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On June 20th and 21st 2019, NORRAG, USAID, and the Inter-agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE) co-hosted an Education in Emergencies (EiE) Data Summit in Geneva, Switzerland with participants from 48 organisations. An optional one-day training on navigating EiE data was also held on June 19th. The two-day Summit aimed to address EiE data issues, challenges and opportunities across humanitarian and development partners.

INTRODUCTION

Purpose
The purpose of the Data Summit was to share recent work on EiE data issues in order to better understand the challenges of EiE data; discuss good practices and success stories; and share recent initiatives, in an effort to strengthen humanitarian-development coherence and to improve programming through EiE data. The summit brought together EiE data specialists: policy makers, practitioners, donors, academics, and data aggregators working across humanitarian and development sectors. The event was specifically geared towards technical actors who routinely collect, analyse, aggregate, or share education data.

Background
In emergency contexts, timely and accurate data can be difficult to access. A lack of data poses challenges for organizations working to provide education to children in need. Publicly available data are often fragmented or difficult to navigate online and misalignment of humanitarian and development response and programming is reflected and reproduced by data systems that differ in process and structure.
Recognizing these challenges, there are many initiatives occurring to improve data collection and dissemination for education in conflict-affected settings. These include initiatives to standardize humanitarian indicators (i.e., GEC Indicator Database and Education Under Attack), systematize collection of data on refugees in public schools (i.e., REMIS), systematize tools for conducting needs assessments through Education Clusters, and to improve data sharing platforms (i.e., HDX).

However, there are two major limitations to current initiatives to improve data for education in conflict. First, there are many, disparate initiatives occurring in parallel. Those involved in some of these initiatives are not fully aware of the other initiatives, and therefore, do not benefit from collaborations or partnerships. Secondly, these initiatives and developments are occurring primarily in the humanitarian sector (under the umbrella of Education for Emergencies or Education in Crisis and Conflict). Development actors and organizations may not be aware of them or may not see them as relevant or important to their work. However, the increasingly protracted nature of conflicts around the world and the shift towards longer-term collective outcomes, defined at the World Humanitarian Summit have blurred the line between development and humanitarian sectors in education. There is a need for deeper and more thoughtful conversations about how we can improve data for education in emergency settings that bring together both humanitarian and development actors and that share and build on current initiatives to chart “a new way of thinking” about data in education in emergencies.

Objectives

The key objectives of the data summit were:

1. To bring together diverse stakeholders working on educational data in emergency affected contexts across humanitarian and development spaces;
2. To overview and map current initiatives to improve data and evidence for education in emergencies;
3. To create an opportunity for stakeholders to share their experiences, good practices, and lessons learned regarding data for education in emergency-contexts;

Workshop Series

The summit built on a series of INEE workshops and consultations to develop an INEE Learning Agenda with the aim of strengthening consensus around knowledge gaps and EiE research themes for investigation. The Learning Agenda development process includes the diversity of INEE’s membership through a series of regional workshops, and global consultations (2018-2020) hosted with strategic partners including NORRAG, the USAID MEERs program, the Journal on Education in Emergencies (JEIE), the Global Challenges Research Fund (GCRF), and Dubai Cares. This consultative process aims to ensure that the Learning Agenda is representative of the EiE landscape at large.

