

Report

# REGIONAL INEE LEARNING AGENDA CONSULTATIONS

Evidence for Education in Emergencies



Inter-agency  
Network for Education  
in Emergencies

## Acknowledgments

This report was commissioned by the Inter-agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE) and authored by Yasmina Haddad with contributions from Sonja Anderson and Margi Bhatt of INEE, Shauni Iles of AHRC, and Kelsey Shanks of UKRI GCRF. The report was reviewed by consultation participants to ensure that it accurately reflected their input. The conclusions of this report are those of the authors and consultation participants' and do not necessarily reflect the positions or policies of UK Research and Innovation Global Challenges Research Fund (UKRI GCRF) or INEE.

We would like to thank all INEE Learning Agenda Consultation participants who shared their time, expertise, and insights on knowledge production and evidence needs in their regional context. This work and report would not have been possible without their invaluable contributions. INEE and UKRI GCRF thank all those who facilitated and shared presentations and provocations throughout the three consultations including: Iyad Abualrub, University of Oslo; Bassel Akar, Notre Dame University - Louaize, Lebanon; Sonja Anderson, INEE; Bilal Barakat, Global Education Monitoring Report; Julian Bermeo, Centro de Memoria Paz y Reconciliación; Kelly di Bertolli, Independent; Margi Bhatt, INEE; David Brenner, Goldsmiths College; Daniel Couch, Auckland University of Technology; Ruth Custode, UNICEF; Rana Dajani, We Love Reading; Silvia Diazgranados, IRC; Chris Henderson, University of Waikato; Yeshim Iqbal, NYU Global TIES; Tazreen Jahan, UNICEF; Georgios Karyotis, University of Glasgow; Carol Mutch, University of Auckland; Claudio Osorio, INEE; Yesid Paez, University of Bath; Julia Paulson, University of Bristol; Dick Pelupessy, University of Indonesia; Luis Eduardo Perez Murcia, Global Campaign for Education; Tejendra Pherali, University College London; Doris Santos, Universidad Nacional de Colombia; Ritesh Shah, University of Auckland; Nour Shammout, Abdul Latif Jameel Poverty Action Lab (J-PAL); Kelsey Shanks, UKRI GCRF; Alan Smith, UNESCO Chair, Ulster University; Jen Steele, equitas education and Integrity Global; and Sakila Yesmin, BRAC University. INEE and GCRF also thank all the workshop organizers including Sonja Anderson, INEE; Margi Bhatt, INEE; Chris Henderson, University of Waikato; Paris Hickton, AHRC; Shauni Iles, AHRC; Tim Pank, AHRC; and Kelsey Shanks, UKRI GCRF.

INEE gratefully acknowledges the in kind and financial support provided by UKRI GCRF to convene and host this series of consultations as well as the financial support provided for this report by the Education Cannot Wait Fund. INEE is grateful to the agencies, foundations, institutions, and individuals that provide financial and in-kind support to the network.

The report development process was managed by the INEE Data and Evidence Coordinator, Sonja Anderson.

Copy editing was provided by Dody Riggs.

Design was provided by 2D Studio Ltd.

For feedback or questions please contact [evidence@inee.org](mailto:evidence@inee.org).

## Published by

Inter-agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE),  
c/o International Rescue Committee,  
122 East 42nd Street, 12th floor,  
New York, NY 10168  
United States of America.

INEE © 2020

## Suggested citation:

Inter-agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE). (2021). Report: Regional INEE Learning Agenda Consultations. New York, NY. <https://inee.org/resources/report-regional-inee-learning-agenda-consultations>

## License:

Creative Commons Attribution ShareAlike 4.0.



This document is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0. It is attributed to the Inter-agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE).

## Cover Image:

© P. Biro, IRC

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

During review of the [INEE 2015-2017 Strategic Plan](#), it became evident that INEE is seen as central to the collection, curation, and dissemination of knowledge and evidence on EiE. There is a clear need for a strategic approach to the production of knowledge and research, and to the curation and dissemination of evidence. In light of this need, and recognizing the sector-wide momentum to strengthen the EiE evidence base, INEE and its partners facilitated a series of workshops to pursue a shared learning agenda.

INEE partnered with the UKRI GCRF to convene a series of three regional workshops (Amman, Bogota, and Dhaka) to discuss regional challenges and opportunities of research, identify key evidence gaps, and map ongoing knowledge production. The below provides an introduction and key learnings from these workshops as well as a summary of each workshop.

## COVID-19 PANDEMIC

The COVID-19 pandemic began in early 2020, soon after the final workshop in this series. In 2020 alone, more than 1.5 billion students had their education disrupted due to the COVID-19 pandemic (UNESCO, 2020). The COVID-19 education crisis has pushed the concept of education in emergencies (EiE) to apply globally. However, it is imperative that the EiE sector continue to advocate for and prioritize the most vulnerable and hard-to-reach children who were already out of school prior to the COVID-19 pandemic and who are now experiencing compound crises. Globally, this pandemic has demonstrated the need for robust empirical and theoretical research to guide the delivery of education services during crises, further validating the need for the INEE Learning Agenda and Evidence Platform. With this ever-growing need for research comes additional priorities, such as maintaining a high standard of research ethics, sustaining meaningful and effective research partnerships, and increasing access to EiE research worldwide. That said, it is important to note that there is no mention of COVID-19 in this report because all the workshops occurred before the onset of the pandemic.

## BACKGROUND

At the time of this workshop series, one in four of the world's school-age children lived in a country affected by crisis. In 2019, 127 million school-age children and young people were out of school in crisis-affected contexts (INEE, 2020). This accounted for nearly half of the global out-of-school population. Loss of education services during a crisis not only disrupts the positive societal impact of education over the long term, it also leaves children without the vital services that support their day-to-day protection, wellbeing, and human development.

Despite the essential role education can play, there is a noted lack of empirical and theoretical research to guide the delivery of education services during conflict and protracted crises. The INEE has highlighted the fact that research on the impact of education in the prevention of, response to, and recovery from disaster risks and complex emergencies continues to be limited. In a recent review of the EiE literature, Burde et al. (2017) concurred that "robust evidence on which to act is limited." Education actors working in conflict and protracted crises are calling increasingly for a greater commitment to rigorous research in this area, more comprehensive and timely dissemination of research results, and better coordination between external and local actors.



## **PARTNERS**

### **UK Research and Innovation Global Challenges Research Fund**

The Global Challenges Research Fund (GCRF) provides a unique opportunity to build a global community of researchers who are committed to sustainable development and the eradication of poverty. It promotes meaningful and equitable relationships between UK research institutions and developing country partners, which will help to ensure the identification and relevance of realistic pathways by which research can have an impact on national, regional, and international development policy and practice.

The GCRF supports a diverse but balanced portfolio of activities. Their common feature is that they all in some way address the challenges defined for developing countries in the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Education in conflict and crisis has been a key theme of recent research calls in the GCRF education portfolio. For more information visit <https://www.ukri.org/our-work/collaborating-internationally/global-challenges-research-fund/>.

### **Inter-agency Network for Education in Emergencies**

The Inter-agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE) is a global open network of members who are working together within a humanitarian and development framework to ensure that all individuals have the right to a quality, safe, relevant, and equitable education. INEE's work is founded on the fundamental right to education. For more information and to join INEE, visit <https://inee.org/>.

## **INEE LEARNING AGENDA CONSULTATIONS**

The [INEE Learning Agenda](#), which is aligned with INEE's Strategic Priority 3 — to provide, curate, and organize knowledge to inform policy and practice — is a key resource for the INEE network, including its members and other partners interested in engaging in, learning from, and taking up sound research, as well as academics, students, and researchers who want to produce relevant research for the field of EiE. The Learning Agenda does so by producing the following:

1. An inventory of research and learning currently being carried out by EiE stakeholders who participated in or fed into the INEE Learning Agenda consultations
2. A chart of participant-identified key knowledge gaps, categorized according to the INEE Minimum Standards domains

This information will be captured in INEE's Evidence Platform and hosted on the INEE website, where EiE stakeholders can search and engage with existing research, stay up to date on ongoing research projects, and view gaps in EiE evidence, as identified by practitioners and academics and exhibited by the lack of existing research. This interactive platform will be regularly updated to ensure that it remains a relevant tool and will be accompanied by a periodic summary of the current "top reported" evidence gaps.

Recognizing INEE's strength as a network and convener, the learning agenda process included INEE's diverse members, who attended a series of regional workshops and global consultations that were hosted with and supported by its strategic partners from 2018 to 2020. The aim of this consultative process was to ensure that the learning agenda is representative of the EiE landscape at large.

## Regional Consultations

INEE partnered with the UKRI GCRF in holding a series of regional learning agenda consultation workshops. These regional workshops brought together key local actors from both the practitioner and research communities to discuss research gaps, challenges, and opportunities. The workshops were aligned with INEE's [Strategic Priority 4](#) — to strengthen and diversify the INEE membership — which brought a vital regional voice and perspective to the global-level INEE Learning Agenda consultations held in [New York in 2018](#) and [Geneva in 2019](#).

Regional consultations occurred in the Middle East (Amman, 2019), Central and South America (Bogotá, 2019), and South and Southeast Asia (Dhaka, 2020). The overarching aims were:

- To share research and practitioner experience with the methodological and ethical implications of conducting education-focused research in emergencies and protracted crises
- To build networks of international and local actors and encourage them to connect and converse around the challenges and opportunities for education research
- To identify research gaps through a collaborative approach that combined the views of all actors and stakeholders

This regional workshop series was also designed to help GCRF understand more fully the context in which projects will take place and to enable institutional learning around the ethical and practical challenges of conducting research in this space. As INEE seeks to understand “what” is being researched in EiE, GCRF seeks to explore “how” this research is being conducted.

