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Elevating Education in Emergencies is a series of four thematic meetings unpacking the centrality of education in humanitarian responses. Convened by the Permanent Mission of Norway to the UN and the Permanent Mission of Switzerland to the UN, and facilitated by the Global Education Cluster (GEC), this four-part series started in 2018 and will come to an end with the final event on 25 June 2020. The final event focuses on the humanitarian-development nexus and the role of coordination in ensuring uninterrupted learning for affected children and youth in crisis contexts.

This framing paper draws extensively on research, including a series of case studies conducted by the Overseas Development Institute (ODI) during 2018 and 2019, which examined how humanitarian and development actors can effectively coordinate to strengthen education outcomes for children and young people affected by crises. The research was commissioned by the Global Partners’ Project, which brings together the GEC, the UN Refugee Agency (UNHCR), and the Inter-agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE), with generous funding from Education Cannot Wait (ECW) – the global fund dedicated to education in emergencies and protracted crises.

The COVID-19 crisis and its near-universal impact on education systems makes providing attention to uninterrupted learning more urgent than ever. While this paper was first drafted and research conducted prior to this global pandemic, some aspects have relevance to the current context. Its focus, however, remains on ongoing and future emergencies in low- and middle-income countries.
1 Disruption of learning in emergencies and protracted crises

The significance of humanitarian crises on education has new meaning today. The COVID-19 pandemic resulted in most governments around the world temporarily closing schools and over 90% of the world’s student population experiencing disruption to their education. While this scale is unprecedented, the impact of emergencies and protracted crises on education has always been significant. Previously, conflict, disasters and epidemics were estimated to directly affect the education of approximately 75 million children and adolescents per year. Amongst those forcibly displaced, some 33 million have been facing education challenges and 3.7 million (52%) school age refugee children were out of school. Girls, children with disabilities and ethnic minorities have often been further excluded in emergency contexts.

While brief disruptions can take their toll, extended interruption to learning – through displacement, insecurity or other crises – will potentially have long-term detrimental effects to a child’s learning outcomes, well-being and their life-long chances. Many who miss out on school during periods of crisis do not return to formal education. Yet humanitarians increasingly find themselves responding to crises that perpetuate year after year. The average length of assistance through humanitarian response plans (HRPs) rose from five to nine years in 2014–2018. Several recent global commitments include a focus on reducing the time displaced children are out of the education system and returning to learning within three months from any disruption starting.

Working through and with ministries of education and other relevant authorities at all levels, neither humanitarian nor development actors can alone address the range of education needs facing learners affected by emergencies and protracted crises. Promisingly, progress towards an operational ‘nexus’ in which humanitarian and development planning and delivery is aligned has gained momentum in the past decade. This framing paper explores how the humanitarian-development nexus, through coordination in particular, can be used to secure uninterrupted learning for crisis-affected children.

2 The humanitarian-development nexus and education

The humanitarian-development nexus is the link between humanitarian assistance, a rapid response measure in emergency contexts, and medium-to-long-term development action. It encompasses the effort of different actors working in emergencies and protracted crises to collaboratively analyse contexts, achieve collective outcomes, and identify ways to work better together. Work on collective outcomes – which represent a measurable, intermediate target between the current level of need, risk and vulnerability, and the targets set by the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) – with a multi-year timeframe and based on comparative advantage is known as the New Way of Working (NWOW), agreed to at the World Humanitarian Summit in 2016 as part of the Commitments to Action.

Humanitarian and development actors have begun to channel their efforts in recent years to address the nexus in education, with the overarching aim of ensuring that children whatever their context have uninterrupted access to an education that enables learning and contributes to their protection and well-being before, during and after periods of crisis. In a global context where forced displacement is growing and crises are increasingly protracted, a common view is that short-term, parallel or transitional education interventions are not adequate to address the needs of children, nor to ensure inclusive and sustainable development progress demanded of governments under the SDGs. Taking a more joined-up approach to programming and financing for education in crises is therefore critical to fill numerous gaps that are leaving children behind.

---

1 These include the Global Compact on Refugees (2017); Global Framework for Refugee Education (2019); Refugee Education 2030 – a strategy for refugee inclusion (2019); and Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council on Education in Emergencies and Protracted Crises (2018).

