated with Boko Haram is prevalent, the project has relied heavily on a community-based approach and a conflict-sensitive lens. Key elements of the program include:

- **Community coalitions:** Community members have formed coalitions that help oversee the program by facilitating community awareness sessions, identifying out-of-school children, and supporting the selection of learning facilitators.
- **Learning center management committees:** All non-formal learning centers have management committees that are composed of parents of children enrolled in the program. These committees have led the development of comprehensive school safety plans and taken a leadership role in defining the early warning system.
- **Local government and community-based organizations (CBOs):** AENN engages with government officials at various levels to help clarify their roles and responsibilities in the provision of non-formal education to displaced children. The project has also engaged and built the capacity of local CBOs, which help to monitor program implementation and provide another layer of support between the community and the project team.

As a result of the AENN program, community members have a better understanding of their role in supporting children's education, and they have been able to navigate the system and successfully enroll their children in formal schools after they complete the NFE program.

Sources: FHI 360; Save the Children US

RECOMMENDATION 4:
Build cross-over capacity so that more education actors have a comprehensive understanding of the sector, including key humanitarian and development processes

A new generation of education experts is needed to take coherence forward, one that is able to navigate both humanitarian and development processes and to support strong coordination and linkages between them. This cross-over capacity is needed among all education stakeholders, and within organizations that run both humanitarian and development programming. There is good progress in this area; for example, the GEC has already included a module on alignment with national education processes in their core skills training, and UNHCR and INEE have made a joint commitment to develop more capacity-building materials under their partnership. Overall, careful documentation of good practices and research on humanitarian-development interventions, and their impact, will provide a much-needed base of evidence on what is working.

More learning materials and opportunities to unpack humanitarian-development coherence are needed in the education sector. In some cases, seconding dedicated capacity to MoEs to coordinate and link humanitarian and development coordination, plans, and initiatives may be needed. Box 8 highlights the work of UNESCO IIEP in building the capacity of multi-stakeholder groups in crisis-sensitive planning.

BOX 8

Building cross-over capacity for education planning with multi-stakeholder groups

Crisis-sensitive planning helps MoEs to develop and implement systemic policies, plans, and programs that strengthen the resilience of education systems. It does so by bringing MoEs together with their humanitarian and development partners to reduce the risk of crises.

Since 2008, to meet the increasing demands of MoEs and their partners as they integrate the risk of conflict and disaster in their planning processes, IIEP has progressively scaled up its crisis-sensitive program in collaboration with partners such as the GPE, INEE, and UNHCR.

Central to IIEP's crisis-sensitive planning work is capacity development for policy formulation and strategic planning with international-, regional-, and national-level MoE staff members and their humanitarian and development partners. Capacity development activities include (1) capacity development workshops with national education authorities; (2) further training using a variety of modalities, including face-to-face workshops, and blended and online learning using IIEP's virtual learning platform; and (3) practical on-the-job assignments supported by resource persons and participants.

IIEP also runs regional workshops that support exchange and learning between country teams. In 2019, for example, IIEP held a regional workshop on crisis-sensitive planning and the inclusion of displaced children and youth in national education systems in West and Central Africa in Dakar, Senegal. The workshop was hosted in collaboration with UNHCR, UNICEF, and the GEC, with funding from the EU's Service for Foreign Policy Instruments.

The workshop provided a platform for participants from six countries (Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, and Senegal) to meet, exchange, and build common understanding around planning opportunities to address EiE situations and protracted crises. The workshop reinforced and promoted future collaboration between the various decision-making bodies and actors at the country and regional levels. Country teams, composed of MoE education planners, administrators, and practitioners, and of humanitarian and development education partners, developed joint action plans to address the educational needs of displaced populations.

One outcome of this workshop was a contribution to the technical capacity of the Burkina Faso's newly established MoE division, the Technical Secretariat for Education in Emergency Situations, and the development of a 2019-2024 MoE strategy to institutionalize a prevention, preparedness, and response approach to the multiple crisis risks affecting the education sector.