The INEE Learning Agenda will produce a joint framework for key knowledge gaps, in addition to a repository of EiE data and evidence in an effort to increase access to existing knowledge while providing a platform through which to identify gaps which can be updated and responsive to the changing needs of the sector.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 09.00 - 09.30 | **Introductions & Objectives of Day 1**  
**Joost Monks**, Executive Director - NORRAG  
**Welcome remarks**  
- **Gita Steiner-Khamsi**, Professor - Columbia University (Teachers College) and the Graduate Institute, and Director - NORRAG  
- **Annie Smiley**, Associate Director, Research & Evaluation - MEERS, FHI 360  
- **Dean Brooks**, Director - INEE |
| 09.30 - 10.00 | **Keynote:** Yasmine Sherif, Director - Education Cannot Wait |
| 10.00 - 11.00 | **The EiE Data Landscape**  
**Chair:** Heddy Lahmann, Managing Editor - Journal on Education in Emergencies  
- **Galen Englund**, Consultant for the Global Education Monitoring Report - UNESCO  
- **Annie Smiley**, Associate Director, Research & Evaluation - MEERS, FHI 360  
- **Patrick Montjourides**, Senior Research Associate - NORRAG |
| 11.30 - 12.30 | **Building the EiE Data Ecosystem: Challenges and Opportunities**  
**Chair:** Bilal Barakat, Senior Policy Analyst - Global Education Monitoring Report, UNESCO  
- **Silvia Montoya**, Director - UNESCO UIS  
- **Nicolas Servas**, RRT Education Cluster Coordinator - Global Education Cluster  
- **Javier Teran**, Statistician - UNOCHA Humanitarian Data Exchange (HDX)  
- **Erica Aiazzi**, Associate Education Officer - UNHCR |
| 14.00 - 15.30 | **EiE Data Lightning Talks**  
Presentations from a range of educational, humanitarian, and development organizations  
**Chair:** Elizabeth Buckner, Assistant Professor - OISE, University of Toronto  
- Data Tools, Q&A  
- Data for Evidence, Q&A |
| 16.00 - 16.45 | **EiE Data Lightning Talks**  
**Chair:** Elizabeth Buckner, Assistant Professor - OISE, University of Toronto  
- Data Systems, Q&A |
| 16.45 - 17.00 | **Closing**  
**Joost Monks**, Executive Director - NORRAG |
## Day 2 - Developing an Action Agenda: Funding, global public goods, and collective action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 09.15 - 09.30 | **Objectives of Day 2**  
*Joost Monks*, Executive Director - NORRAG |
| 09.30 - 10.30 | **Funding Education Data in Emergency and Crisis Contexts**  
Chair: *Joost Monks*, Executive Director - NORRAG  
- *Christian Stoff*, Senior Advisor (Economist, Statistician) - Education Cannot Wait  
- *Yuki Murakami*, Research Officer - Global Education Monitoring Report, UNESCO  
- *Sabina Handschin*, Senior Education Policy Advisory / Head Education Unit - SDC  
- *Francesca Bonomo*, Education Specialist (Emergencies/Resilience) - UNICEF |
| 11.00 - 12.00 | **Introduction of Breakout Groups and Initial Discussions** |
| 13.00 - 15.00 | **Breakout Group Discussions**  
Discussion on an Action Agenda to improve the availability and accessibility of data on Education in Emergencies. Participants will break into groups and will seek to address designated themes through identifying key challenges and priorities, as well as key stakeholders, opportunities for collaboration, and concrete actions.  
- Data Ecosystem and Global Governance  
- Refugees, In and Out of National Systems  
- Education and Internal Displacement  
- Beyond Counting: Outcomes Measurement |
| 15.30 - 16.30 | **Plenary Discussion and Reporting Back: Towards an Action Agenda**  
Chair: *Sébastien Hine*, Consultant - MEERS |
| 16.30 - 17.00 | **Closing** |

### Summit recordings and presentations

The summit was live streamed and recordings for all but the breakout sessions can be found here:
- **Day one, morning** - Keynote, The EiE Data Landscape, Building the EiE Data Ecosystem: Challenges and Opportunities  
- **Day one, afternoon** - Lightning talks, Closing  
- **Day two, morning** - Funding Education Data in Emergency and Crisis Contexts  
- **Day two, afternoon** - Closing

The slides from the presentations can be found [here](#).
The Data Summit informed the development of a Long-Term Vision and Action Agenda for data for education in emergency contexts. The agenda proposes a roadmap to guide the work of the Data and Evidence Collaborative at INEE as well as actionable items for all stakeholders of the EiE community.

**Longer term vision and objectives**

The longer term vision that was broadly shared at the Summit has several dimensions. First, EiE data collection, storage, and use must be underpinned by strong methodological and ethical foundations. The primary purpose of this data is to support the intervention of programmes and strengthening of education systems. Ideally this data would be comparable across contexts and over time while also able to be contextualised to meet the needs of emergency-affected populations. Second, where possible, data sharing should become the norm with increased use of global repositories and platforms. Again, this must adhere to strict ethical and protection guidelines. Third, data should be made more accessible to non-data specialists for use in research, advocacy, and programme design and implementation, while organisations should simultaneously strengthen data literacy and capacity of their own staff. Fourth, groups currently absent or underrepresented by the statistical picture - such as IDPs, refugees, girls, speakers of minority languages and other marginalised groups - must be prioritised. Fifth, none of this is possible with adequate funding. As funding for EiE as a sector increases so should funding for EiE data initiatives, initiatives which often help make the case for EiE itself and so increase funding for the sector.
General recommendations