2 For some, the nexus is a ‘triple nexus’ in which responses should align humanitarian and development programming as well as peacebuilding. Most agree that early investment in institutions and social services reinforces and contributes to sustaining peace. (See, for example, Security Council Resolution 2282 (2016) on post-conflict peacebuilding). However, there are sensitivities around aligning humanitarian action with peacekeeping and peacebuilding, which is inherently political and may reinforce existing patterns of exclusion and undermine guiding principles of needs-based delivery. While the debate continues at a policy level, in practical terms, each context is likely to operate across this nexus somewhat differently, with the role and capacity of government being a key factor.

3 For some, the nexus is a “triple nexus” in which response should align humanitarian and development programming as well as peacebuilding. Most agree that early investment in institutions and social services reinforces and contributes to “sustaining peace.” (See, for example, Security Council Resolution 2282 (2016) on post-conflict peacebuilding). However, there are sensitivities around aligning humanitarian action with peacekeeping and peacebuilding, which is inherently political and may reinforce existing patterns of exclusion and undermine guiding principles of needs-based delivery. While the debate continues at a policy level, in practical terms, each context is likely to operate across this nexus somewhat differently, with role and capacity of government being a key factor.
Linking humanitarian-development responses has created significant opportunities for greater coherence in education and can yield multiple benefits.\(^4\) Quality education in crises contributes to collective outcomes and demands collective action by humanitarian and development actors that is more predictable and comprehensive.\(^5\) Beyond learning, education supports the overarching humanitarian goal of saving lives and protecting the most vulnerable, and can contribute to peace and security through possibilities for more stable and sustainable futures, both individually and across communities. It can be leveraged to contribute to conflict mitigation, peacebuilding, and security in conflict-affected and fragile states. It can strengthen individual and community resilience, and instil hope for the future, mitigating the psychosocial impact of violence and displacement.\(^6\)

An important aspect – and potential driver – of operationalising the humanitarian-development nexus is through humanitarian and development cooperation and financing.\(^4,5\) Among bilateral donors, there have been recent shifts towards linking education financing in humanitarian and development budgets, with Australia, Canada, Norway, Switzerland and the United Kingdom having made strides in this direction.\(^6\)

Multilateral donors and partnerships are furthering these efforts. The European Union has explicitly emphasized a nexus approach in its policy framework, calling for joint analysis of education needs and differentiated roles and responsibilities for various instruments in a response.\(^7\) The Global Partnership for Education (GPE) – a global education fund and a multi-stakeholder partnership – typically makes its long-term support to countries affected by fragility and conflict more flexible by allowing them to develop interim education sector plans and receive up to 20% of their indicative allocation within eight weeks of a crisis.\(^8\) ECW – the only global fund specifically for education in emergencies and protracted crises – has structured its support to span the onset of a crisis and recovery phases through a combination of its First Emergency Response and Multi-Year Resilience Programme investment windows.\(^9\)

An analytical framework developed as part of research by ODI in 2019 has identified three areas that can deliver greater coherence with respect to norms, capacities and operations (see figure 1). This framework has informed the work of education thought leaders, partners, and practitioners including the US Government. Under this framework:

**Norms** look at what guides education responses in humanitarian and development assistance, such as principles, goals, standards, mandates, strategies and expected outcomes.

**Capacities** focus on who leads and coordinates support to education, with an emphasis on understanding key actors, coordination groups, and staff knowledge and skills.

**Operations** consider how education programmes are planned and provided, including delivery of aid and functions such as assessment processes, planning, finance and monitoring.
### Figure 1: Conceptual framework: Opportunities for greater education coherence