A survey was conducted in advance of each workshop to collect participants' responses on (1) ongoing research they were involved in, (2) their research partnerships, (3) key EiE knowledge gaps, and (4) gaps in specific types of research. With breakout groups organized around the [INEE Minimum Standards](#) domains, the survey responses provided a basis for discussion in each consultation. They also provided information for the Priority Knowledge Gaps for EiE Mapping that were specific to each context.

While organized and facilitated by INEE and GCRF staff, these consultations relied heavily on participants' active engagement through their presentations of research, provocations<sup>1</sup> on key topics such as equitable research partnerships or research dissemination, and group work.

## Participants

The number of participants ranged from 20 to 40 per consultation. Participants were drawn from GCRF-funded principal investigators and INEE members, including regional academics and local and international practitioners.

The three consultations held in Amman, Bogotá, and Dhaka made it possible for representatives from key EiE regions to contribute to the creation of the INEE Learning Agenda and to GCRF's understanding of how EiE research is being done globally.

## Key Learnings

Many of the participants who joined the conversation identified similar research needs in the three regions. Most notably, regional representatives discussed the need to reconceptualize EiE in order to grow past the “traditional” EiE conflict or post-conflict setting; they indicated that an expanded definition must include and prioritize protracted crises. Participants also made it clear that the current scope of EiE research is not comprehensive enough to meet needs at the local level. For example, researchers from the Central and South America region asked for EiE to encompass gang violence, drug trafficking, and armed groups. There also was a mention in each region of how language could create a barrier to both participation in

---

<sup>1</sup> A short presentation or speech designed to provoke thought and discussion on a specific topic.

research and its dissemination. This barrier can create a secondary issue that many participants highlighted, which is the lack of primary resources published in languages other than English. Participants encouraged INEE and GCRF to be intentional about the role language plays in the INEE Learning Agenda and the extent to which resources published in other languages will be included in the evidence platform or resources in English will be translated into local languages. Another common thread among the three consultations was the universal struggle to establish and sustain equitable research partnerships. Participants from all three regions reported a need for funders and donors to prioritize equity from the start. They said this would include allocating funds for community participation and capacity-building in proposals, extending research project timelines to allow sufficient time for these partnerships to flourish, and being intentional about selecting local research proposals and entrusting the communities to research their own context. Lastly, participants from all regions reported a gap in research around the use and efficacy of technology-based programs and pedagogy.

Meanwhile, each region had its own unique research needs on thematic areas such as teacher wellbeing, instruction and learning, and access to learning environments. It is important to note that these discussions were led by participants, were only two hours long, and were not all encompassing. While the needs in each region have specific nuances, most of those reported were applicable in all three.

Key learnings that surfaced in these consultations will be used to dictate how INEE approaches the creation of the INEE Evidence Platform. The key learnings include the following:

1. Include research in all languages. By including research in all languages, the evidence platform will promote resources from all regions as primary resources for the EiE community.
2. Be inclusive of research related to all types of emergencies. The evidence platform should ensure that the definition of EiE includes and highlights all types of emergencies, giving particular attention to the compound emergencies and contexts that are frequently excluded from the international agenda.
3. Encourage the dissemination of locally led research. By adding a way to search for locally led research, the evidence platform can elevate research that otherwise might not be widely disseminated.
4. Highlight various types of research around each theme. Displaying a range of research types around each theme will provide platform users with a variety of perspectives on their area of interest.

INEE and GCRF are grateful to the key local actors in the practitioner and research communities who spent considerable time and energy preparing for and attending these regional consultations. The important insights gained from the regional representatives will be invaluable to the creation of INEE's Evidence Platform and to GCRF's institutional learning around the ethical and practical challenges of conducting research in these contexts.

For more information on the INEE Learning Agenda and global consultations, click [here](#).



Consultation participants, Amman Jordan, February 2019

# AMMAN, JORDAN

---

February 19-20, 2019

The first joint GCRF-INEE regional INEE Learning Agenda consultation was held February 19-20, 2019, in Amman, Jordan, at the Landmark Hotel (see Annex I: Amman Workshop Agenda). The consultation convened 43 participants from Jordan, Lebanon, and other countries in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) region who represented 27 organizations and 8 academic institutions (see Annex II: Amman List of Participants).

## CONTEXT

For decades, practitioners and researchers in the MENA region have been responding to and studying numerous acute and protracted crises unique to the region, such as the Syrian crisis. In 2019, it was reported that 2.1 million children in Syria were out of school and 1.3 million more were at risk of dropping out (UN OCHA, 2019). Lebanon was concurrently attempting to accommodate 1.5 million Syrian refugees and more than 200,000 Palestinian refugees within their already fragile infrastructure (UNHCR, 2020). Surrounding countries were doing the same, some while also responding to their own crises. This uniquely complex context makes the MENA a high-priority region to contribute to the content and direction of the INEE Learning Agenda.

## OPENING SESSIONS

The opening sessions laid out the workshop objectives, provided background on INEE, GCRF, and the INEE Learning Agenda, posed key questions, and grounded participant discussion in the context of ongoing regional research. To frame the discussions for the two-day workshop, Dr. Ritesh Shah of the University of Auckland spoke on the political economy of education research. Following Dr. Shah's talk, Jen Steele of equitas education, Rana Dajani of We Love Reading, Georgios Karyotis of the University of Glasgow, and Nour Shammout of the Abdul Latif Jameel Poverty Action Lab participated in a panel discussion. These presentations focused on how teacher practice and learning can influence children's learning and



wellbeing in Syria; on social movements and the promotion of literacy in Jordan; on Syrian refugee youths' experiences in Lebanon; and on the Innovation for Poverty Actions' work on education in fragile settings. The panel demonstrated the depth, diversity, and quality of current research in the region.



*Participant presentation, Amman Jordan, February 2019*

## **WORKING SESSIONS**

The working sessions were designed to spark debate and active discussion among participants. They prompted participants to think critically about issues and opportunities for education research in the region. There were two working sessions a day; each opened with a 15-minute provocation by a facilitator, followed by an hour-long discussion.

### **Session 1: Research Design and Methodology**

Dr. Kelsey Shanks of UKRI GCRF shared a provocation on the challenges of conducting education research in fragile environments. She asked the group to think broadly about research, and about how the political economy of knowledge production has impacted education research in the MENA region. Participants agreed that more flexibility was needed for research in fragile environments, along with increased openness and transparency throughout the research process. Many participants also agreed that research questions or areas of inquiry in fragile environments are often driven by Western institutions, rather than being locally defined. This tends to remove the process from local hands and create a distance between donor research and beneficiary needs, especially when donors predominantly communicate and make decisions in foreign languages rather than in the local languages. Participants also voiced concerns about the security aspects of research in fragile environments, such as having safe access to research locations and not being able to include the names of local researchers out of fear for their safety. Participants concluded that these and other issues can result in certain areas being over-researched and others being neglected.

### **Session 2: Humanitarian-Development Nexus**

Dr. Bassel Akar of Notre Dame University in Louaize, Lebanon, presented a broad overview of the humanitarian-development context and how it impacts education research. In response, participants discussed the need for research to be grounded in a cross-sector approach. They noted that research conducted in accordance with humanitarian principles during a crisis can negatively impact researchers' ability to challenge the state or armed



group actors about developmentally focused education issues that arise such as politically driven education. They also acknowledged that education is a long-term endeavor and therefore needs longer and more flexible funding cycles for both research and project implementation. Short-term funding is a key contributing factor which creates a nexus between the humanitarian and development responses and challenges the continuity of education between the humanitarian and development response. Participants also mentioned that the nexus makes EiE more political and susceptible to control by vested interests. They expressed the concern that new global funds for education in emergencies risk the consolidation of rather than the expansion of education opportunities.

### **Session 3: Building Equitable Research Partnerships**

Ilyad Abualrub of the University of Oslo shared a provocation on the challenges and potential opportunities of establishing true North/South equitable research partnerships. Participants described equitable research partnerships as culturally sensitive, collaborations in which all partners have equal access to resources and equal opportunity to share in the outputs, leading to jointly conceived, produced, and owned knowledge. Participants noted that research design is too often created in the Global North, while partners in the Global South are tasked with carrying out most of the work. This limits the opportunity to build true partnerships and can be viewed as exploitative. Participants also asserted that a truly equitable partnership should be treated as a discussion space in which disagreements are resolved not by a voting system but through negotiation and collaborative work. It is important to note that local knowledge and cultural understanding should be taken into account in partnership agreements, rather than putting all of the emphasis on the physical resources that are brought to the table.

### **Session 4: Research Dissemination**

Bilal Barakat of the Global Education Monitoring Report shared a provocation on how research is disseminated and shared, noting specific regional challenges to accessing research. Participants reported that, in their experience, research is often held behind a paywall that makes it inaccessible to many. They said they often rely on LinkedIn and Facebook groups to find free reports and articles. Participants also reported using practitioner reports, noting that this often reinforces certain ideas of rigor and fails to create an environment of academic variety. Participants mentioned that continuously and rapidly sharing findings throughout the research cycle should be incentivized so that the results can be used for preparedness and response. Participants all agreed that the language of publication is a significant challenge to the MENA region. Most of the research about education in emergencies in the MENA region is in English, which makes it inaccessible to local communities. Furthermore, education ministries in the region are often reluctant to share information publicly and are often sensitive to criticism, which makes disseminating negative findings particularly difficult. Participants wondered if podcasts or shorter, lighter articles would be more accessible to researchers in the region than strictly academic publications. They also recommended using film festivals, documentaries, and panel events to reach a wider audience.