Sources: UNESCO IIEP; IIEP crisis sensitive planning and curriculum booklets

RECOMMENDATION 5:
Ensure that national ESPs address the needs of children and youth in crisis contexts and that humanitarian plans align with national priorities and processes

Aligning humanitarian and development education planning, which is closely linked with joint coordination, is an ideal forum for joint needs analysis and the best way to ensure that all education partners are working toward multi-year collective outcomes based on comparative advantage in order to ensure continuity of education for all children and youth. Although good progress has been made, more systematic cooperation around planning is needed between humanitarian and development partners to ensure that plans and processes are linked, streamlined, and aligned.

Examples of good practice include the Lebanon RACE II and the Uganda Education Response Plan (see Box 3), which are MoE-led plans to respond to significant refugee crises. The plans establish collective outcomes, roles, and responsibilities for government, humanitarian, and development actors. Many donors have improved the flexibility of their funding across the humanitarian-development divide in crisis contexts, as evidenced by policy alignment between the European Commission Directorate-General for International Cooperation and Development and the Directorate-General for European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations, and by practical measures such as USAID's crisis modifier, which enables development funding to pivot to respond to emergencies. GPE and ECW have been instrumental in incentivizing humanitarian-development coherence through joint development of education-sector and transitional-sector plans. Moreover, the recent introduction of ECW-facilitated multi-year resilience programs provides more flexible funding for both emergency response and systems strengthening in protracted crisis situations. A joint pledge between ECW, GPE, and the World Bank to create joint approaches to financing education in refugee and crisis contexts is also promising.

In addition to planning, alignment of key processes such as education data management and budgeting ensures that children and young people in crisis are visible and accounted for in national systems, as described in Box 9. Critical areas such as teacher management and development also require harmonized joint planning. For example, better preparedness and planning are needed to rapidly increase the teacher supply in displacement contexts and address the thorny issue of teacher compensation (Mendenhall et al., 2019, p. 13).

BOX 9

Aligning humanitarian data-collection tools with the EMIS in Uganda

In Uganda, the day-to-day running of schools, including local budgeting, school inspector visits, classroom monitoring, etc., lies with the District Education Offices (DEOs). However, community schools set up specifically for refugee populations are generally not registered with the Ugandan education system and are run and funded by EiE partners.

The Uganda EiEWG has worked with its partners and with DEOs to implement an effective monitoring and reporting system for the refugee response. It is aligned with national systems and provides the data necessary for planning and budgeting. UNHCR has streamlined refugee education data management by assigning lead agencies in refugee-hosting districts to coordinate the monitoring and reporting process. The lead agencies collate the data from individual partners and submit monthly compiled reports to UNHCR and the DEOs.

Harmonizing data management with national systems has been achieved through the following:

- EiE actors have developed monitoring tools in line with the Ugandan EMIS system. The information recorded provides the same quality metrics used in Uganda, such as student classroom ratio, student-teacher ratio, etc.
- The forms and data EiE partners collect are familiar to the school staff members who provide it, to school inspectors, to the DEO, and to the MoE planning division in Kampala.
- The EiEWG and the Information Management Working Group have developed budgeting tools to support the DEOs in costing the education response plan at the district level, based on key quality metrics. This mirrors the process DEOs use for their normal education planning and budgeting.

As the monitoring, reporting, planning, and budgeting processes for the refugee response become aligned with the overall sector planning processes, the next aim is to fully integrate refugee education provision into the overall ESP.

Sources: Education Response Plan for Refugees and Host Communities in Uganda; J. Sparkes, personal communication, April 28, 2020

RECOMMENDATION 6:
Institutionalize DRR and EiE approaches into national education systems so they are ready to respond to needs of children and youth in crisis situations

Ideally, both humanitarian and development actors support national MoEs in preparing for emergencies and building capacity for a robust education response during and after crises. In a report on the institutionalization of psychosocial support programming in national systems, Shah (2018, p. 4) describes humanitarian agencies' adjustment from service delivery to systems strengthening as "ensuring that the best practices of humanitarian response, which includes a strong focus on protection, safety, and inclusion, transfer into the practices of education system; and conversely that some of the key ambitions of the education for development agenda, and in particular the focus on learning outcomes and retention, are increasingly given attention within humanitarian responses."