Source: Nicolai et al. (2019)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NORMS</th>
<th>What guides education support</th>
<th>Opportunities for education coherence</th>
<th>Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian principles</td>
<td>SDG commitments to “leave no-one behind” applied to education in fragile and conflict-affected states</td>
<td>Principles for Good International Engagement in fragile states</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHS commitments, CRRF</td>
<td>Focus on education collective outcomes as part of the NWOW</td>
<td>SDG Agenda and SDG4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INEE Minimum Standards</td>
<td>Contextualising minimum standards at national level (INEE, child protection in humanitarian action)</td>
<td>Incheon Framework for Action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Standards for Child Protection in Humanitarian Action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPACITIES</td>
<td>Who leads and coordinates support to education</td>
<td>National government (MoE, MHA)</td>
<td>National Government (MoE, MoSA, MoP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National government (MoE, MHA)</td>
<td>UN Humanitarian Coordinator and UNCT</td>
<td>UN Resident Coordinator and UNCT</td>
<td>UNICEF, UNESCO LEG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN OCHA, UNHCR, UNICEF</td>
<td>Education Cluster, Child Protection AoR</td>
<td>Education Cluster, Child Protection AoR</td>
<td>Education Cluster, Child Protection AoR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATIONS</td>
<td>How education support is planned and provided</td>
<td>Education may be temporary or non-formal</td>
<td>Education through formal schooling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education focused on life-saving information, safety, psychosocial and social-emotional well-being, temporary learning spaces</td>
<td>Education focused on reform, infrastructure, learning outcomes</td>
<td>Education focused on reform, infrastructure, learning outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid education needs assessments</td>
<td>National education monitoring plans</td>
<td>National education monitoring plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRPAs/flash appeals</td>
<td>Education sector plans</td>
<td>Education sector plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited, short-term education funding</td>
<td>More, longer-term education funding</td>
<td>More, longer-term education funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Cluster Monitoring Tool</td>
<td>Education management information systems</td>
<td>Education management information systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Humanitarian Opportunities for education coherence**

- Link emergency education provision to formal system
- Risk-informed, flexible programming, incorporating conflict sensitivity and focus on resilience
- Joint education needs assessments
- Joint education and child protection strategies
- Multi-year humanitarian education plans and transitional education sector plans
- Crisis modifiers, link financing mechanisms and plans
- Interoperability and integrated information systems

**Development**

- Education through formal schooling
- Education focused on reform, infrastructure, learning outcomes
- National education monitoring plans
- Education sector plans
- More, longer-term education funding
- Education management information systems
4 Coordination’s critical role in practice

Coordination plays a critical role in operationalising the humanitarian-development nexus by bringing key actors together to ensure coherent and principled education responses in crisis contexts. The main coordination approaches that bring national and international actors together for country-level education planning and response include:

- Humanitarian cluster coordination approach;
- Refugee coordination approach;
- Development coordination approach; and,
- Mixed, regional and other hybrid approaches.

These different coordination approaches are shown in Figure 2. An overview of those providing leadership for global- and country-level planning and response is included for each approach, alongside a brief description of the population groups and contexts in which they operate, and the approach’s key features.

There are comparative advantages to each education coordination approach, as Figure 2 indicates under ‘key features’. For example, comparative strengths of the humanitarian cluster coordination approach include its capacity for first response and its strong set of standardised tools. The refugee coordination approach boasts technical expertise on refugee law, rights, services and protection. The development coordination approach is notable for its comprehensiveness and longer timeframes, while mixed approaches can offer adaptability to contextual needs. Other features of these coordination approaches are outlined in Figure 2. These are indicative rather than comprehensive.

Figure 2
Main education coordination approaches in emergencies and protracted crises

![Figure 2](source: ODI (2020b))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mechanism</th>
<th>Humanitarian Cluster: Education clusters</th>
<th>Refugee: Refugee education working groups</th>
<th>Development: LEGs</th>
<th>Mixed, regional, hybrid: Multiple groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country: MoE as chair, UNICEF as co-lead, Save the Children or other NGOs often as co-leads</td>
<td>Country: National refugee agency or MoE lead, UNHCR co-lead/support</td>
<td>Country: MoE as lead, often with rotating donor co-lead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>IDPs, local crisis-affected populations in emergency contexts</td>
<td>Refugees in all contexts</td>
<td>Typically stable development contexts</td>
<td>Designed to meet context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key features</td>
<td>● Formal mandate and expertise of the humanitarian system</td>
<td>● Mandate across the nexus through to durable solutions</td>
<td>● High-level access to, and relationship with, government, funding officials and decision-makers</td>
<td>● Advance agreements for who decides mechanism(s), e.g. UNHCR/OCHA joint letter or government reflecting on approach to coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Capacity for first response through rapid response team</td>
<td>● Technical expertise on refugee law, rights, services and protection</td>
<td>● Interventions that span humanitarian-development nexus</td>
<td>● Set up and adapted for needs of context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Standardised tools that present a common framework for coordinated planning and response</td>
<td>● Inclusive structures for coordination, including with affected populations</td>
<td>● Increasing global guidance or capacity building for fragile states</td>
<td>● Different coordination groups can co-exist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ECW works across approaches to strengthen links in the humanitarian-development nexus, such as by working with education clusters, host governments, LEGs and the GPE.