## **INEE EVIDENCE GAP MAP SESSION**

To start off the INEE Learning Agenda consultation, Margi Bhatt, INEE Education Policy Coordinator, presented the Amman Priority Knowledge Gap Map for EiE, which displayed participant-reported results from the pre-workshop survey on evidence gaps and ongoing research in the Middle East organized in accordance with the INEE Minimum Standards. Participants then engaged in breakout sessions on the evidence and research reported across

each Minimum Standard domain. The objective of this session was to build on the pre-workshop survey and evidence gap map and to identify and discuss key knowledge gaps for the EiE field, and the MENA region specifically.



Working session, Amman Jordan, February 2019

### **Domain 1: Foundational Standards (Community Participation, Coordination, Analysis)**

Participants first mentioned the need for better understanding of how to work effectively with community members and how to prioritize mentoring and capacity-building for community members. They said that the lack of understanding hinders their ability to engage in meaningful and sustained community participation. Participants also noted that many local actors do not know how to become involved with education-focused associations. This led to a discussion on the critical need for local research knowledge management. Participants noted that creating learning hubs or think tanks to encourage sharing knowledge gained from research by academics, government, school staff, and other stakeholders could help bolster community participation and encourage coordination among actors.

When discussing the analysis standards, participants were primarily concerned with the need for a critical context analysis of the region led by local researchers. They acknowledged that this would likely require capacity exchange to support local researchers to perform the analysis, which would promote more sustainable community participation in the future. This related to their discussion surrounding coordination in a humanitarian response, and participants noted the lack of a strong common contextual understanding of the region among actors. They suggested that a critical context analysis should be the starting point for any action in a protracted crisis, and that the actors should pool expertise that already exists in the region, rather than having each individual donor or implementing partner conduct their own analysis. The analysis should also build on practitioners' experiences through networks, such as academics, public service providers, implementers, and stakeholders.

In order to ensure the sustainability of assessment and analysis outcomes, participants expressed a need to update the context analysis frequently. They wondered if this needs to be done at the sector level rather than by an individual actor, and in collaboration with local and international research partners. Participants requested more needs assessments and program evaluations at the program level, both of which would require increased investment in monitoring and evaluation research.

## Domain 2: Access to Learning Environment

Participants quickly identified the access needs of students with physical, learning, and intellectual disabilities in EiE contexts as a critical gap in EiE research. They observed that there has been a decline of research on students with disabilities in EiE contexts since the Syrian crisis began. They said there also is a lack of research around teacher capacity building to address the needs of students with disabilities. Participants noted that they are aware of this research happening in other contexts, but said it is not covered enough in EiE or MENA settings.

In terms of the physical security of students, participants discussed the lack of research around corporal punishment in schools and transition points in education. They noted that, while there is a lot of investigation into basic education, there is still a need for research around the transition to secondary school and on to higher education. Participants envisioned this research identifying why students are dropping out of school and when they tend to stop attending, and then outlining how to prevent it. They underscored that it is not just about why students stop their education but about what barriers keep them from returning to school.

Another point of discussion in this domain was around emergency preparedness, or lack thereof, in the region. Research and policies tend instead to respond to a crisis, and there is a need to prioritize preparedness in this region that experiences crisis after crisis. Finally, participants expressed the need for more longitudinal studies in the region to determine if and how the sector is changing the longer term provision of education for all children and young adults.

## Domain 3: Teaching and Learning

Participants in this group identified five key areas that should be included in the evidence platform under the Teaching and Learning domain: (1) curriculum, instruction, and learning; (2) psychosocial support and social and emotional learning (PSS-SEL); (3) assessment of learning outcomes; (4) accelerated education; and (5) technology.

There was consensus among participants that a plethora of research has been conducted on PSS-SEL and accelerated education in the region and, while both are important thematic areas that should be reflected on the evidence platform, there is no need for additional research at this time. With regard to the assessment of learning outcomes, participants noted that, while a fair amount of research is being done that is based on formative assessments in the classrooms, they would like to see work done on how students can receive widely recognized certifications, and if and how teachers should be prioritizing 21st-century skills.

An additional gap in the research that participants discussed was the need for more research on textbook design and curriculum development in the region. They mentioned a regional study that looked at textbooks in Lebanon, Jordan, and Palestine and found that they contained misconceptions of ethical approaches and were lacking a human rights lens. Participants also spoke about the new work being done to develop learning passports that can be recognized internationally, but they expressed concern about who was creating the curriculum and who was involved in the process. Participants ultimately felt that research is needed on the curriculum's appropriateness to the regional context.

Finally, participants discussed the need for more research on the use of technology in the region and the private sector's involvement in these endeavors. They noted that, while there is widespread willingness to support displaced students with access to education technology, the actors providing the technology lack an understanding of teaching and of the MENA context. Additional research into the efficacy of these initiatives would illuminate how useful the technology-dependent initiatives are in the region.

## Domain 4: Teachers and Other Education Personnel

Participants discussing this domain were concerned primarily with teacher training and teacher wellbeing. They began the discussion by noting that refugee teachers do not receive mentoring or guidance, which has resulted in a gap in knowledge about their specific needs. They would like to see more research done on the most effective professional development procedures for teachers in crisis contexts. There also is a lack of understanding of teachers' wellbeing needs and how to best support them. Participants noted that additional research on teacher wellbeing could illuminate the boundaries that should exist around their roles. Participants wondered if the sector is asking too much of teachers, as they often become students' primary emotional support in addition to being their teachers. Finally, participants noted that there is a gap in the research around the specific needs of host community teachers who teach refugee or displaced students.

## Domain 5: Education Policy

Participants reported a gap in the research on policy links between the formal and informal education sectors. They went on to say that they need research that helps them better understand which policies enable learners to transition from the informal to the formal classroom, which policies recognize both the demand and size constraints unique to crisis contexts, and how those policies should be implemented. Participants also noted the lack of policy implementation and fidelity studies. They said they need more analyses of how policies are implemented and why they succeed or fail in specific contexts. Participants also expressed a need for descriptive studies that outline the development of a policy in terms of who is involved in its creation and who is in charge of its uptake. When discussing the domain as it relates to the entire MENA region, participants requested a full analysis of each education system in the region and how they relate to each other. Finally, participants reported the need for a set of principles that guide the identified research priorities, both in each region and globally, irrespective of each country's specific political agenda.

## LOOKING FORWARD

Participants of this regional learning agenda consultation offered valuable insights into the specific needs of those who are supporting and researching education systems and programs in the MENA region. From the unique challenges participants face when conducting research in the region to the context-specific research needs and considerations, it is clear that, in its final form, the INEE Evidence Platform will need to be responsive to the nuances that exist across and within regions. While participants highlighted key gaps in the research for every domain, it was heartening that they also reported key thematic areas that they consider to be sufficiently researched in the region, such as PSS-SEL. As the workshop came to a close and participants began discussing the work that lies ahead, it became clear that equitable research partnerships, leveraging local researchers and international, national, and regional entities alike, will be integral to meeting the research needs of the MENA region.

Please click on the links below to be directed to the Amman workshop agenda and participant list:

[Annex I: Amman Workshop Agenda](#)

[Annex II: Amman Participant List](#)





Consultation participants, Bogotá Colombia, December 2019

# BOGOTÁ, COLOMBIA

3-4 December 2019

The second joint GCRF-INEE regional INEE Learning Agenda consultation was held December 3-4, 2019, in Bogotá, Colombia, at the Marriott Hotel (see Annex III: Bogotá Workshop Agenda). The consultation convened 33 participants from Colombia, Honduras, and other countries in the Central and South America region who represented 17 organizations and 6 academic institutions (see Annex IV: Bogotá List of Participants).

## CONTEXT

In 2019, the Latin America and Caribbean region was hosting 3.9 million Venezuelan migrants and refugees (UNICEF, 2019). This number included 1.2 million children in need of assistance and support. By the end of 2019, Venezuela's neighboring countries, including Colombia, Peru, Ecuador, Brazil, Panama, Trinidad and Tobago, and Guyana, were hosting 67% of the worldwide total of Venezuelan migrants and refugees (UNICEF, 2019). Practitioners noted that a majority of these vulnerable families with young children were migrating on foot to seek refuge. Moreover, the growing number of vulnerable populations in the region has increased need and put a strain on the region's infrastructure, including education systems. Central and South America are experiencing the most extreme humanitarian crisis in recent years, which has far-reaching implications for the host countries and migrants alike. This crisis is further compounded by the armed conflicts several countries are also facing, which have had a drastic effect on their youth. Globally, nearly 50% of all adolescent homicides occur in the Latin America and Caribbean region, despite it being home to slightly less than 10% of the global adolescent population (UNICEF, 2017). It is important that the EiE sector prioritize and support the Central and South American contexts in their EiE response. Therefore, this region was given high priority in contributing to the content and direction of the INEE Learning Agenda.