Based on where consensus was found during the Summit discussions, this Action Agenda makes the following overall recommendations:

• Data sharing between agencies should become the norm. Specific data sharing arrangements are encouraged between organisations to facilitate this. These must be in line with data sharing principles and ethics guidelines.
• The sector should work towards developing standardised methodologies to calculate indicators with agreed definitions. This could include a list of suggested core indicators that actors are encouraged to report on, when possible and context-relevant. Existing efforts to do this should be harmonised rather than duplicating efforts.
• These core indicators should be accompanied by ethics guidelines on the collection and use of EiE data.
• A data usage framework should guide discussions about data collection, analysis, aggregation, sharing, and use. This should also indicate what data should be prioritised at different stages of crises.
• Capacity building and preparedness should be encouraged so that EMIS systems and local organisations are able to respond to crises and sudden movements of people either across or within borders.
• Further efforts should be made to include those that are absent from the global statistical picture, such as IDPs, refugees, girls, children with disabilities, ethnic, linguistic and religious minorities, and other population groups, who are often the most vulnerable during crises.
• Organisations should commit to sharing their EiE data initiatives early in their development so as to avoid duplication and encourage cooperation.
• Collective action is needed to produce global public goods which address the needs of all stakeholders involved with EiE data, including facilitating the sharing of data.
• Funders should recognise the catalytic effect strong data can have on service provision and increase funding for EiE data.

Agreed key actions

More specific than the above recommendations are the following Action Commitments. These were concrete actions organisations or groups of organisations made at the Summit to address specific issues in the EiE data ecosystem:

• The INEE Data and Evidence Collaborative will convene an Expert Group, the main purpose of which will be to oversee the implementation of this Action Agenda and to make reasonable steps towards the improvement of the EiE data ecosystem. The Expert Group will consist of key EiE data experts from a range of organisations that have EiE mandates.
• The Expert Group will lead the development of standardised methodologies for a minimum set of EiE indicators. The INEE will help facilitate the selection of indicators.
• The Global Education Cluster and the Humanitarian Data Exchange will continue discussions with the aim of completing a data sharing arrangement.
• In support of UNESCO’s 2020 EMIS Conference, Middle East Education Research Training and Support program (MEERS), INEE and NORRAG will work with UNESCO and UNHCR partners to design and implement a desk review and/or research project that examines case studies of how refugee data are collected and analysed and in some cases, integrated into EMIS systems, and what factors have affected the availability of reliable refugee education data.
• Summit participants will reach out to EiE professionals and civil society actors working in the humanitarian sector to raise awareness and encourage and facilitate their participation in the UNESCO EMIS Conference.
• A coalition of actors will advocate for increased prioritisation of IDP education data.
• Participants will lobby their organisations internally for increased data literacy capacity building among staff.
• INEE Working Groups and the Data and Evidence Collaborative will lead efforts to share data project work plans so as to avoid duplication and encourage cooperation.
Yasmine Sherif, Director - Education Cannot Wait, delivered the keynote address. She stated that the changes in the humanitarian landscape change how we must collect, process, and use data. The first major shift in the landscape has been the increased funding needs because crises are becoming more frequent, on a greater scale, and more protracted. Humanitarian appeals now last seven years on average and have increased by nearly 400% in size over the last decade. The second shift is the new emerging threats that affect children disproportionately. These include climate change and the associated conflicts and natural disasters, and increased attacks on education, as shown by GCPEA’s impressive research. GCPEA’s data is vital for advocacy around the Safe Schools Declaration and as an accountability mechanism for those countries that have signed the declaration. There have also been increased security and safety concerns when delivering aid due to weakening of international standards and respect for international law. Another shift is the increased cross-border and internal displacement. There were 10.8 million new internal displacements due to conflict in 2018, the three highest
countries being Ethiopia, DRC, and Syria, and 17.2 million internal displacements due to disasters. There are now 25.4 million refugees and 3.1 million asylum seekers. 68% of all refugees and asylum seekers come from Syria, Afghanistan, South Sudan, Myanmar, and Somalia and increasing proportions are children, over 50% of refugees are under 18 now compared to 41% in 2009. These factors call for a new way of working. Systems need to recognise that conflicts and natural disasters increasingly affect entire regions, not just individual countries and responses must reflect these cross-border needs. ECW itself is trying to work more on regional responses than country ones, for example in the Sahel or the Venezuela region crisis. Because data has political dynamics, working at the regional level makes data collection more complicated, especially when similar political dynamics are fuelling conflict. Ultimately education is a state responsibility and systems must be in place to deliver it. In crises these systems break down and cannot be relied on, especially if the government is involved in bombing schools for example. To know where and when to carry out emergency and development programming requires adequate data.

