

# **EVALUATION REPORT**

## **Training Workshop on the INEE Minimum Standards**

**New York**

**March 26<sup>th</sup> – 27<sup>th</sup>, 2007**

**The International Rescue Committee (IRC), the Women's Commission for Refugee Women and Children and the Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE)**

## I. INTRODUCTION

**Context:** A training workshop on the INEE Minimum Standards was conducted in New York on behalf of the International Rescue Committee (IRC), the Women's Commission for Refugee Women and Children, and the Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE) on 26– 27 March, 2007.

**Purpose:** The training introduced the INEE Minimum Standards to workshop participants and provided opportunities to apply and use them to assess, implement, and monitor education programs. It promoted holistic approaches to quality education programs and gave overviews of evaluation and disaster preparedness.

The learning objectives of the workshop were:

- Be familiar with the INEE Minimum Standards – the process and product
- Understand that the standards are interdependent and mutually reinforcing
- Have an in-depth knowledge of the particular standards and indicators that are most relevant to participants' current work
- Be able to apply and commit to the use of the INEE Minimum Standards
- Be able to advocate for the implementation of the INEE Minimum Standards

**Participants:** There were 17 participants in the workshop. Organizations represented included CCF, WVI, AJWS, IRC, the Women's Commission, OCHA, UNICEF, OSRCAAC, OHCHR, Forced Migration Program at Columbia University's School of Public Health, Columbia University's Teacher's College, and the INEE Secretariat. See list of participants in annex.

**Training team:** The facilitators of the workshop were Allison Anderson and Jennifer Hofmann (INEE Secretariat), Rebecca Winthrop (IRC), Jenny Perlman Robinson (Women's Commission), and Dana Burde (Columbia University).

## II. TRAINING PLAN

**INEE Training materials:** The training materials used consisted of the INEE Minimum Standards Handbook, the Workbook for Participants, the Training Guide, and PowerPoint slides. A case-study on the use of the INEE Minimum Standards by Jesuit Relief Services was presented. The roles for the simulation were adapted to include a strong focus on gender issues as they pertain to education.

**Workshop design:** This was a two-day workshop. See training agenda in annex.

## III. ACTIVITIES AND FINDINGS

### A. Activities

#### Day One – Monday March 26<sup>th</sup>

Day one introduced the INEE Minimum Standards - the development process and the content of the Handbook. Several exercises helped participants familiarize themselves with the Handbook, different standards and indicators. In reviewing the standards and indicators in detail, participants became aware of the interrelated nature of the standards and how they also intersect with other sectors such as health and nutrition, water and sanitation, safety and protection. The training provided group and individual exercises that enabled participants to understand the legal foundations of the standards and what a

rights-based approach to education programs means. They identified education issues and problems and use the INEE Minimum Standards to define solutions, based on rights.

In the afternoon participants started applying the Minimum Standards to the first phases of the project cycle, i.e initial assessment and program design. Participants used the different INEE Minimum Standards categories to develop and implement a role play assessment. Four issues were selected among the assessment findings to be addressed by an education program. Groups were asked to use the standards and indicators to design holistic education programs to address these issues.

### **Day Two - Tuesday, March 27<sup>th</sup>**

Monitoring plans were created that used the INEE Minimum Standards indicators to measure program activities. Participants presented their findings to a “big boss” during a role play exercise. The facilitators then gave an interactive presentation of evaluation and disaster preparedness. In particular, participants were able to gain knowledge on disaster terminology and the role of education in preventing, mitigating and responding to disasters.

In the afternoon, participants discussed using the INEE Minimum Standards for Research, Programming and Advocacy with experts in these respective fields as facilitators. The facilitators discussed how they are currently using the standards, including challenges, good practices and lessons learnt. They also presented a case-study and discussed how other organizations are using the standards. They then reported back in a plenary session and discussed next steps.

## **B. Findings**

### **Day Two - Tuesday, March 27<sup>th</sup>**

The content of the group work in the afternoon provoked interesting discussions on the INEE Minimum Standards and how they are being used and can be used in advocacy, research and policy and programming.

#### **► Advocacy Breakout Group Brief**

For the Women’s Commission advocacy work on education, the INEE Minimum Standards represent a useful advocacy tool that provides useful guidance to enhance the quality of education and a common framework to promote improved coordination & accountability.

### **CASE STUDY: DARFUR**

**Background:** Promote awareness & use through:

- Determine whether and how standards being used
- Identify challenges to implementation
- Document lessons learned & recommendations
- Nov 2005: 2-day training in N&S Darfur w/ various stakeholders
- June 2006: interviews & focus groups in KHT, N&S Darfur to determine:
  - Are standards being used?
  - Are they having any impact?
  - Can they be improved?