## OPENING SESSIONS

The consultation opened with an introduction to INEE, GCRF, and the INEE Learning Agenda. Claudio Osorio, INEE's Spanish Language Community Facilitator, led a discussion among participants to define what EiE means in the Central and South American context. In Colombia specifically, children in crisis contexts are impacted by three types of emergencies that could affect their learning: migration, natural hazards, and violence. Part of EiE in this region is considering the unique way multiple emergencies interact and their negative effects on the children. In response to the myriad emergencies this region experiences, participants reported that schools are often used as shelters, resource collection centers, and military facilities, which creates another barrier to providing high-quality education. Participants also reported being frustrated with the reality that research coming out of the Central and South America region rarely reaches a global level, unlike the research coming out of the MENA and African regions. Another aspect of EiE in the region is the lack of access to information about migrant children and fragmentation amongst the agencies that are working with these children. Participants also raised the question of language with respect to the region's unique cultural diversity. Teachers are required to teach in Spanish, which makes other cultures and languages invisible and hinders students' ability to perform well on assessments.



INEE Spanish Language Community Facilitator Claudio Osorio, Bogotá Colombia, December 2019.

A panel discussion featuring Kelly di Bertolli of Proyecto Quixote, Julian Bermeo of Centro de Memoria Paz y Reconciliación, Silvia Diazgranados of IRC, and Luis Eduardo Perez Murcia of the Global Campaign for Education (GCE) highlighted research and tools applicable to the specific needs of the region. The panelists presented teaching methodologies that address the effects of violence on young people's education pathways (Bertolli); practices of collaborative remembering (Bermeo); evidence for cost-effective responses to the global education crisis (Diazgranados); and GCE's current research agenda (Murcia). The panelists highlighted creative and collaborative approaches to achieving quality education in the region.

## WORKING SESSIONS

The working sessions were designed to spark debate and active discussion among participants and to prompt them to think critically about issues and opportunities for education research in the region. Each of the three working sessions opened with a 15-minute provocation led by a facilitator, followed by an hour-long group discussion.

## **Session 1: Research Methodology**

The first session opened with a provocation led by Yesid Paez of the University of Bath, who encouraged participants to reflect on the challenges of doing robust research on EiE in the region and how they negotiate the politics of education in this context. Participants discussed a number of region-specific challenges to doing EiE research, such as the nature of financing in the region, which they noted is often short-term and does not allow for longer term projects. There were multiple mentions of how the various cultures and languages of the region add a layer of complexity. Many participants reported that language discrimination creates challenges in doing research. The discrimination happens on a number of levels. It occurs first when people who speak indigenous languages are excluded from the research at the local level, and later with the lack of visibility of research published in Spanish, which is rarely disseminated at a global level. One general challenge to conducting EiE research is that, because communities in the region have experienced a substantial amount of extractive research, they are often reluctant to participate in new research projects. There is a need to carry out humanizing research, which means that researchers and participants learn from each other and build mutual confidence and trust in order to prevent “academic messianism.” Moreover, researchers and the research participants themselves must be included in the development of ethical protocols. Participants also mentioned that research tends to focus largely on the symptoms generated by conflict and how they manifest, rather than on the political and root causes of conflict.

## **Session 2: Building Equitable Research Partnerships**

The second session opened with a provocation led by Julia Paulson of the University of Bristol, who asked participants to reflect on how equitable research partnerships can be created under conditions and within contexts that are not equitable. Participants were asked such questions as, “What is the role of community voice in education research in conflict-affected areas?” and “How can research funders encourage or require equitable research partnerships and support local research capacity?” Participants noted a need to reconstruct the concept of community within this context, as borders between communities in the region are often unclear. They said it is important to include participants in the research process in order to determine what each community is and what borders distinguish them. An additional challenge of working with rural or indigenous communities is that researchers may not know if or how the participants understand or conceptualize the research protocols they agree to. Researchers could meet this need by creating space for discussion and input throughout the entire research process — not just at the end to validate their findings. Another way to build equitable partnerships would be to create and expand networks of researchers that attend workshops at which funders show communities how to access calls for research. They also could invite local researchers to bring their proposal drafts and give them useful feedback. Funders must make an effort to understand, recognize, and value the diversity of researchers working at the local level who are conducting research projects that might not be found at the international level. Calls for research proposals often exclude researchers who are not members of an institution or agency, which excludes the unique and diverse perspectives of non-traditional researchers.

## **Session 3: Dissemination of Research**

The third and final session opened with a provocation led by Kelsey Shanks of UKRI GCRF, who asked participants such questions as, “How do we ensure that research findings are taken up by key stakeholders and translated into practice?” and “What are promising formats that ensure disseminated research is approachable?” The participants emphasized that, without dissemination, research does not have an impact, and that the academic environment does not prioritize or support ethical dissemination, which means that findings are usually disseminated at conferences and to other researchers before they are disseminated to the local communities, if at all. This dictates the language in which research is published and the people who are the first to read and benefit from the research.



It is important to remember that evidence about a community or phenomenon can bring visibility to a cause or a demonstrated need. Researchers therefore should use accessible verbal and visual language when carrying out workshops and should co-validate results with workshop participants in a timely manner. Other innovative forms of dissemination could also be leveraged, such as technology or art. It is important to disseminate extensive documentation of the learning challenges faced by NGOs and their best practices. Participants stated that lessons learned are often not taken into account, as reports to donors tend to mix performance results with impact. By encouraging the global community to be open to different types of research, the sector could minimize competition and maximize dissemination and uptake.

## INEE EVIDENCE GAP MAP SESSION

To start off the INEE Learning Agenda consultation, Sonja Anderson, INEE Data and Evidence Coordinator, presented the Bogotá Priority Knowledge Gap Map for EiE, which displayed participant-reported results from the pre-workshop survey on evidence gaps and ongoing research in the Central and South America region, organized in accordance with the INEE Minimum Standards. Participants then engaged in breakout sessions on the evidence and research reported across each Minimum Standard domain. The objective of this session was to build on the pre-workshop survey and evidence gap map, and to identify and discuss key knowledge gaps for the EiE field in general, and in Central and South America specifically.



Working session, Bogotá Colombia, December 2019.

### Domain 1: Foundational Standards (Community Participation, Coordination, Analysis)

When discussing Domain 1 of the Minimum Standards, participants reported a need for general system strengthening. The countries across the region lack a shared vision of EiE, coordination mechanisms, definitions of responsibilities (i.e., the department of education), and a mapping of all of the actors, risks, situations, and actions, as well as an understanding of existing mechanisms for coordination at the country level. There is also a need for greater inter-sector coordination.

Participants asserted that research and evidence should not be produced by academic institutions alone but should involve national institutions (such as the ministry of health), specialized NGOs, and private actors. They also expressed the need for increased understanding of how EiE is affected by gang violence, drug trafficking, and armed groups. Participants said that,



although these factors are not always considered “traditional” EiE realities, they are key to the region and therefore require research and evidence. They suggested that using more case studies would help highlight how different types of crises affect people in the region at the local level. It is important to think about using technology and other creative research methods to meet the unique needs of the region.

Community participation also should be prioritized, not just in traditional EiE conflict or post-conflict settings but in situations of violence. Participants grappled with questions around how research can foster parents’ and guardians’ interest in education when they have other pressing concerns; without them, community participation is difficult. Finally, participants said that the region lacks understanding of the effects crisis and conflict have on the functioning of schools, and on the relationships and dynamics in the classroom. Participants asked what happens in classrooms when students or others with power question the teacher’s authority, or in situations where teachers are constantly scared. Conflicts in this region are often protracted, and participants said that once a response is exposed to the public eye, they see how unprepared local and regional institutions are to respond.

## **Domain 2: Access to Learning Environment**

Participants in this group identified six key areas that should be included in the evidence platform under the Access to Learning Environment domain: (1) access, (2) equity and inclusion, (3) gender, (4) safe and protective spaces, (5) education infrastructure, and (6) social programs.

Within the realm of access, equity, and inclusion, research should consider the affected populations, with a special focus on people with mobility challenges, indigenous people, afro descendants, migrants, and displaced students. Also needed is a flexible system to facilitate access to education, including transportation to and from school. When discussing gender, participants wanted to know what specific challenges pregnant adolescents might encounter in a crisis context that could limit their access to school, how menstruation affects girls’ educational experience, and how their role as caregivers affects girls’ ability to access school.

Research on safe, protective spaces must include opportunities for students to transition to formal schooling, early childhood education programs, and support for the physical and PSS-SEL needs of the entire school community. Research around school infrastructure, including primary, secondary, and higher education school buildings, could highlight how these spaces have been impacted by direct damage, what alternative school infrastructure exists, and the infrastructure needed to meet the basic hygiene and sanitation needs of all students. Participants said that it would be helpful to know how social programs based in schools — cash transfer, school meals, attention to health, etc. — affect school enrollment, retention, and dropout. While participants acknowledged that the choice of research method depends on what is being researched, they recommended more community-based research, program impact evaluations, case studies, and evaluations of damage to the economic, social, and education learning environment.

## **Domain 3: Teaching and Learning**

Key research areas that should be included under the Teaching and Learning domain include (1) teacher professional development, (2) management and support, (3) teacher wellbeing, and (4) teaching and learning. Participants reported that the greatest research gaps are in the areas of teacher professional development, management and support, and wellbeing. Participants said that teachers are not being properly trained how to maintain the basic curriculum quality while adjusting to constrained resources or the unique cultural needs of an EiE context. Given the protracted nature of emergencies in the region, teachers also need to be taught how to prioritize comprehensive curricula during crises. Teachers would benefit from additional preservice and in-service training on how to support young people and pro-

mote their vocational skills. Participants also noted that teachers must be trained to teach human rights education, peace education, and education around violent conflict and sexual violence at school. The type of research that could meet these gaps includes participatory action research, impact studies to understand what works, design research, comparative studies, operational research to understand how programs work, research on system-level impact, and longitudinal studies.