Institutionalization is typically a long-term process of infusing all aspects of a model into a national education system, including planning, implementation, financing, staffing, management, supervision, monitoring, and evaluation. Some countries have made significant progress in institutionalizing preparedness and crisis-sensitive programming. In the Philippines, crisis-prevention and response systems are supported by national policies and guidelines, such as the "National Policy Framework on Learners and Schools as Zones of Peace" (Republic of the Philippines, 2019), which outlines a strategy for ensuring the safety and security of learners and schools, continuity of education in situations of armed conflict, and education's contributions to peace-building. Burkina Faso's MoE recently established an EiE division (see Box 8), and a national policy on refugee education is under development in Kenya. Box 10 shows how AE is gradually being institutionalized in a number of countries as a critical program that enables out-of-school children and youth to attain primary education certification or integrate back into formal schooling. This example highlights the importance of multi-stakeholder consultations' and working groups' support for the harmonization and institutionalization of program areas, as well as the use of common tools like the <u>AE 10 Principles for Effective Practice</u>.

More good examples of coherence at the program level, particularly around teachers and learners, can be found in UNICEF's education think piece, <u>Navigating the Humanitarian-Development Nexus in Forced Displacement Contexts</u> (Mendenhall, 2019).

BOX 10

Institutionalizing Accelerated Education

AE is a flexible, age-appropriate program that provides access to education for disadvantaged, over-age, out-of-school children and youth and is run on an accelerated timeframe. AE programs provide learners with equivalent, certified competencies for basic education, which supports their transition to formal education or provides them with accredited primary qualifications if a transition is not possible (INEE, 2020). At the global level, the Accelerated Education Working Group (AEWG), an inter-agency group of education partners that support and/or fund AE programs, have been utilizing the AEWG tools and guidance to help countries' MoEs and AE stakeholders achieve a more harmonized, standardized approach to AE provision.[2]

In some countries, such as the Democratic Republic of the Congo and South Sudan, regulatory AE frameworks exist as part of the non-formal or AE policy, but many have no standard, accredited MoE AE program that can promote access and continuity of education for over-age out-of-school children and youth in crisis-affected communities and other marginalized groups. Together with multi-stakeholder groups of the MoE and affiliated institutions, such as curriculum-development bodies and humanitarian and development partners, AEWG members have been supporting several countries to move toward harmonizing and institutionalizing AE within their national education systems. Examples of progress include:

- **Uganda:** The MoE and partners in country have jointly developed national AE guidelines (still in draft and pending MoE approval) based on the AE 10 Principles for Effective Practice, and a national AE curriculum.
- **South Sudan:** South Sudan has an Alternative Education Systems (AES) policy and implementation guide, both of which include AE. There is a national-level AES directorate with a director for AES, plus AES directors in each state's MoE. There is also an AES advisory group at the national level that is led by the MoE and UNICEF.
- **Pakistan:** As part of the non-formal education response, partners agreed to advocate to include AE in the ESP in each province as a key strategy for out-of-school children.
- **Kenya:** Partners agreed to strengthen collaboration and coordination by establishing a Kenyan AE task team/working group, which would be a subgroup of the Kenya Education Sector Working Group, known as the Education Donors and Partners Coordination Group.

Key to the success of the work done in these countries was working with the MoEs and multiple stakeholders from both the humanitarian and development sectors to dialogue, identify contextual needs, and commit to working together to achieve collectively approved outcomes.

There is a key opportunity for humanitarian partners providing AE programs to work closely with development and MoE partners to ensure that formal schools have adequate classroom capacity to absorb AE learners who are able to transition to formal education after completing one or two levels of AE. This will include addressing barriers to continuing education in the formal system and preparing teachers to support successful transitions.

Sources: AEWG; Education Development Center

---

2   The AEWG is currently led by UNHCR, with representation from UNICEF, UNESCO, USAID, Norwegian Refugee Council, Plan International, International Rescue Committee, Save the Children, Education Development Center, and War Child Holland.

Conclusion

Our collective outcome in the education sector is **SDG4: to ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all**. However, crises, whether caused by the current climate emergency, violent conflict, or the recent COVID-19 pandemic, threaten our progress toward SDG4 targets.

Humanitarian-development coherence is critical in order to ensure that all children have access to an uninterrupted, quality education that helps increase their resilience and overall development. Collective action is needed to build inclusive and adaptable education systems that are prepared for and have the capacity to respond to crises. While education can provide significant benefits for individuals, communities, and countries, establishing resilient education systems requires multi-year planning, coordination, and investment in the education sector. This is reflected in the NWOW framework proposed during the 2016 World Humanitarian Summit. NWOW involves humanitarian and development agencies working toward collective outcomes over multiple years, based on the comparative advantage of a diverse range of actors.