5 The humanitarian cluster approach attempts to make a clear division of labour between organisations, their roles and responsibilities in different areas, while improving accountability to affected people (Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC), 2015). In this paper, groups with formal accountabilities through the IASC are denoted under the ‘Education Cluster’. Sector-specific coordination groups are referred to by UNHCR as ‘sectors’, which are determined by context and envisaged as operational coordination bodies either led or co-led by the host government, with UNHCR and partners coordinating or co-coordinating. Working groups may then be activated, typically to respond to specific topics, sometimes within a cluster.
Ideally, there are shared efforts in joint planning and response across humanitarian and development actors. However, commitment to collaboration is not standard and ways of working together across the nexus are not very clear. In many contexts, the planning and programming tools used by humanitarian and development actors at the national level are not well coordinated. In addition, the coordination structures to support them are separate – sometimes for ease of engagement, given the mandate and nature of response, or in an attempt to preserve independent humanitarian action. In Syria, an Education Dialogue Forum has been working to address these gaps. Established under the framework of an ECW investment, this forum aims to support a unified approach to strategic and technical education issues between humanitarian and development actors.14

One way to look in more detail at potential points of collaboration is across the humanitarian response planning cycle.6 Table 1 identifies some of the critical processes, guidelines and tools that enable coordinated planning and response and could be further adapted across the humanitarian-development nexus. Box 1 then looks specifically at how, in Burkina Faso, contingency planning for education as one of these processes has been important across the humanitarian-development nexus.

---

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Country example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Needs assessment and analysis</td>
<td><strong>Data gathered/shared between stakeholders.</strong> Can vary from joint needs assessments, multi-sector needs assessments, or education sector needs assessments, as well as context analysis.</td>
<td>DRC: joint needs assessments to simultaneously identify education and other needs, or to plan and sequence e.g. reduce similar surveys have limited responder fatigue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment.</td>
<td><strong>Education Cluster Strategies, UNHCR’s Refugee Response Plans (RRPs), Comprehensive RRF, Transitional Education Plans, ECW Multi-Year Resilience Plans, all aligned to National Education Sector Plans.</strong></td>
<td>Iraq: Cluster Strategy aligned with both the Iraqi Humanitarian Response Plan and Regional Refugee Response Plan, which target IDPs, returnees, host communities and refugees as well as the federal and Kurdistan-specific education strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasingly significant funding is jointly provided in education in emergencies.</td>
<td>E.g. ECW’s resources and scope of work from its First Response and Multi-Year Resilience window.</td>
<td>Syria: Under ECW investment, the Education Dialogue Forum, co-led by Whole of Syria-level Education Coordinators and the Syria Education Development Partners Group, also reached out to other donors and facilitated financing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typically, organisational, can be combined to identify weakness and improve accountability.</td>
<td>E.g. Periodic Monitoring Report is an internal management tool for data and analysis and can be used to examine progress in strategic and Education Cluster objectives.</td>
<td>Chad: protection &amp; accountability checklist used to consult with communities during project design- includes ‘do no harm’ checks on WASH infrastructures such as separate facilities for girls and boys, the dissemination of a code of conduct and its signature by teachers, PTAs, NGOs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

6 The preparation of HRPs and RRPs follow the same basic stages of needs assessment, planning, resource mobilisation, implementation and monitoring, evaluation and learning.
Box 1
Joined-up contingency planning in Burkina Faso

Sources: IIEP-UNESCO, Burkina Faso Education Cluster and GEC

Education in emergencies risk-informed planning in Burkina Faso illustrates how timely collaboration among humanitarian and development actors can support a ministry of education in education sector planning.