#### **Domain 4: Teachers and Other Education Personnel**

Key research areas that participants noted under the Teachers and Other Educational Personnel domain include (1) teacher professional development, (2) management and support (including attention to trauma in teacher training), and (3) teacher wellbeing. Research gaps were noted around preservice and in-service teacher training in the region. Participants wanted to know how teacher training programs can prepare future teachers adequately to teach social and emotional learning, and to teach in diverse classrooms with a focus on inclusion. When considering the fragile contexts many teachers are working in, participants said that local actors lack the knowledge or training to navigate dynamics around insecurity and crisis. Research on teacher training quality in the region would reveal needs to improve the teacher preparation process. Participants said that research around teacher wellbeing also should focus on creating tools to map and compare teaching conditions and to measure teacher mental health and wellbeing. They said that having these tools to use alongside the findings on teacher effectiveness or student achievement would help contextualize the results. Action research could include teachers in the research process and ensure that their voices are heard. Participants underscored that teachers are political actors, in particular in this region. Research on teacher networks and teacher unions, what they are able to achieve, and the challenges they face would highlight what works and what does not work around teacher support in the region.

Participants also discussed the role of armed actors in schools. While there is extensive research on attacks and recruitment in schools, there is none on armed actors imposing rules, giving gifts, or maintaining a presence, or on how they manipulate or prohibit the school curriculum. Lastly, participants reported a need to understand more fully how educational communities and educators support their school communities when difficult events related to conflict occur (e.g., kidnappings, assassination of students, suicide).

#### **Domain 5: Education Policy**

Participants expressed a desire to identify possible areas of intervention within the education policy realm. They said they lack an understanding of how to obtain the results of research-based practices and of what actions should be taken when considering unique political contexts. A better understanding of policy interventions could be complemented by research on how evidence is taken up by policy-makers and used to inform decisions. Participants noted that it is especially important that research informs what academics should do to fill this knowledge gap (i.e., the opportune time, the format, the language, the content). Participants underscored the need for policy at the local, regional, and national levels that secures the right to education for people affected by conflict and by emergencies related to climate change, including IDPs, migrants, refugees, and deportees.

## LOOKING FORWARD

The Central and South America region is dealing with a number of protracted crises. This includes the Venezuelan crisis, as well as prolonged gang violence, natural hazards, and other forms of emergency. There was a specific need to focus research on teacher wellbeing in the stressful environments in this region. Local researchers want to know how the EiE community can support teachers to work most effectively under these precarious conditions. The Central and South America region is struggling to ensure that research coming out of the region connects with and directly benefits various cultural groups and indigenous populations. The vast number of indigenous languages adds complexity to the dissemination of research. The participants made it clear that the INEE Evidence Platform will have to curate research originally published in other languages, such as Spanish, and elevate them to be considered as primary resources. It will be important that the platform encourages EiE professionals to do the same.

Please click on the links below to be directed to the Bogotá workshop agenda and participant list:

[Annex III: Bogotá Workshop Agenda](#)

[Annex IV: Bogotá Participant List](#)



Consultation participants, Dhaka Bangladesh, February 2020

# DHAKA, BANGLADESH

---

February 16-17, 2020

The third joint GCRF-INEE regional INEE Learning Agenda consultation was held February 16-17, 2020, in Dhaka, Bangladesh, at the Radisson Blu Dhaka Water Garden (see Annex V: Dhaka Workshop Agenda). The consultation convened 42 participants from Bangladesh, Nepal, Myanmar, and other countries in the South and Southeast Asia region who represented 19 organizations and 12 academic institutions (see [Annex VI: Dhaka List of Participants](#)).

## CONTEXT

The South and Southeast Asia region has experienced protracted crises such as large-scale migration and acute crises such as natural hazards exacerbated by climate change, and conflict. Since 2018, for example, Bangladesh has been accommodating over 900,000 Rohingya refugees, more than 55% of whom are children, in the Cox's Bazar district alone (ISCG, 2018). This large influx was met with pushback from the Bangladeshi government, which deliberately prevented 400,000 Rohingya children from attending government schools until early 2020, at which time they announced that they would work with UNICEF to provide these children with education opportunities (IRC, 2020). Other countries in the region, such as the Philippines and Pakistan, are among the ten countries most affected by climate change, due to the more frequent and extreme natural hazards that occur there (Eckstein et al., 2020). These compounded crises have put extreme pressure on education infrastructure across the region and caused a large number of children to be out of school and without access to quality education. Given the prevalence of EiE contexts in the region, it was crucial to host a consultation with local actors to gain a deeper understanding of their unique educational and research needs.



## OPENING SESSIONS

The consultation opened with an introduction to INEE, GCRF, and the INEE Learning Agenda. Tazreen Jahan of UNICEF then facilitated a whole-group discussion entitled, “What does ‘EiE’ mean in your context?” Participants said that EiE for them goes beyond traditional definitions to include protracted crises. Participants who have responded primarily to the Rohingya crisis said that EiE addresses students’ education and wellbeing needs at various schooling levels. A challenge they often face is the language of instruction for refugees and how it relates to the existing local education system. Cross-cutting EiE themes in Bangladesh relate to disaster risk reduction, climate change, and the impact of crises on host communities. They reported that there sometimes is tension between the host and refugee communities. Lastly, participants from the South Asia region mentioned the political nature of the term “emergency.” While some believe that an emergency should be declared by the state, there are instances when the state might use the term to oppress or suppress people. This engaging discussion made it clear that the broad EiE umbrella has implications for what research is needed and how researchers should approach research gaps.

The latter part of the opening session included a panel discussion that offered examples of research projects happening in the region. The speakers included David Brenner of Goldsmiths College, Dick Pelupessy of the University of Indonesia, and Sakila Yesmin of BRAC University. They discussed, respectively, non-state education and ethnic conflict, findings on teachers’ psychological wellbeing in the aftermath of natural disasters in Indonesia, and the Humanitarian Play Lab Model. The panel highlighted a range of research, addressing the diverse needs of the South and Southeast Asia region.



*Presentation by Chris Henderson, University of Waikato, Dhaka Bangladesh, February 2020*

## WORKING SESSIONS

The working sessions were designed to spark debate and discussion among participants. They prompted participants to think critically about issues and opportunities for education research in the region. Each of the three working sessions opened with a 15-minute provocation by a facilitator, followed by an hour-long group discussion.

## Session 1: Research Ethics

The research ethics session was opened by Tejendra Pherali of the University College London, who asked participants, “What are the challenges of doing robust education research on EiE in the region?” and “How can we negotiate the political nature of education in this context?” Participants reported that there has been increased awareness in recent years of the significance of ethics in research, and of ethical guidelines and frameworks. However, they noted that power dynamics and other cultural considerations still exist in the region, which make it difficult to ensure that all ethical standards are being met. Participants agreed that heightened attention to the protection of research participants was needed, particularly during the Rohingya crisis. They noted that researchers are able to operate without restriction and, as a result, basic ethical research standards often are ignored. They illustrated this point with discussions on the use of photography without consent and the risks of over-burdening research participants by taking up their time without compensation. Participants noted that funding bodies should have clear expectations and a rigorous monitoring process to ensure that agencies follow ethical review processes. Finally, they stated that the region needs alternative, non-coercive ways to gather consent.

## Session 2: Building Equitable Research Partnerships

Session 2 was opened by Yeshim Iqbal of NYU Global TIES, who asked participants questions such as, “What is the role of community voice in education research in conflict affected areas?” and “How can research funders encourage or require equitable research partnerships and support local research capacity?” Participants highlighted successful projects that prioritized community participation from the outset. They also noted that regulatory institutions, such as those that grant research visas, do a good job of ensuring that research partnerships are valid. Challenges discussed include the need to build reciprocity into research proposals and to consider timelines when establishing partnerships. Participants noted that the timelines of institutionalized and funded partnerships should start much earlier to provide ample time to build and maintain partnerships. Another challenge participants noted is the bureaucracy behind researchers, such as those working for academic institutions. The bureaucratic nature of these institutions can make it difficult to support equitable partnerships. Northern organizations’ ways of working are often prioritized in their partnerships, and they often do not take enough time to translate partnership agreements into local languages or to explain the mechanisms and procedures to all involved. In terms of urgent priorities, participants noted that equitable research partnerships must have a consistent understanding of and guidelines on ethics, procedures, and other processes between donors and partners so that they can be in sync every step of the way. Research grants must be flexible in terms of what the funds can be used for, and all partners must be made aware of how much funding is available and how it can be spent. Most importantly, donors should designate equitable funding shares between partners to ensure a financial balance of power; this will prevent Global North academics and agencies from ending up with an inequitable share.

## Session 3: Dissemination of Research

The final session was opened by Daniel Couch of Auckland University of Technology. He asked participants, “How do we ensure that research findings are taken up by key stakeholders and translated into practice?” and “What are promising formats through which to ensure that disseminated research is approachable?” Participants said that the most successful methods they have experienced include targeted dissemination to key actors, who then championed the work at the policy level. They also noted an increase in the number of platforms available to share their research, which has encouraged researchers to be flexible in their writing and the timing of research publication. Other dissemination challenges include a need to partner with other sectors to avoid creating an education silo, and a need for stronger links between research and advocacy to ensure the uptake of evidence and the translation of research into

policy and practice. Supportive visual aids for training and capacity-building are urgent priorities. Overall, participants wanted the accessibility and availability of EiE research to match the scale of general education guidance in these contexts.