Building resilience is vital to successful system building and strengthening. Learning outcomes cannot be achieved through one actor alone, but requires working with the full range of actors and intersectorally. Education is closely linked to other sectors and ECW is working more and more with non-education partners, such as the World Food Programme. There is greater need for forward looking data so responses can be more predictive than reactive and in regional responses there is a need for standardised data systems across countries with minimal duplication due to resource constraints. Safeguarding is a key area for data collection, for prevention and accountability. To learn about mental health issues in crises also requires sensitive research. We need to make sure those implementing have the capacity to do so. This data is vital for making the case to raise funds for EiE. This includes forward-looking predictive data and data which is standardised and not duplicated. Data must be made as accessible and visual as possible while still maintaining rigour. Yasmine closed by reiterating that ECW is not a closed team but an open platform for the whole sector and that the success of all SDGs depends on the success of SDG4.

The EiE Data Landscape
Chaired by Heddy Lahmann, Managing Editor - Journal on Education in Emergencies

Galen Englund, Consultant - UNESCO Global Education Monitoring Report
Galen presented his findings from his background paper for the 2019 Global Education Monitoring Report, which sought to answer the question of how many forcibly displaced children were out of school. There is no comprehensive global dataset on education for forcibly displaced people so estimates based on fragmented data is the best possible approach currently. Data at each level, from sub-national to national to global, can be difficult to access and with each level of aggregation loses accuracy. Many national governments do not distinguish between IDPs and non-IDPs and schools may not track displacement status. Based on case-study analysis the background paper estimates that between 29% and 44% of displaced people are school-age and between 40% and 62% of school-age displaced people are out-of-school. Other issues with the data include lack of disaggregation, a focus on camp-settings, lack of data on urban settings, and both under- and double-counting. Policy recommendations included: 1) Standardise definitions and reporting guidelines; 2) Join up data repositories; 3) Boost national data skills with knowledge exchange; 4) Improve out-of-camp data methodologies.

Mapping education data in Middle Eastern crisis contexts: What we learned and where to go from here
Annie Smiley, Associate Director, Research & Evaluation - FHI 360
Annie presented USAID MEERS’s (Middle East Education Research Training and Support) research on the state of education in emergencies data. This research included an EiE data mapping for publicly available data in Iraq, Syria, and Yemen; stakeholder consultations to analyse what data stakeholders collect, need, and use, and where the gaps are; strategic meetings to find out who is doing what to address EiE data challenges; and analysis of what can be done to support improved accessibility, quality, and navigability of EiE data. A key finding is that in these three countries there was a huge amount of data available, however, there are issues with it. There are two main sources of this data - development and humanitarian
operations. Development data systems break down in crises and generally do not collect data on displaced people. Humanitarian data is often readily available but difficult to navigate, for example being presented in PDFs. Humanitarian data focuses more on supply (details on response) than demand (actual needs), lack consistent indicator definitions, and lack quality control. The existing systems for collecting and using data entrench the humanitarian-development divide. However, there are overlaps in what is needed. Both humanitarian and development partners need data on refugees and IDPs and for similar indicators. The research suggests six categories of use for EiE data: 1) Programme planning and design; 2) Coordination; 3) Sector planning and policy reform; 4) Monitoring; 5) Evaluation and learning; 6) Advocacy. Education is not the first sector to explore issues of humanitarian and development data and should seek to learn from other sectors. To improve the EiE data landscape we need to make EiE data more accessible, build capacity of users to access and use EiE data, and convene stakeholders around challenges and opportunities for EiE data across both humanitarian and development actors.