Violence in Burkina Faso has left almost half a million children without formal education. More than 1,000 schools have been closed, with armed groups accused of attacking villages and threatening teachers and students. At the start of 2019, the Ministry of National Education, Literacy, and Promotion of National Languages (MENALPN) ramped up efforts to prepare and plan for education in emergencies.

Education actors from both humanitarian and development sectors supported the ministry’s contingency planning, while also strengthening the coordination capacity of key ministry and education staff. The UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP-UNESCO) supported the ministry with crisis-sensitive educational planning by developing a 2019–2024 education strategy for children in high-risk situations to institutionalise a ‘prevention, preparedness and response’ approach to the multiple crises affecting the education sector. IIEP-UNESCO also supported crisis sensitive data collection and capacity building of the Technical Secretariat (ST-ESU) in its function of steering education in emergencies.

A team from Burkina Faso participated in a regional workshop on crisis-sensitive planning on the inclusion of displaced populations in national education systems, organized by UNESCO IIEP, in collaboration with UNHCR, UNICEF and the GEC. The workshop sought to improve joint crisis-sensitive planning for education delivery across development and humanitarian interventions. One objective was to prepare action plans to improve coordination between MENALPN, humanitarian and development partners. The Burkina Faso Country Team, including MENALPN officials, humanitarian partners and civil society representatives, later participated in a 10-week distance course on educational planning for crisis risk reduction and forced displacement, which was organised by IIEP-UNESCO.

MENALPN also created the Technical Secretariat for Education in Emergency Situations (ST-ESU). This Secretariat sits within the ministry, reports to its cabinet, which is responsible for coordination of education in emergency activities. Members of the education in emergencies coordination team from Burkina Faso (2 people from the ministry and 3 from agencies) participated in the GEC Regional Core Coordination Skills Training in Dakar, which provided participants with strengthened coordination skills applicable throughout the Humanitarian Programme Cycle.

In the lead up to activation of the Education Cluster response in December 2019, an education in emergencies strategy was already in place and key staff within the Ministry and Cluster Lead Agencies were trained in crisis-sensitive education planning and the Humanitarian Program Cycle. This advance planning feeds into multi-year funding support from ECW in 2020. The ECW will soon be reviewing the MENALPN’s 3-year costed action plan (supported by IIEP-UNESCO) and work with the Burkina Faso Education Cluster to see how the plan could be used to inform a multi-year resilience programme.

5 Coordination’s contribution to collective education outcomes

Education coordination among humanitarian actors and across the humanitarian-development nexus can facilitate more coherent planning, connectedness, and timeliness of a response. As ODI case studies in Bangladesh, Chad, Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), Ethiopia, Iraq and Syria have shown, this kind of coordination leads to:

- Better coverage so that fewer refugee and crisis-affected children are out of school;
- Greater continuity of education opportunities by reducing gaps in provision; and
- Cost efficiencies due to information sharing and rationalised responses.