### **Challenges:**

- Not sure how to use them (too new & requires training & tools)
- Intentionally broad but concerned needed to be more prescriptive/quantitative indicators
- Concern meant to replace existing standards
- Short-hand MSEE /EiE misleading: thought not relevant if not in “emergency”
- Format / presentation of handbook (eg Arabic Xerox)

### **Good practices:**

- trainings: more understanding, clear how to use, buy-in
- joint trainings w/ diverse actors
- languages: multiple languages obviously more accessible
- donors particularly interested as M& E tool / indicators – easier to evaluate access (#) vs. quality of ed programs
- reinforce msgs through advocacy materials—to raise awareness & recommendations (eg Sudan)

### **Lessons learned:**

- need for more HQ & field trainings: HQ (support) & field (use) – not enough to distribute book
- individuals from community should accompany intl staff in efforts to promote standards
- all share obstacles to promotion & use of standards & develop talking points / FAQ to address
- know existing nat'l standards & how INEE may link before engaging in discussions
- institutionalize term INEE Minimum Standards vs. MSEE
- make case to donors for need to support protection & translation of professional looking docs

### **► Research Breakout Group Brief**

Integrating Research and NGO Work

Schooling Effects in Post-Conflict Afghanistan - Dana Burde, Columbia University

The discourse surrounding how research and the INEE Minimum Standards can work together to reinforce each other is exciting. Both are driven by on a framework constructed around informed decision making based on indicators and strong evidence. It has been argued that both sectors draw on the same professional work force, thus as academic professional possibilities decrease many NGOs find increasing numbers of former academics within their ranks. Furthermore, many of the Standards' achievements (increased community participation, increased robust nature of data collection, etc.) are also the goals of informed researchers. Thus, combined efforts of researchers and NGOs working with the INEE Minimum Standards should find mutual support throughout their endeavours.

Likewise, many of the challenges faced by researchers through their everyday work are mirrored in the obstacles that face implementers of the Minimum Standards. From the issues surrounding community members' view of researchers/NGO workers, to potential funding source biases, to staffing and security issues. It is clear that both the NGO world and the research community have much to offer each other through their continued and future partnerships in implementing and assessing the INEE Minimum Standards.

## ► Programming Breakout Group Brief

### CASE STUDY: ACEH, INDONESIA

The tsunami's effects on the education system in Aceh were devastating. Over 40,000 students and 2,500 teachers and education personnel were killed. Some 2,135 schools were damaged, including kindergartens, primary, junior and senior high schools, technical and vocational schools and universities, and 150,000 students lost access to proper education facilities. Schools opened again on 26 February, two months after the tsunami. In many locations, makeshift tents were used, or students and teachers from destroyed schools were absorbed into surviving ones.

Three agencies involved in the INEE Working Group – the International Rescue Committee (IRC), Save the Children and the UN Children's Fund (UNICEF) – distributed the Minimum Standards handbook to their staff in Aceh, who used it to develop and coordinate their education and child protection response. UNICEF translated the handbook into Indonesian, and shared it with all the agencies attending Education Coordination Meetings in Banda Aceh. UNICEF also sponsored Minimum Standards Working Group meetings in Banda Aceh throughout February, March and April. At these meetings, Save the Children provided orientation on the Minimum Standards, and facilitated discussion on them. The need to fully understand and build upon the education system that existed prior to the tsunami quickly became apparent. IRC took up this issue and, using the Minimum Standards handbook, developed a 'Focused Conversation' template. This was used to better understand the education situation and design interventions, with an emphasis on learning from communities themselves.

Due to the dire lack of teachers in Aceh, an emergency teacher certification programme was initiated in March with the support of UNICEF and Save the Children, and in collaboration with the Ministry of Education. Although the Ministry of Education had created 4,500 new teaching posts, around a third of new recruits had no formal training. In early May, following community assessments using the 'Focused Conversation' tool and discussions in the MSEE Working Group, the idea began to germinate to revitalise the system of clustering schools, known as Gugus in Indonesian. The Gugus system had been shut down prior to the tsunami because of the conflict in Aceh. Within a cluster, one main school served as a meeting/training place for teachers and administrators from surrounding schools. In coordination with the Ministry of Education, and in partnership with Syiah Kuala University and the University of Pennsylvania, IRC began training teachers from the Gugus schools who could later act as mentor teachers to new, untrained teachers. As a result of this initiative, 100 teachers have been trained as mentors. The Teacher Training Coordination Group meets regularly, and is now looking at approaching various agencies to support a longer-term initiative to sustain the Gugus system.