## INEE EVIDENCE GAP MAP SESSION

To start off the INEE Learning Agenda consultation, Sonja Anderson, INEE Data and Evidence Coordinator, presented the *Dhaka Priority Knowledge Gap Map for EiE*, which displayed participant-reported results from the pre-workshop survey on evidence gaps and ongoing research in the South and Southeast Asia region, organized in accordance with the [INEE Minimum Standards](#). Participants then engaged in breakout sessions on the evidence and research reported across each Minimum Standard domain. The objective of this session was to build on the pre-workshop survey and evidence gap map to identify and discuss key knowledge gaps in the EiE field, and in South and Southeast Asia specifically.



Working session, Dhaka Bangladesh, February 2020

### Domain 1: Foundational Standards (Community Participation, Coordination, Analysis)

Participants reported a gap in the research in terms of both community participation and coordination of foundational standards. When discussing community participation, they said there is a need to increase the participation of adolescent girls and boys, children with disabilities, and parents. Research on the impact of discrimination on racial, cultural, and religious diversity in the classroom context would be helpful, as well as research on the intersection of identities and their impact on students' access to education. When asked about coordination, participants noted that universities in the region could be leveraged to help with coordination and offer meaningful insights into higher education needs in the region. For example, participants reported ongoing efforts to work with the University of Yangon in Myanmar, which could be an interesting model to build on in efforts to engage other partners and higher education institutions. Participants said that there is a difference between an education response based on the cluster system and one the government is leading. Participants wanted to know how education ministries could be more closely involved and engaged with coordination mechanisms, and how knowledge is passed between various crises.



## Domain 2: Access to Learning Environments

Participants' research interests in the Access to Learning Environments domain revolved around the inclusion of historically marginalized groups such as girls, children with disabilities, and refugee children and youth. Some participants from Myanmar reported that they were conducting gender analyses and managing girls' empowerment and gender transformative programs across various sectors within their programming and would like to see others do the same for comparative purposes. There is a need for durable education solutions for refugee and internally displaced children, youth, and teachers in non-government-controlled areas in a protracted humanitarian crisis. Participants reported a need for additional research around PSS-SEL provision at the school level in order to fully support historically marginalized students. Finally, additional research around the role of education governance in disaster mitigation, preparedness, response, and recovery would be beneficial to coordination efforts.

## Domain 3: Teaching and Learning

Participants noted four main areas of need for research related to the Teaching and Learning domain: (1) curricula, (2) professional learning and development, (3) assessment of learning outcomes, and (4) instruction and learning processes. With regard to curricula, participants expressed a desire to more fully understand the need for a competency-based curriculum in disaster risk reduction and peace-building in emergency contexts. In the non-formal space, participants wanted to know how refugee learners can establish their identity and foster belonging in displaced contexts. Research that measures a curricula's responsiveness to short-term disruptions would also help practitioners and teachers decide which curriculum to implement or how to adapt their existing curriculum to the context. In terms of professional learning and development, participants wanted to know how pre-service education supports teacher capacity when they must respond to and manage multiple emergencies. They also wanted a better understanding of who teachers are in these contexts and who is training them. It is important to understand what personal experiences teachers bring into the classroom. For example, are there types of human capital that refugees and local community members bring to teaching that could be enhanced by pre-service training? Participants said that a greater focus should be put on research that assesses the learning outcomes of children whose education has been disrupted due to conflict or other events. Lastly, research on the instruction and learning processes should explore the ways technology advances or disrupts learning progress in crisis contexts.

## Domain 4: Teachers and Other Education Personnel

Participants considered the need for more research on existing training opportunities for the broad range of actors included within Domain 4 including teachers and other education personnel. Participants wanted more research on teacher support that outlines how well-established teacher training practices might be generalized to a variety of contexts, including EiE contexts. They said this support should apply to all educational personnel, not just teachers. Participants also discussed the need to test the transferability of evidence to different contexts instead of always developing new practices. Participants agreed that Standard 3: Support and Supervision should be given high priority because, in the absence of government capacity in certain contexts in the region, there has been heavy reliance on volunteer teachers who are not traditionally trained. Along the same vein, participants wondered what research exists on the pathways for volunteer teachers to be accredited after a period of time and what incentives exist in the EiE context to retain teaching staff. Ultimately, participants concluded that it would be useful to have a set of case studies that address this domain and its specific standards in order to gain a better understanding of the contexts in which evidence-based programs and policies work, and how those contexts differ from or are similar to the South and Southeast Asia region.



## Domain 5: Education Policy

Participants began by noting the need to research the capacity of government institutions in the region. Research could show what certain institutions are good at and what gaps there are in capacity and effectiveness. It would also be beneficial to have a solid understanding of the politics of development assistance and whether or not policy reforms map onto each other. These research questions could be addressed using assessment methodology with a focus on qualitative research. Participants noted that technical research does not always capture the nuances needed to understand how and why certain policies succeed or fail. Another research gap reported was around the implementation of best practices and the contextualization required for best practices to succeed. Participants wondered which, if any, local standards should be developed as prerequisites to implementing certain programs. Finally, participants wanted to know more about sustainable capacity-building mechanisms. They observed significant funding for capacity-building but were not seeing a positive impact. Research on what capacity-building mechanisms exist, what capacity building efforts have been made, and what the best practices are would help illuminate how the region could directly benefit from capacity-building.

## LOOKING FORWARD

The South and Southeast Asia region consultation brought to light, among other things, the importance of research around preparedness and disaster risk reduction. This is particularly important for countries that are especially vulnerable to natural hazards. Many participants also reported a need for a deeper understanding of the government's role in crisis response and policy implementation. Perhaps most notably, participants repeatedly expressed a desire for the EiE sector to broaden its definition and understanding of "education in emergencies" to include those that disrupt education in the South and Southeast Asia region. Participants felt that the EiE needs in the region, such as additional disaster risk reduction resources and tools to respond to natural hazards, are not as readily prioritized within the sector to receive support or funding.

Please click on the links below to be directed to the Dhaka workshop agenda and participant list:

[Annex V: Dhaka Workshop Agenda](#)

[Annex VI: Dhaka Participant List](#)

# KEY CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE INEE EVIDENCE PLATFORM

---

As noted, the information captured in the [INEE Learning Agenda](#) consultations will be highlighted on INEE's forthcoming Evidence Platform. Hosted on the INEE website, this platform will enable EiE stakeholders to search and engage with existing research, stay up to date on ongoing research projects, and view gaps in EiE evidence as identified by practitioners and academics and exhibited by a lack of existing research. This interactive platform will be regularly maintained to ensure that it remains a relevant tool. This platform will be accompanied by a periodically updated summary of current "top reported" evidence gaps.

Hosting the three global Learning Agenda consultations and engaging academics and practitioners on topics related to EiE and research within their contexts surfaced four key learnings that will be used to shape how INEE approaches the creation of the INEE Evidence Platform:

1. **Include research in all languages.** By including research in all languages, the evidence platform will promote resources from all regions as primary resources for the EiE community.
2. **Be inclusive of research related to all types of emergencies.** The evidence platform should ensure that the definition of EiE includes and highlights all types of emergencies, giving particular attention to the compound emergencies and contexts that are frequently excluded from the international agenda.
3. **Encourage the dissemination of locally led research.** By adding a way to search for locally led research, the evidence platform can elevate research that otherwise might not be widely disseminated.
4. **Highlight various types of research around each theme.** Displaying a range of research types around each theme will provide platform users with a variety of perspectives on their area of interest.

INEE and GCRF are grateful to the key local actors from the practitioner and research communities who spent their time and energy on preparing and attending these regional consultations. The important insights gained from the regional representatives will be invaluable and crucial to the creation of INEE's Evidence Platform and to GCRF's institutional learning around the ethical and practical challenges of conducting research in these contexts.

# REFERENCES

---

Burde, D., Kapit, A., Wahl, R. L., Guven, O., & Skarpeteig, M. I. (2017). Education in emergencies: A review of theory and research. *Review of Educational Research*, 87(3), 619-658. DOI 10.3102/0034654316671594

Eckstein, D., Künzel, V., Schäfer, L., & Wings, M. (2020). *Global Climate Risk Index 2020: Who suffers most from extreme weather events? Weather-related loss events in 2018 and 1999 to 2018*. Germanwatch. <https://www.germanwatch.org/en/17307>

Inter-agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE). (2020). *20 years of INEE: Achievements and challenges in education in emergencies*. <https://inee.org/resources/20-years-of-inee>

Inter-Sector Coordination Group (ISCG). (2018). *JRP for Rohingya humanitarian crisis: March-December 2018*. <https://reliefweb.int/report/bangladesh/jrp-rohingya-humanitarian-crisis-march-december-2018-0>

International Rescue Committee (IRC). (2020). *No time to lose: An urgent call for access to quality education for Rohingya children in Cox's Bazar*. <https://www.rescue.org/sites/default/files/document/5151/ircaccesstoeducationrohingyav4.pdf>

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (2020). *COVID-19 impact on education*. <https://en.unesco.org/covid19/educationresponse>

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). (2020). *Lebanon fact sheet*. <https://www.unhcr.org/lb/wp-content/uploads/sites/16/2020/02/UNHCR-Lebanon-Operational-Fact-sheet-January-2020.pdf>