Developing an evidence base for these links was one objective of the ODI research conducted for the Global Partners Project. Analysis tying together the OECD DAC Criteria for Evaluating Development Assistance and the ECW Collective Education Outcomes provided a way to examine these links. The OECD DAC criteria help to indicate the strength of coordination. The ECW Collective Education Outcomes of access, equity and gender equality, continuity, protection and quality are hoped-for areas of impact as set out in the ECW 2018–2021 strategic plan. Table 3 presents examples from ODI’s research on how coordination practices can contribute to better education outcomes.
Table 2
Links illustrating coordination’s contribution to collective education outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OECD DAC Criteria</th>
<th>Example of coordination’s contribution to collective education outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coverage</strong></td>
<td>In Iraq, the number and geographical spread of education sub-clusters in all seven major areas of displacement have enabled good coverage of the response, improving education access through humanitarian-development coordination. For Syrian refugees, integration into local schools in the Kurdistan Region and use of the regional education curriculum in Kurdish has also helped to improve education coverage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance</strong></td>
<td>In Chad, when the Education Cluster strategy was developed, working groups were formed based on relevant ‘pressing issues’, and included: identifying and measuring education demand/supply, to improve access; quality of education; and, governance (e.g. parents’ role, teacher attendance) to improve quality and continuity of service provision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sufficiency</strong></td>
<td>In Ethiopia, integrating refugee enrolment data into the national Education Management Information System has improved information on where refugee students are enrolled, allowing schools to be funded accordingly. This has contributed to education continuity, among other outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency</strong></td>
<td>In DRC, joint needs assessments amongst humanitarian partners allowed education needs to be identified at the same time as other humanitarian needs, and thus were planned and sequenced in a more efficient way, enabling continuity and better protection for communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td>In Ethiopia, collaboration between the Ministry of Education, Regional Education Bureaus, and the Ethiopian Agency for Refugee and Returnee Affairs increased effectiveness in running accreditation processes for refugee children lacking formal evidence of their schooling - opening opportunities for continuity of education opportunities and access to refugee students to attend government schools, particularly at the secondary level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Connectedness</strong></td>
<td>In North Kivu, DRC, strong collaboration between education and protection cluster coordinators through workshops and joint programme design strengthened connections between humanitarian actors, resulting in improved education continuity and child protection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coherence</strong></td>
<td>In Iraq, coordination of humanitarian actors has enabled a more coherent approach to the response and contribution to protection outcomes through dissemination of humanitarian principles, including on safeguarding and child protection and partners for example monitoring protection risks faced by school children and taking steps to mitigate these.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Complementarity</strong></td>
<td>In DRC, ECW funding has had an explicit focus on consortia, localisation and capacity building which has led to greater involvement of smaller actors, which has been conducive to beneficial education outcomes, especially around continuity and equity around access to education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accountability and participation</strong></td>
<td>In Bangladesh, coordinating humanitarian actors via education groups and disaster risk management initiatives during monsoon season led to communication trees between camp focal points, education coordinators, teachers and parents. This made quick notification and action possible when learning centre roofs blew away, enhancing educational continuity in a multi-hazard context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact</strong></td>
<td>The Whole of Syria coordination mechanism harmonised teacher salaries in North West Syria (they previously varied significantly even in the same school as different NGOs supported different activities). Coordination by humanitarian actors helped to set an agreed pay scale, avoid unequal pay and help retain teachers over the longer term, maintaining education continuity. Anecdotal evidence indicates that this has strengthened the quality of learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ODI (2020b)
6 Implications and opportunities for humanitarian and development actors

Both experience and research point to the following approaches and actions as being vital for global actors and donors as part of their approach to education responses.

**Recognise the critical role of coordination in minimising education disruption.** While national governments – typically education ministries – are responsible for education in all circumstances, their capacity to lead coordination varies widely. Consequently, international and other actors often play an important role in supporting such coordination. Formal coordination mechanisms in humanitarian contexts, such as education clusters and refugee education working groups, along with LEGs should work to strengthen national coordination leadership, with a focus on centralised capacities and localisation. Alongside this, they should support the capacity of civil society organisations to hold governments to account.

**Actively cultivate education coherence across the humanitarian-development nexus.** There is space for greater coherence among humanitarian and development actors working in crisis contexts across the different layers of norms, capacities and operations in education work. While there is already some joint use and alignment of processes and tools for education coordination, there is need to further scale up joint working particularly in assessments, sector and strategic plans, and appeal processes.

**Work towards more predictable joint funding to support education coordination.** Funding can be an enabling factor when designed in a way that explicitly incentivises coordination and reduces competition between education actors. For instance, the bulk of ECW’s assistance via its Multi-Year Resilience Programme window commits financing over several years through pooled support from multiple donors, explicitly linking planning processes such as HRPs, RRPAs and the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF), as well as transitional and education sector plans.

**Focus coordination efforts on strengthening collective education and other outcomes.** Research shows that good coordination has strong potential for contributing to education access, continuity and child protection outcomes. In addition to this, coordination needs to focus on education quality, equity and gender equality. Coordination has potential to strengthen education’s contribution to collective outcomes in areas such as health, protection and food security. Attention to the INEE Minimum Standards for Education and the Minimum Standards for Child Protection in Humanitarian Action are an essential part of this.

Against the backdrop of this framing paper, the event to mark the final instalment of the Elevating Education in Emergencies series can play a role in demystifying the humanitarian-development nexus and galvanising action to ensure uninterrupted learning for affected children and youth in crisis contexts. A focus on what can be done in practice – including in response to the COVID-19 pandemic – is essential to fulfil the education rights of children in all circumstances.
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