In addition to these coordinated inter-agency responses, IRC drew on the Minimum Standards to guide the design and implementation of its Emergency Education Program. In its emergency support to schools, IRC staff used the handbook's Information Gathering and Needs Assessment Questionnaire in its needs assessments. The assessment tool also helped in developing a safety assessment form, which IRC used to conduct structural assessments of damaged schools.

INEE's Minimum Standards provided a valuable and relevant design, implementation and coordination tool during the emergency phase, both for IRC and for other agencies. Copies of the handbook were also requested by the Aceh Provincial Ministry of Education. The standards were widely accepted, and provided a common framework, shared between all agencies, enabling a greater level of coordination and improved practice. The framework guided early discussions and actions, leading to more effective emergency education responses that laid the groundwork for long-term quality education systems.

There were nonetheless challenges in implementing a coordinated, quality emergency education response. The continual state of flux inherent in the emergency phase made it difficult to schedule meetings, and scheduling conflicts were common. High staff turnover in international agencies meant that several MSEE Working Group meetings had to focus on orientation. In addition, several key advocates for the INEE Minimum Standards have left Aceh, thus decreasing momentum and increasing the burden on staff that remain. This highlights the need for a training module to be developed to train practitioners and policymakers to effectively implement the Minimum Standards.

### **Lessons learned**

- Discussions on implementing the INEE Minimum Standards should be introduced in coordination meetings right at the outset of the response, including dissemination of the handbook and discussions on how to best utilise this tool within the local context.
- Staff need to be familiar with the INEE Minimum Standards, and also advocate within their organisations and to partners on implementing the standards.
- Translating the handbook into local language(s) is a priority.
- Staff continuity is important for maintaining the pace of coordination and implementation.
- Training materials and workshops are needed.
- Through in-depth discussions on implementing the INEE Minimum Standards, actors can gain a better understanding of how to strengthen or build upon previous systems of education.

## **IV. WAY FORWARD**

The final session presented INEE resources and next steps in the INEE Minimum Standards implementation process to participants. The group also considered the lessons learned from the case studies on the use of the standards in Uganda, Darfur and Pakistan, as reported in the *Humanitarian Practice Network* Network Paper on Implementation of the INEE Minimum Standards (December 2006):

### **Key findings from Uganda and Darfur Case Studies**

#### **Awareness**

- Increasing through involvement with INEE, HQ or inter-agency trainings
- Those with awareness have an improved and clear understanding of interconnectedness of standards - enforcing holistic response

#### **Utilization**

Majority at stage of determining how best to use the standards  
Primarily used as helpful reference guide or checklist  
Community participation standards most widely used  
Teachers and other education personnel standards most challenging

#### **Institutionalization and impact**

Too early to measure but promising signs -- follow-up research planned (pending funding)  
Significant advances since the introduction of the INEE Minimum Standards

#### **Use of standards as common framework in Pakistan Cluster:**

- Enforced an intersectoral approach to the emergency and laid groundwork for holistic recovery
- Policies and programmes influenced by standards crossed relief to development continuum and avoided funding gap between phases

### **Common Recommendations from Uganda, Darfur, Pakistan:**

Involve local community and government in efforts to promote

Emphasize relevance of standards beyond emergencies and institutionalize the term “INEE Minimum Standards” as the abbreviation not “MSEE” or INEE Minimum Standards for Education in Emergencies

Develop additional tools to help contextualize and adapt standards to local context and programs

Increase inter-agency opportunities to share obstacles and good practices in promotion and implementation

Include training on standards in organizational orientation process

As a result of these recommendations, the INEE Working Group is prioritizing the following activities and initiatives for 2007/2008:

- Toolkit to complement and help implement the standards
- Regional Capacity-Building Workshops
- Organizational and Regional/National Focal Points
- Continued Monitoring and Evaluation
  - Building on Uganda, Darfur, Pakistan + new case studies
  - Questionnaire and Database for detailed analysis report
- Advocacy and strategic linkages, especially with donors and governments
- Standards institutionalized within the application of the cluster approach to the education sector
- Future INEE revision and advocacy for incorporation into Sphere revision

At the conclusion, the group brainstormed ways to continue working together and feeding into INEE initiatives, including through the idea of contributing to the INEE Academic Space, exploring an INEE Interest Group on Advocacy and/or Research and/or forming an informal NY-based group that would meet monthly to share information, good practices and lessons learned and collaborate on:

- 1) institutionalization of the standards within their own organizations
- 2) advocacy towards the inclusion of education within Sphere
- 3) advocacy more generally around education in emergencies

Please complete this Workshop Evaluation form and the Participant List Reporting form and send it

to the INEE Minimum Standards focal point, Ms. Allison Anderson ([Allison@theirc.org](mailto:Allison@theirc.org)) as well as to your own organisation.