UNICEF. (2017). *A familiar face: Violence in the lives of children and adolescents*. <https://www.unicef.org/bulgaria/media/1511/file/BGR-violence-in-the-lives-of-children-and-adolescents-en.pdf>

UNICEF. (2019). *Migration flows in Latin America and the Caribbean: Situation report no. 9*. <https://reliefweb.int/report/colombia/unicef-migration-flows-latin-america-and-caribbean-situation-report-no-9-january>

United Nations Office of the Coordination and Humanitarian Affairs (UN OCHA). (2019). *Humanitarian needs overview: Syrian Arab Republic*. <https://reliefweb.int/report/syrian-arab-republic/2019-humanitarian-needs-overview-syrian-arab-republic-enar>

# ANNEX I: AMMAN WORKSHOP AGENDA

---

## Day One

10.00 – 10.30	<b>WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS</b> <i>Kelsey Shanks, UKRI GCRF</i>
10.30 – 11.30	<b>OVERVIEW OF RECENT EIE RESEARCH EVENTS</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>2018 INEE Evidence for EiE Workshop and Learning Agenda</b> <i>Margi Bhatt, INEE</i></li> <li>• <b>2018 Bristol Workshop: Critically Examining Our Work in EiE 20 Years On</b> <i>Ritesh Shah, The University of Auckland</i></li> <li>• <b>GCRF Education in Conflict and Crisis—upcoming calls</b> <i>Kelsey Shanks, UKRI GCRF</i></li> </ul>
11.30 – 13.15	<b>PANEL: SHARING REGIONAL RESEARCH EXPERIENCE AND FINDINGS</b> Local and regional practitioners and researchers present research <b>Moderator:</b> <i>Alan Smith, UNESCO Chair, Ulster University</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jen Steele, equitas education and Integrity Global</li> <li>• Rana Dajani, We Love Reading</li> <li>• Georgios Karyotis, University of Glasgow</li> <li>• Nour Shammout, Abdul Latif Jameel Poverty Action Lab (J-PAL)</li> </ul>
13.15 – 14.15	Lunch
14.15 – 15.30	<b>DISCUSSION 1: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 15-minute provocation, followed by small group discussion to address questions posed and whole group feedback</li> </ul> <i>Kelsey Shanks, UKRI GCRF</i>
	Coffee to be brought between sessions - short break in proceedings
15.30 – 16.45	<b>DISCUSSION 2: HUMANITARIAN-DEVELOPMENT NEXUS</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 15-minute provocation, followed by small group discussion to address questions posed and whole group feedback</li> </ul> <i>Bassel Akar, Notre Dame University - Louaize, Lebanon</i>
16.45 – 17.15	<b>CLOSING REMARKS AND AGENDA SETTING FOR DAY 2</b> <i>Kelsey Shanks, UKRI GCRF</i>



## Day Two

9.00 – 09.30	Registration, tea, and coffee
9.30 – 11.30	<b>INEE GLOBAL EVIDENCE GAP MAPPING</b> Margi Bhatt, INEE <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Presentation of INEE Global Evidence Gap Map and regional survey, followed by small group discussions and whole group feedback</li></ul>
11.30 – 12.30	Lunch
12.30 – 13.45	<b>DISCUSSION 3: BUILDING EQUITABLE RESEARCH PARTNERSHIPS</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 15-minute provocation, followed by small group discussion to address questions posed and whole group feedback</li></ul> Iyad Abualrub, University of Oslo
13.45 – 15.00	<b>DISCUSSION 4: RESEARCH DISSEMINATION</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 15-minute provocation, followed by small group discussion to address questions posed and whole group feedback</li></ul> Bilal Barakat, Global Education Monitoring Report
15.00 – 15.30	Coffee
15.30 – 16.00	<b>CLOSING REFLECTIONS AND NEXT STEPS</b> Kelsey Shanks, UKRI GCRF Margi Bhatt, INEE

# ANNEX II: AMMAN

## PARTICIPANT LIST

---

FIRST NAME	LAST NAME	AFFILIATION
Mai	Abu Moghli	UCL
Iyad	Abualrub	University of Oslo
Bassel	Akar	Notre Dame University - Louaize
Nadeen	Alalami	Dubai Cares
Mayas	Alcharani	Chemonics
Dina	AlMasri	Middle East Children's Institute - MECI
Alia	Assali	An Najah National University
Bilal	Barakat	Global Education Monitoring Report
Dina	Batshon	Independent Researcher
Anna	Bertmar Khan	Dubai Cares
Margi	Bhatt	INEE
Karen	Bryner	UNICEF
Mark	Chapple	World Vision International - Syria Response
Lauren	Clarke	UKRI
Frosse	Dabit	UNRWA
Rana	Dajani	We Love Reading
Maureen	Edwards	UKRI
Nisrine	El Makkouk	UNICEF
Aida	Essaid	King Hussein Foundation
Francesca	Freeman	SYE (Syrian Youth Empowerment)
Sissel Gudrun	Idland	The Norwegian Embassy in Beirut
Vick	Ikobwa	UNHCR MENA Regional Bureau
Georgios	Karyotis	University of Glasgow
Maya	Maddah	Issam Fares Institute - American University of Beirut

Arran	Magee	UCL Institute of Education
Mackenzie	Monserez	Save the Children - Syria response
Tim	Pank	UKRI
Helena	Pylvainen	Queen Rania Foundation
Maen	Rayyan	Questscope for Social Development in the Middle East
Ritesh	Shah	University of Auckland
Nour	Shammout	Abdul Latif Jameel Poverty Action lab (J-PAL) at MIT
Kelsey	Shanks	UKRI GCRF
Mayasa	Shanon	UNICEF
Alan	Smith	Ulster University
Jen	Steele	equitas education and Integrity Global
Heba	Suleiman	Finn Church Aid (FCA)
Tala	Sweis	Madrasati Initiative
Fredrik	Telle	EiE Advisor UNESCO
Haogen	Yao	UNICEF MENARO
Fotouh Mahmoud	Younes	Arab Network for Civic Education - ANHRE
Amal	Zahran	UNRWA - Education Monitoring Officer
Alaa	Zaza	Chemonics International; - Manahel Program
Mais	Zuhaika	NRC - Syria Response Office

# ANNEX III: BOGOTÁ

## WORKSHOP AGENDA

---

### Day One

9.30 – 10.00	Registration, Tea & Coffee
10.00 – 10.30	<b>WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, AND WORKSHOP OVERVIEW</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduction to INEE &amp; GCRF</li> <li>• General Workshop Aims</li> </ul>
10.30 – 11.30	<b>GROUP DISCUSSION: WHAT DOES “EIE” MEAN IN THIS CONTEXT?</b> <i>Facilitated by Claudio Osorio, INEE</i> <i>Opening introduction by Ruth Custode, UNICEF</i>
11.30 – 11.45	Coffee & Tea Break
11.45 – 13.45	<b>PANEL 1: LOCAL RESEARCH EXPERIENCE</b> <i>Chair: Doris Santos, Universidad Nacional de Colombia</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kelly di Bertolli: Interrogating the value of theatre based methodologies as a reach tool for addressing the effects of violence on young peoples’ education pathways</li> <li>• Julian Bermeo, Centro de Memoria Paz y Reconciliación: Practices of collaborative remembering at public schools in Bogota: For what purpose and through which means?</li> <li>• Silvia Diazgranados, IRC: How can we improve access to safe and quality learning opportunities for children in crisis settings? Building evidence for cost-effective responses to the global education crisis.</li> <li>• Luis Eduardo Perez Murcia, Global Campaign for Education: Sharing GCEs current research agenda</li> <li>• Q&amp;A and group discussion</li> </ul>
13.45 – 14.30	Lunch
14.30 – 15.45	<b>DISCUSSION 1: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small group discussion followed by whole group feedback <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What are the challenges of doing robust education research on EiE in the region?</li> <li>- What are the risks and ethical implications?</li> <li>- How can we negotiate the political nature of education in this context?</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <i>15-minute provocation led by Yesid Paez, University of Bath</i>
	Tea & Coffee to be brought into the room - no break in proceedings
15.45 – 17.00	<b>DISCUSSION 2: BUILDING EQUITABLE RESEARCH PARTNERSHIPS</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small group discussion followed by whole group feedback <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What is the role of community voice in education research in conflict affected areas?</li> <li>- How do we ensure that global calls for proposals are accessible to local actors?</li> <li>- How can research funders encourage or require equitable research partnerships and support local research capacity?</li> <li>- Who determines what is ‘rigorous’ research?</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <i>15-minute provocation led by Julia Paulson, University of Bristol</i>



<b>17.00 – 17.15</b>	<b>CLOSING REFLECTIONS &amp; AGENDA SETTING FOR DAY 2</b> Kelsey Shanks, UKRI GCRF & Sonja Anderson, INEE
<b>19.00 – 21.00</b>	Group dinner at Marriott