The examples of promising practices cited in the previous section signal a shift in the education sector away from the compartmentalization of humanitarian and development actions and toward coherence. In fact, there is currently a window of opportunity to make concerted progress toward systematic humanitarian-development collaboration in education. Major global policy commitments, such as the Global Compact on Refugees and NWOW, encourage a joint approach. Donors are becoming increasingly flexible, which enables humanitarian and development interventions to adapt to immediate needs while also contributing to resilient systems. Furthermore, the onset of the global climate emergency and the scope and scale of the COVID-19 crisis suggest that gathering around collective outcomes and leveraging comparative advantage may be the only effective way to deliver education services to all children and youth in the coming years.

Challenges to coherence

As discussed in Section 4 of this report, three levels of action influence conditions for coherence—norms, capacities, and operations—which reflect the framework proposed in the USAID white paper, *Education and Humanitarian-Development Coherence* (Nicolai et al., 2019). These challenges include:

NORMS

- Balancing humanitarian and development mandates is challenging, particularly in conflict contexts

CAPACITIES

- Coordination is siloed, without structural links to bring humanitarian and development coordinating bodies together
- Local capacity to support education in crises is mixed and requires further support
- Specialization has led to lack of cross-over capacity between humanitarian and development systems and programming

OPERATIONS

- Different response timeframes separate humanitarian and development planning and action
- Many different layers of education planning, and therefore programming, occur independently

LEARN, CONVENE, AND ADAPT:
Actions to strengthen humanitarian-development coherence in education

As discussed in Section 5 of this paper, we make six recommendations to strengthen coherence, which are framed within the Learn-Convene-Adapt framework below. These actions create the conditions necessary for partners to identify and work jointly toward collective outcomes for crisis-affected children and youth.

LEARN
Strengthen a comprehensive understanding of key humanitarian and development processes

Education practitioners need to take a holistic approach to education. Humanitarian actors need to learn about development approaches/processes, and vice versa. This means providing better documentation of the most effective coherence approaches and interventions at the operational level.

Suggested actions	Lead actors
Develop accessible materials on humanitarian-development coherence in education, make them available on the INEE website, and integrate them into existing and new capacity-development activities.	Initiative to Strengthen Education in Emergencies Coordination;[3] LEG, Education Cluster, UNHCR, county-level MoEs
Map humanitarian and development partners, programs, and plans active at the country level and identify systemic gaps and opportunities for coherence.	MoEs, education coordinators (LEG, Education Cluster, REWG)
Invest in capacity development of national and sub-national MoE officials, and local NGOs, CBOs, and school communities to support education in crisis situations.	MoEs, donors, UN agencies, implementing partners
Document and learn more about factors that influence the success and impact of humanitarian-development interventions, including and across different financing mechanisms.	Donors, UN agencies, implementing partners

CONVENE
Use common frameworks and standards, and unite humanitarian and development education coordination systems

Convening diverse stakeholders to conduct joint analysis and seek opportunities to work toward collective outcomes is at the heart of humanitarian-development coherence. In multi-mandate organizations and MoEs, systematic channels for dialogue are also needed internally.

Suggested actions	Lead actors
Establish systemic links between education coordination bodies, as well humanitarian-development links within agencies that lead or participate in multiple coordination systems.	Education coordinators with support of partners, multi-mandate organizations, donors
Use global, regional, and national policy commitments, standards, and tools to build common ground for collective analysis and outcomes.	MoEs, education coordinators, UN or NGO agencies
Engage multi-stakeholder groups to identify collective outcomes during planning processes and negotiate solutions in politically sensitive contexts.	MoEs, UNESCO IIEP, donor groups, education coordinators

---

3   The Initiative to Strengthen Education in Emergencies Coordination is a partnership between GEC, UNHCR, and INEE.

Ensure that national ESPs address the needs of children and youth in crisis contexts and that humanitarian plans align with national priorities and processes

Coherence also requires humanitarian and development partners to consider how they can adapt and "lean" a little more toward the other side while maintaining their essential mandates and accountabilities. This implies institutionalizing DRR and EiE approaches within national education systems so they are ready to respond to the needs of children and youth in crisis situations. Humanitarians may need to adapt to longer-term planning and consider shifting from service-delivery to systems-strengthening approaches. To respond to crisis, development actors may need to build robust contingency plans, flexibility, and agility into their program. This implies strengthening the capacity of local education actors to respond to crisis.