**Education in Emergencies: Towards an actionable agenda**

*Patrick Montjourides, Senior Research Associate - NORRAG*

Patrick's presentation had three key messages. Firstly, that there is a scarcity of education data in crisis settings but there is growing evidence that the EiE community has been able to develop fit-for-purpose, safe and effective data collection processes. Secondly, the main issue at the operational level remains the diversity and ever-changing nature of crisis situations. This requires flexible systems, new modes of collaboration, acknowledging the non-neutrality of data collection, and building the capacity of all actors. Thirdly, we as a community should reduce the transaction costs associated with accessing and analysing existing data. The backdrop to these messages is that 97% of conflicts now last longer than a primary education cycle. Additionally, in these circumstances data collection itself can be harmful. Ethical and statistical standards are more, not less, important in emergency situations, and communities have high expectations of education data collection that we need to meet. We can work better with local populations and their knowledge and be better about communicating results to them. Critical data gaps include data on the needs of students with disabilities, languages, community responses to school violence, teacher management, lifelong learning, and needs of older students. Partnerships are key, in particular with host governments, to produce EMIS which promotes the inclusion of refugees in national education systems. Translation and identification of language are critical for quality data. A key missing public good is a global repository to navigate EiE data, this would have country level data, program data, needs assessments, dashboards, individual level data, legal and policy data.

**Q&A**

The discussion covered several issues. Firstly, human resources and capacity were discussed. Whose capacity should we be strengthening? Panellists indicated that data literacy needs to be strengthened at all levels, the INEE has a capacity development group, and that grant-making policies should place more emphasis on data methodologies and skills. The usefulness of EMIS in humanitarian settings was called into question. Panellists argued that there are case-studies of flexible EMIS systems to draw on, such as in North East Nigeria, where data is collected every two weeks, not just once a year. The question of existing data-sharing arrangements was raised. It was agreed that trust and lack of incentives are a key barrier to these. Data shared needs to be de-identified and there are security and protection risks.
Building the EiE Data Ecosystem: Challenges and Opportunities

Chaired by Bilal Barakat, Senior Policy Analyst - Global Education Monitoring Report, UNESCO

Silvia Montoya, Director - UNESCO UIS

Silvia highlighted that for SDG 4 there is still so much data lacking across countries, not just in humanitarian situations. Reporting systems are now trying to find ways to include non-official statistics to fill in some of the gaps. At the same time there is the challenge of making data comparable across countries, which required agreed methodologies and standardisation of indicators.

Erica Aiazzi, Associate Education Officer - UNHCR

Refugees are increasingly included in national education systems, making it harder for UNHCR to track their education outcomes. In comparison, it is relatively easy to track their education when they are in camps. UNHCR is reliant on working with host governments as they control their own data. UNHCR is exploring how to better use EMIS to collect data on refugees, but this comes with protection concerns as EMIS data collection is mostly school-based and asking children in schools about their refugee status has risks. Therefore, we need to work on how to integrate refugee data in EMIS or other national statistics through a variety of solutions, such as integration of different data sources, or flexible modules in EMIS.

Javier Teran, Statistician - UNOCHA Humanitarian Data Exchange

Javier introduced the Centre for Humanitarian Data, hosted by UN OCHA, which runs the Humanitarian Data Exchange (HDX). The main challenge for HDX, which hosts data publicly, is gaining trust of partners. The Education Above All foundation has been a useful partner in supporting HDX’s work, specifically on education in crisis situations.

Nicolas Servas, RRT Education Cluster Coordinator - Global Education Cluster

Nicolas highlighted the criticality of coordination when it comes to EiE data and the role the cluster plays in this. However, there is a lack of human and financial resources for EiE data. Only 25% of education clusters have individual information management officers. The rest of the time information management is handled by other staff who have competing priorities. There is a lack of prioritisation of needs assessments. These need to be incentivised, as does capacity building. Again, both of these are competing with other priorities.
Q&A