## Day Two

<b>08.00 – 08.30</b>	Registration, Tea & Coffee
<b>08.30 – 11.00</b>	<p><b>BREAKOUT GROUP WORK: INEE LEARNING AGENDA</b></p> <p>Participants to reflect on what we know/what we don't know, as well as provocation discussions to identify how evidence gaps and challenges in the context fit into the INEE Learning Agenda evidence mappings. Breakout groups to follow INEE Minimum Standard Domains:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Foundational Standards &amp; Policy</li> <li>• Access &amp; Learning Environment</li> <li>• Teaching &amp; Learning</li> <li>• Teachers &amp; Other Education Personnel</li> </ul>
<b>11.00 – 12.00</b>	Lunch
<b>12.00 – 13.15</b>	<p><b>DISCUSSION 3: DISSEMINATION OF RESEARCH</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small group discussion followed by whole group feedback <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What is the overall aim of research in this context?</li> <li>- How do we ensure research findings are taken up by key stakeholders and translated into practice?</li> <li>- What are promising formats through which to ensure disseminated research is approachable?</li> <li>- What are the challenges presented by institutional learning environments in INGOs?</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>15-minute provocation led by Kelsey Shanks, UKRI GCRF</p>
<b>13.15 – 14.00</b>	Coffee & Tea Break - Networking
<b>14.00 – 14.15</b>	<p><b>CLOSING REFLECTIONS &amp; NEXT STEPS</b></p> <p>Kelsey Shanks, UKRI GCRF, &amp; Sonja Anderson, INEE</p>

# ANNEX IV: BOGOTÁ

## PARTICIPANT LIST

---

FIRST NAME	LAST NAME	AFFILIATION
Monica	Almanza	GCRF Partner - Millican
Sonja	Anderson	INEE
Maria	Ballarin	Group for the Analysis of Development (GRADE)
Julian	Bermeo	Centro de Memoria, Paz y Reconciliación, Bogota
Doris	Santos	Universidad Nacional de Colombia
Arturo	Charria	Centre de Memoria, Paz y Reconciliacion, Bogota
Ibeth	Cortes	Consultant working on Spencer-funded project
Ruth	Custode	UNICEF LACRO
Silvia	Diazgranados	IRC
Nathalie	Duveiller	NRC
Kelly	Fernandes	Independent Performing Arts Professional
Vera	Grabe	Observatorio de la Paz
Paris	Hickton	AHRC
Janaina	Hirata	Plan International
Shauni	Iles	AHRC
Manuel	Jimenez	
Maria Jose	Bermeo	Universidad de Los Andes, Bogotá
Carlos	Maradiaga	DAI Honduras
Pauline	Martin	Central American University, San Salvador
Yadira Casas	Moreno	Colciencias (Administrative Department of Science, Technology and Innovation of Colombia)
Luis Eduardo	Perez Murcia	Global Campaign for Education
Claudio	Osorio	INEE
Suyapa	Padilla	National Pedagogical University of Honduras and Consultant for USAID/ Honduras

Raul Yesid	Paez Cubides	Bath Spa University
Julia	Paulson	University of Bristol
Maria Teresa	Pinto	Universidad Nacional de Colombia
Angie Ariza	Porras	Consultant working on Spencer-funded project
Karen Molina	Pricto	Save the Children
Sebastian	Ritschard	Consultant working on Spencer-funded project
Maria Andrea	Rocha	Former Team member (2013-2017) and Coordinator of pedagogy (2018-2019) at the National Centre for Historical Memory
Ariel	Sanchez Meertens	Jurisdicción Especial para la Paz, Bogota - Education, Conflict and Identity
Wim	Savenije	Central American University, El Salvador
Kelsey	Shanks	UKRI GCRF
Martin	Suarez	Project Manager for MEMPAZ

# ANNEX V: DHAKA WORKSHOP AGENDA

---

## Day One

9.30 – 10.00	Registration, Tea & Coffee
10.00 – 10.30	<p><b>WELCOME</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduction to INEE &amp; GCRF</li> <li>• General Workshop Aims and Agenda</li> </ul>
10.30 – 11.30	<p><b>GROUP DISCUSSION: WHAT DOES “EIE” MEAN IN YOUR CONTEXT?</b></p> <p><i>Facilitated by Chris Henderson, University of Waikato</i>  <i>Opening introduction from Tazreen Jahan, UNICEF</i></p>
11.30 – 11.45	Coffee & Tea Break
11.45 – 13.45	<p><b>PANEL 1: LOCAL RESEARCH EXPERIENCE</b></p> <p><i>Chair: Carol Mutch, University of Auckland</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• David Brenner, Goldsmiths College: Non-state education and ethnic conflict</li> <li>• Dick Pelupessy, University of Indonesia: Findings on teachers' psychological wellbeing in the aftermath of natural disasters in Indonesia</li> <li>• Sakila Yesmin, BRAC University: Humanitarian Play Lab Model</li> <li>• Q&amp;A and group discussion</li> </ul>
13.45 – 14.30	Lunch
14.30 – 15.45	<p><b>DISCUSSION 1: RESEARCH ETHICS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small group discussion followed by whole group feedback <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What are the challenges of doing robust education research on EiE in the region?</li> <li>- What are the risks and ethical implications?</li> <li>- How can we negotiate the political nature of education in this context?</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><i>15-minute provocation led by Tejendra Pherali, University College London</i></p>
	Tea & Coffee to be brought into the room - no break in proceedings
15.45 – 17.00	<p><b>DISCUSSION 2: BUILDING EQUITABLE RESEARCH PARTNERSHIPS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small group discussion followed by whole group feedback <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What is the role of community voice in education research in conflict affected areas?</li> <li>- How do we ensure that global calls for proposals are accessible to local actors?</li> <li>- How can research funders encourage or require equitable research partnerships and support local research capacity?</li> <li>- Who determines what is 'rigorous' research?</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><i>15-minute provocation led by Yeshim Iqbal, NYU Global TIES</i></p>
17.00 – 17.15	<p><b>CLOSING REFLECTIONS &amp; AGENDA SETTING FOR DAY 2</b></p> <p><i>Kelsey Shanks, UKRI GCRF, &amp; Sonja Anderson, INEE</i></p>



## Day Two

09.00 – 09.30	Registration, Tea & Coffee
09.30 – 12.00	<b>BREAKOUT GROUP WORK: INEE LEARNING AGENDA</b> Participants to reflect on what we know/what we don't know as well as provocation discussions to identify how evidence gaps and challenges in the context fit into the INEE Learning Agenda evidence mappings. <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Foundational Standards &amp; Policy</li><li>• Access &amp; Learning Environment</li><li>• Teaching &amp; Learning</li><li>• Teachers &amp; Other Education Personnel</li></ul>
12.00 – 13.00	Lunch
13.00 – 14.15	<b>DISCUSSION 3: DISSEMINATION OF RESEARCH</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Small group discussion followed by whole group feedback<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- What is the overall aim of research in this context?</li><li>- How do we ensure research findings are taken up by key stakeholders and translated into practice?</li><li>- What are promising formats through which to ensure disseminated research is approachable?</li><li>- What are the challenges presented by institutional learning environments in INGOs?</li></ul></li></ul> <i>15-minute provocation led by Daniel Couch, Auckland University of Technology</i>
14.15 – 14.30	Tea & Coffee Break
14.30 – 16.00	<b>WORKSHOP SYNTHESIS &amp; NEXT STEPS</b> <i>Chris Henderson, University of Waikato</i>
16.00 – 16.30	<b>CLOSING REFLECTIONS</b> <i>Kelsey Shanks, UKRI GCRF, &amp; Sonja Anderson, INEE</i>

# ANNEX VI: DHAKA PARTICIPANT LIST

---

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation
Nashida	Ahmed	BRAC
Professor Syeda Tahmina	Akhter	Institute of Education and Research (IER), University of Dhaka
Sonja	Anderson	INEE
Akbar	Anwar	BRAC
Dr. Taposh Kumar	Biswas	Institute of Education and Research (IER), University of Dhaka
Dr David	Brenner	Goldsmiths College
Sukhee	Chae	International Organisation for Migration
Mohammed Jahedul Islam	Chowdhury	UNHCR
Daniel	Couch	Auckland University of Technology
Bernadett	Fekete	International Organisation for Migration
Rachael Cristal	Fermin	Save the Children
Dr Matteo	Fumagalli	University of St Andrews
Mohammad Ashraful	Haque	Innovations for Poverty Action, Bangladesh
Chris	Henderson	University of Waikato
Paris	Hickton	AHRC
Mohammad Qausar	Hossain	UNICEF
Hamidul	Huq	United International University
Shauni	Iles	AHRC
Mega	Indrawati	World Vision Indonesia
Yeshim	Iqbal	NYU Global TIES
Shahidul	Islam	UNESCO
Tazreen	Jahan	UNICEF
Rosalyn	Kayah	Jesuit Refugee Services

Mahfuza	Khatun	Sesame Workshop Initiatives
Mohammad Golam	Kibri	DFID
Sun	Lei	UNESCO
Bevita	Meidityawati	World Vision Indonesia
Ricardo	Morel	Innovations for Poverty Action, Myanmar
Prof. Carol	Mutch	UNESCO NZ / University of Auckland
Anuragini	Nagar	Sesame Workshop Initiatives
Chris	Paek	American Institute of Research
Miriam	Pahn	EDC
Yagya Raj	Pant	University of Auckland
Dr. Dicky	Pelupessy	University of Indonesia
Mary	Pham	Plan International
Tejendra	Pherali	University College London
Mahbub	Rahma	International Organisation for Migration
Samir	Ranjan	BRAC University Institute of Educational Development (BIED)
Jacklin	Rebeiro	Save the Children
Teresa	Retno	Resilience Development Institute
Fahmida	Shabnam	DFID
Kelsey	Shanks	UKRI GCRF
Aimee	Vachon	Plan International
Sakila	Yesmin	BRAC University



**Inter-agency Network for  
Education in Emergencies**