## Workshop Evaluation – trainers

Workshop: <i>Understanding and Using the Minimum Standards for Education in Emergencies</i> Length of workshop: 2 days	
Dates: March 26 <sup>th</sup> and 27 <sup>th</sup> , 2007 Location: IRC Conference Rooms B and C, New York	No. of participants: 17
<i>Please fill out the Participant List Reporting form, including contact information for the participants, at the end of this evaluation.</i>	
Trainers: Allison Anderson, Jennifer Hofmann, Rebecca Winthrop, Jenny Perlman Robinson, Dana Burde	

### Summary of participants' evaluations

After the course, compile the participants' evaluations in the matrix below. Indicate the number of participants who ticked each category.

Participants rated the course according to the following categories where 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, 4 = strongly agree.

	1	2	3	4
The workshop achieved its aims and objectives.		1	2	10
The content of the workshop is relevant to my work.	1		6	6
What I have learned will impact the way I work.	1		6	6
The methodology used in the workshop helped me to understand how the INEE Minimum Standards can be applied.			7	6
The quality of the learning materials and aids was useful.		1	4	8
The facilitation and presentation during the workshop were open and helped me to learn.			4	9
The venue and accommodation were appropriate.			4	9



## **Examples of participants' comments**

### **• What parts of the workshop were most useful for you?**

- Introduction to the INEE Minimum Standards
- Group work and application exercises
- Initial assessment role play
- Program design and monitoring
- Sessions on advocacy and research
- Getting a chance to systematically look through the Handbook
- Update on the process (cluster, Sphere, etc)

### **• What improvements/changes would you suggest for similar workshops?**

- Structured activities and information within the training: More activities on monitoring, more interaction with implementers, more case studies/real-life examples of utilization of the INEE Minimum Standards, elaborate more on Sphere linkages and disaster preparedness, emphasize more on the right to education as a human rights, more discussion of linkages between INEE and marginalized local networks
- Training Team: Respect scheduled breaks, less involvement of trainers in the group discussions, more feedback on exercises

### **• How will you use the Minimum Standards in your work?**

- Advocacy for more funding for education in emergencies, for the education cluster and the inclusion of an education chapter in the Sphere Handbook
- Promotion of training and implementation of the INEE Minimum Standards within my organization
- Internal awareness raising and advocacy
- To generate ideas and to assist in monitoring and evaluating education programs
- Strengthen the need to prioritize education and promote the right to education in emergency and crisis situations
- Link education to the other sectors I cover
- They will inform my research and field practice
- Promote the standards and raise awareness through teaching and advocacy
- Basis for future research
- Refer people to them in the field
- Cite them in proposals/reports to donors
- Help to hire staff

### **• Please give any other comments/suggestions.**

- Creation of an advocacy and research working group and/or a follow-up workshop focusing on advocacy and policy
- Have at least one case-study or best practice example at the end of the Handbook
- Place all appendices at the end of the Handbook
- Include a brief chapter in the Handbook on advocacy at the field, national and international level
- Will there be further outreach to development-focused NGOs?

## Agenda: New York Training on the INEE Minimum Standards

### Day 1

Time	Sessions
8:30	Registration
9:00	1: Welcome and Introduction to the INEE Minimum Standards
10:30	Coffee/tea break
10:50	2: Introduction to Rights-based Framework of the INEE Minimum Standards
12:00	Lunch
1:00	3&4: Simulation: <i>Emergency in Zamborra</i> Assessing Education Programmes in Emergencies and Chronic Crises
3:10	Coffee/tea break
3:30	3&4: Simulation: <i>Emergency in Zamborra, continued</i> Designing Education Programmes in Emergencies and Chronic Crises
5:30	End of Day 1

### Day 2

9:00	5: Monitoring Education Programmes in Zamborra
10:15	Coffee/tea break
10:35	5: Presentations on Monitoring Programmes in Zamborra
11:20	6: Overview of Evaluation and Preparedness
12:00	Lunch
1:00	7: Using the INEE Minimum Standards for Research, Advocacy, Programming and Policy Small Group Discussions
2:30	Coffee/tea break
2:50	7: Using the INEE Minimum Standards for Research, Advocacy, Programming and Policy Plenary Discussion and Next Step Planning
4:00	8: Synthesis and Conclusion
5:00	End of Day 2