There was extensive discussion following these initial short presentations. There were questions on the importance of globally comparable data and UIS data for pre-crisis baseline data. UIS responded that not all countries are even reporting on MDG-level data, let alone SDG-level. Coverage of most SDG 4 global indicators is below 50%. Some indicators need not be globally comparable and can be useful at the national level. Other panellists responded that EMIS can provide baseline data if it has not broken down due to the crisis. In crisis situations there is a need for early coordination on issues such as frequency of data collection and a greater presence of development actors such as UIS and the World Bank. More important than comparing across countries it may be more important to compare refugees and IDPs with host communities within countries. Only GER and NER are comparable so far, and not always available. Health and agriculture were identified as sectors that have made efforts to create common languages and indicators. UNHCR was asked how different levels interact, from local to global. UNHCR responded that HQ is trying to be more aware about what is collected by country offices and to understand where education data is captured in non-education questionnaires or assessments, as well as working better with EMIS. UNHCR is also working on better learning outcome data for refugees. On HDX it was clarified that any data submissions are checked for security issues, so there are no personal, community, or demographic identifying indicators. Each submission must be relevant and include meta-data. HDX is promoting a set of standards on humanitarian data - the Humanitarian Exchange Language - http://hxlstandard.org/. HDX would like to see greater systematic use of available EGRA/EGMA tools. A final question was on the principle of building back better. HDX indicated that data sharing agreements show benefits of open data and change incentives. The cluster highlighted that they exist to facilitate the sharing of information and that UN OCHA has a role for this intersectorally. Other panellists recognised the risks of data sharing but suggested small experiments within organisations that go well could lead to a shift towards greater data sharing across the sector.
Data Tools

**EiE Data Curated using HDX** | **Elliot McBride - HDX**

Elliot presented on the Humanitarian Data Exchange, which seeks to aggregate what data exists and make it publicly available. PDFs can be scraped into CSVs to create interactive dashboards. The key barrier to this is the perceived risks against lack of benefits to sharing data. Data sharing needs to become the norm, which requires a cultural shift across the sector.

**Meet the Holistic Assessment for Learning and Development Outcomes (HALDO)** | **Allyson Krupar - Save the Children**

Allyson presented HALDO (the Holistic Assessment for Learning and Development Outcomes), which assesses learning outcomes in emergencies in four domains - literacy (letter identification, expressive language, reading with comprehension), numeracy (number identification, one-to-one correspondence, simple operations, hard operations, word problems), executive function (short-term memory, working memory), and socio-emotional learning (self-concept, empathy). HALDO is designed for rapid deployment within one to three months of a crisis starting. This operates at the programmatic level and is not a tool for teachers to assess individuals nor does it integrate with EMIS. Feasibility issues include the need to work with enumerators, translation, employing child-friendly language, and time constraints for rapid deployment.

**EducAID: Improving education for Rohingya refugees from Myanmar living in Bangladesh** | **Ingebjørg Finnbakk - PRIO**

Ingebjørg presented on EducAID, which aims to improve education for Rohingya refugees from Myanmar living in Bangladesh. EducAID is trying to understand how quality education can mitigate negative impacts on refugees on socio-economic, psycho-social and other issues through a household survey. This survey, which is still being developed, will be both inside and outside camps, with 2,000 adult participants, possibly including host communities as well.

**Why language matters: Improving data for education in emergencies** | **Alice Castillejo - Translators Without Borders**

Alice spoke to the issue of languages. Most marginalised communities speak languages other than official national languages and are often either targeted in conflict or most impacted by crises. Two issues are that there is no open source up-to-date data on what languages are spoken where in the world, and there is an overdependence on unsupported local staff when it comes to language issues. Enumerators often have to deal with multiple languages and analysis shows enumerators understand between 10% and 80% of the surveys they are carrying out. It is therefore unreasonable to expect them to accurately translate the surveys and responses into multiple languages. Surveys should use plain language and be translated into final languages. They should include glossaries of key terms and enumerators should be tested on understanding of survey. Even obtaining informed consent is a major issue due to language restrictions.

**Q&A**

On scraping technology, it was clarified that the accuracy depends a lot on the formatting of the PDFs being scraped. To align differently worded but similar indicators requires relying on the expertise of partner agency whose indicators you are scraping. On HALDO Allyson clarified that data is collected as a baseline and inputted into dashboards to inform programming as soon as possible. This is followed by an endline assessment. Language can be an issue. In Uganda the delivery team only had three languages but there were 32 in the community. HALDO, like IDELA, is available for other organisations to use. The data analysis itself happens in Washington DC, using Power BI. There is a need to build local staff capacity so analysis can happen in-country. On technology and language Alice indicated that machine learning is improving quickly.
Data for Evidence

Higher education in emergencies supports local knowledge production  
*Barbara Moser-Mercer & Paul O'Keefe - Université de Genève*