Suggested actions	Lead actors
Facilitate MoEs' capacity to prepare for and lead EiE response.	Donors, education coordinators, UN agencies
Ensure that national and humanitarian plans and processes, such as data and teacher management, are harmonized at the sector and agency levels.	Education coordinators, all education stakeholders
Support the harmonization and institutionalization of DRR and EiE responsive programming.	MoEs, donors, humanitarian and development implementing partners

The above examples highlight the concrete actions education stakeholders can take to strengthen humanitarian-development coherence. As the examples presented in this report show, humanitarian-development coherence in education requires the engagement of all education stakeholders, in particular their willingness to relinquish agency agendas and be open to joint needs analysis and collective action across all phases of emergency response. This is the best way of working to ensure that every child and young person affected by crisis has the chance to go to school and stay in school through the full education cycle.

References

Cornish, L. (2019, June 20). *Q&A: Degan Ali on the systemic racism impacting humanitarian responses*. Devex. https://www.devex.com/news/q-a-degan-ali-on-the-systemic-racism-impacting-humanitarian-responses-95083

Dewulf, A. L., Khan, A., & Nicolai, S. (2020). *Strengthening coordinated education planning and response in crises: Chad case study*. Overseas Development Institute. https://www.odi.org/publications/11476-strengthening-coordinated-education-planning-and-response-crises-chad-case-study

Global Alliance for Disaster Risk Reduction and Resilience in the Education Sector (GADRRRES). (2017). *Comprehensive School Safety*. GADRRRES. https://inee.org/resources/comprehensive-school-safety-framework

Human Rights Watch. (2019, December 3). *"Are we not human?" Denial of education for Rohingya children in Bangladesh*. https://www.hrw.org/report/2019/12/04/are-we-not-human/denial-education-rohingya-refugee-children-bangladesh

Inter-agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE). (2010). *Minimum Standards for Education: Preparedness, Response, Recovery*. INEE. https://inee.org/resources/inee-minimum-standards

Inter-agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE). (2013). *INEE guidance note on conflict sensitive education*. INEE. https://inee.org/resources/inee-guidance-note-conflict-sensitive-education

Inter-agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE). (2020). *Accelerated education*. https://inee.org/collections/accelerated-education

Inter-agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE), UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), & Global Education Cluster. (2020). *Education in emergencies coordination: Harnessing humanitarian and development architecture for Education 2030*. https://inee.org/resources/education-emergencies-coordination-harnessing-humanitarian-and-development-architecture

Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC). (n.d.). *More support and funding tools for local and national responders*. https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/more-support-and-funding-tools-for-local-and-national-responders

International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) & Protect Education in Insecurity and Conflict (PEIC). (2019, June 19-20). *The role of humanitarian actors in safeguarding access to education* [workshop report]. ICRC & PEIC. https://www.icrc.org/en/publication/role-humanitarian-actors-safeguarding-access-education-workshop-report-geneva-19-20-june

Mendenhall, M. (2019). *Navigating the humanitarian-development nexus in forced displacement* [UNICEF Think Piece Series: Education in Emergencies]. UNICEF Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office. https://www.unicef.org/esa/media/4866/file

Mendenhall, M., Gomez, S., & Varni, E. (2019). *Teaching amidst conflict and displacement: Persistent challenges and promising practices for refugee, internally displaced and national teachers.* UNESCO. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000266060

Ministry of Education and Sports. (2018). *Education response plan for refugees and host communities in Uganda.* http://planipolis.iiep.unesco.org/sites/planipolis/files/ressources/uganda_education-response-plan-for-refugees-and-host-communities-in-uganda.pdf

Nicolai, S., Hodgkin, M., Mowjee, T., & Wales, J. (2019). *Education and humanitarian-development coherence* [USAID white paper]. USAID, Office of Education. https://www.eccnetwork.net/resources/humanitarian-development-coherence-white-paper

Nicolai, S., Diwakar, V., Khan, A., Mansour-Ille, D., & Anderson, A. (2020). *Strengthening coordinated education planning and response in crises: Synthesis report.* Overseas Development Institute. https://www.odi.org/publications/16741-strengthening-coordinated-education-planning-and-response-crises-synthesis-report

Overseas Development Institute. (2016). *Education Cannot Wait: Proposing a fund for education in emergencies.* Overseas Development Institute. https://inee.org/resources/education-cannot-wait-proposing-fund-education-emergencies

Oxfam. (2019). *The humanitarian-development peace nexus: What does it mean for multi-mandated organisations?* [Discussion paper]. https://reliefweb.int/report/world/humanitarian-development-peace-nexus-what-does-it-mean-multi-mandated-organizations

Poole, L., & Culbert, V. (2019). *Financing the nexus: Gaps and opportunities from a field perspective.* Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC), & United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). https://www.nrc.no/resources/reports/financing-the-nexus-gaps-and-opportunities-from-a-field-perspective/

Republic of the Philippines, Department of Education. (2017). *Terms of reference: Education Resilience Working Group.* Republic of the Philippines, Department of Education.

Republic of the Philippines, Department of Education. (2019). *National policy framework on learners and schools as zones of peace* [DepEd order no. 32]. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/DO_s2019_032.pdf

Shah, R. (2018). *Opportunities, considerations, and challenges for institutionalising the Better Learning Programme within education systems in the Middle East.* University of Auckland, Faculty of Education and Social Work.

Shah, R. (2019). *Transforming systems in times of adversity: Education and resilience* [USAID white paper]. USAID, Office of Education. https://www.eccnetwork.net/resources/transforming-systems-times-adversity-education-and-resilience-white-paper

UN Children's Fund (UNICEF) Education Section. (2019, March). *Risk-informed education programming for resilience guidance note.* UNICEF. https://www.unicef.org/media/65436/file/Risk-informed%20education%20programming%20for%20resilience:%20Guidance%20note.pdf

UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (2014). *Sustainable development begins with education: How education can contribute to the proposed post-2015 goals.* https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000230508

UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (2016). *Education 2030: Incheon declaration and framework for action for the implementation of Sustainable Development Goal 4.* https://inee.org/resources/education-2030-incheon-declaration-and-framework-action

UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (2020a). *Global Education Coalition #LearningNeverStops: Covid-19 education response.* https://en.unesco.org/covid19/educationresponse/globalcoalition

UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (2020b). *SDG4: Education.* https://en.unesco.org/gem-report/sdg-goal-4

UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization International Institute for Educational Planning (UNESCO IIEP). (n.d.). *Crisis-sensitive education planning* http://www.iiep.unesco.org/en/our-expertise/crisis-sensitive-education-planning

UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization International Institute for Educational Planning (UNESCO IIEP). (2011). *Integrating conflict and disaster risk reduction into education sector planning: Guidance notes for educational planners.* UNESCO IIEP. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000228650

UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). (2019). *Global framework for refugee education.* Global Refugee Forum. https://www.unhcr.org/5dd50ce47.pdf

UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). (2020). *Global refugee forum.* https://www.unhcr.org/global-refugee-forum.html

UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA). (2017). *New way of working: OCHA policy and development studies branch.* https://www.unocha.org/sites/unocha/files/NWOW%20Booklet%20low%20res.002_0.pdf

UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA). (2018). *Humanitarian response strategy 2019-2021: Nigeria.* https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/29012019_nigeria_humanitarian_response_strategy.pdf

UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA). (2019a). *Global Humanitarian Overview* https://www.unocha.org/sites/unocha/files/GHO2019.pdf

Wales, J., Khan, A., & Nicolai, S. (2020). *Strengthening coordinated education planning and response in crises: Chad case study. Ethiopia case study.* Overseas Development Institute. https://www.odi.org/publications/11477-strengthening-coordinated-education-planning-and-response-crises-ethiopia-case-study

World Bank Group. (2013). *What matters most for education resilience* [Framework paper]. http://wbgfiles.worldbank.org/documents/hdn/ed/saber/supporting_doc/Background/EDR/Framework_SABER-Resilience.pdf

Inter-agency Network for Education in Emergencies