Barbara and Paul discussed InZone and running a higher education campus in a crisis-affected setting. They run higher education programmes in large refugee camps in Kenya and the Middle East. They highlighted that research must meet a need in the community and their research is highly contextualised. Data creation should be driven from the ground up with a focus on language translation. Their work focuses on transformative pedagogy, adaptive technology, and 21st century skills and aims for the following outcomes - indigenous knowledge, designed solutions, empowered learners, and life and livelihood skills. These all contribute to building back better for sustainable communities. One project paired global health masters students in Geneva and Kakuma to research real issues in the camp, such as snake bites and malaria. Both groups studied the same online Coursera course and designed the research projects collaboratively. Another course delivered in Kakuma was an advanced level human rights course. Based on these courses and research various changes were observed. Firstly, higher education in fragile contexts supports the SDGs, improves specific issues addressed in camps, and works well in partnership with other universities. Skill acquisition is possible through collaborative technology and community-centred research and indigenous knowledge production. It also strengthens student government, student civic engagement, life and livelihood skills, resilience in communities, and empowers refugees.

Access to Education for Refugee and Migrant Children in Europe  
*Tsvetomira Bidart - UNICEF ECARO*

Tsvetomira presented on UNICEF’s work on education for refugees and migrant children in Europe. In total 4 million school-age children and adolescents were born outside the EU, 3.6% of the school-age population, with 471,000 arriving between 2014 and 2019. Germany, the UK, France, Italy, and Sweden host the majority. There are various sources of data for their education, including Ministries of Education, asylum agencies, education working groups, EUROSTAT, PISA, and OECD. Data mostly covers enrolment, attendance, and retention but is often inaccessible and poorly analysed. Only a third of countries require collection of migration status in education systems and the diversity of indicators makes standardisation difficult. In partnership with UNHCR and IOM, UNESCO is trying to map out all the available data and evidence with regard to access to education in Europe for refugees. U-Report is a participatory tool for engaging adolescents and youth and shows the types of data that can be collected. It covers pull-push factors of education, education satisfaction levels, and access to and aspirations for vocational training. Diversity of indicators. Lessons learned from this research include the importance of interagency collaboration, standardized definitions, data visibility, and frequency and quality of data.

How can we assess learning at scale among refugee communities? Insights from a recent pilot in Uganda  
*Patrick Montjourides, on behalf of the PAL Network*

Patrick presented, on behalf of the PAL network, UWEZO’s learning assessment survey of refugees in Uganda. This was a citizen-led assessment collecting basic information on literacy and numeracy of children aged 6-16 who are both in- and out-of-school. It was carried out in three sites in the North West (Arua, Yumbe, and Adjumani) of the country and one site in the South West (Isingiro). It included both Ugandan citizens and refugees, to enable comparisons. Host community grade 5 children outperformed refugees in learning the basics in all but Isingiro. In Adjumani and Yumbe pupils per textbook were three and four in the host community compared to 27 and 111 for refugees respectively.

Q&A

Regarding the UWEZO assessment it was confirmed that the survey was carried out in English, rather than in mother tongue, which did create issues. The survey was citizen-led and not linked to EMIS. It was reiterated that there is a need for standardised terminology for indicators but also for research to be context specific and recognise local knowledge. Better documentation and communication of findings makes data collection less extractive and more useful to communities.
**Data Systems**

**Strengthening EMIS for increased resilience to crises**
*Christian Stoff - ECW and Camille Lailheugue - UNESCO*

Christian and Camille presented this EMIS initiative, which aims to find out what other partners are doing in the field and facilitate coordination. It recognises the need for common needs assessment and for different information management systems to communicate better rather than creating new systems. ECW’s Acceleration Facility provides funding to help strengthen global EiE systems and capacities through the production of global public goods and support to key EiE entities. The initiative aims to promote the use of EMIS for coordinated planning, response, and service delivery in times of crisis. There will be four stages to this initiative. Firstly, there will be case-studies to highlight gaps between EMIS and data used by humanitarian actors. Secondly, in March 2020 they will hold a conference to identify ways to address these gaps. Third will be the implementation of specific interventions in-country. Finally, they will develop guidance tools on the set-up and use of crisis-sensitive EMIS.

**Identifying education sector severity and priority IDP locations using DTM data**
*Nicolas Servas - Education Cluster*

Nicolas presented a joint UNICEF and IOM Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM) tool to analyse the education of IDPs. It identifies priority IDP locations and sector severity. There are three stages to implementation of the tool. Firstly, in-country the various clusters work with DTM to coordinate which questions to include in the tool. Education questions have included: ‘Currently, are there enough teachers to teach primary and secondary level classes for IDP children?’, ‘Overall, what are the age groups facing the most severe issues in education (3-5 years old, 6-12, 13-17)?’, and ‘In your opinion, what are the main causes of education issues for children 3-5 years old?’ Secondly, data acquisition is then carried out by DTM enumerators. Finally, data processing and analysis are carried out by the sector clusters.

**Collecting data on internally displaced children in emergencies**
*Christelle Cazabat - IDMC*

Two thirds of the world’s displaced are IDPs. In 2018 there were 28 million new internal displacements due to conflict and natural disasters. However, age disaggregated data on IDPs is not available in 86% of the countries and territories affected by conflict, with only 14% of them publishing such data, and only 25% of that 14% doing so systematically. Using national-level age distribution models, we can estimate that there are 8.3 million IDPs in Sub-Saharan Africa and 5 million in the Middle East and North Africa. These figures are likely significant underestimates and do not account for disaster-related displacement. We do know that IDP populations are often younger on average than national populations. In Afghanistan where age disaggregated data is available for IDPs, using national-level age distribution models would result in undercounting 200,000 children. Better data on IDPs can and should inform education planning. It should determine who is at risk of being out of school. IDMC estimates there are over 17 million IDPs under the age of 18 and likely seeing their education affected by displacement. This data can be used to identify those in need of educational support and plan for the cost of providing them with education.

**Measuring Attacks on Education: Towards an Indicator Framework for Data Collection and Analysis**
*Marika Tsolakis - GCPEA*

There are four key challenges to collecting data on attacks on education. Firstly, there is a lack of common definitions and methodologies. Secondly, data comes from a variety of different sectors and sources, compromising comparability. Thirdly, there are significant data gaps, depending on capacity, resources, and security. Finally, there are divergent data needs. GCPEA is currently developing a preliminary indicator framework to cover: attacks on schools, attacks on students, teachers, and other education personnel, military use of schools and universities, sexual violence by armed parties at, or on the way to or from, school, child recruitment at, or on
the way to or from, school, and attacks on higher education students, personnel, and facilities. The next steps are an updated mapping of sources and partners, piloting indicators with partners around the world, and awareness raising on data disaggregation.

Q&A

GCPEA clarified that attacks on education in the US are not included as they are almost entirely carried out by individuals who are not part of armed groups. GCPEA’s mandate only covers conflict and armed groups. For this reason, it also does not cover gang violence, for example in Latin America. GCPEA also does not duplicate the work of the Monitoring and Reporting Mechanism (MRM) on grave violations committed against children in times of armed conflict but works with the MRM to include their data.

Closing

**Joost Monks, Executive Director - NORRAG**

Joost closed the day noting that we all have a clear intention to work together despite the many barriers, and introduced the plan for the following day.
Yuki Murakami, Research Officer - Global Education Monitoring Report, UNESCO

Yuki presented the GEM Report’s analysis of humanitarian aid. Since 2015 humanitarian aid has doubled to $566 million per year, however, this accounts for just 2.3% of humanitarian aid and only 44% of education appeals are funded. In 2016 $400 million was spent on refugee education in development and humanitarian aid. Overall this represents a positive trend but finance is still largely lacking. The current data are also inadequate as not all aid is reported. UN OCHA’s Financial Tracking Service (FTS) reports on global figures but does not easily show who the major donors are, nor who and what they are funding. Data in FTS needs to be more easily disaggregated by actor. Issues with OECD data is that it is often at least two years old and there are discrepancies between what is reported in FTS and by the OECD, partly because they have different ways of categorising countries and programming.
In West and Central Africa, the 2018 education sector response was only 19% funded. As of May this year, the appeal is only 5% funded and UNICEF is only 15% funded, so financing is massively lacking. Data is vital in demonstrating the need through needs assessment and highlighting gaps. This requires investment in country teams so they are able to produce this kind of data and give voice to the regional perspective. Cluster coordinators are often double-hatting and covering the roles of information managers, who are often the last priority but should be considered much more important. When donors are able to see the value of this capacity, they are interested in paying for it. Data collection needs to go beyond access to also look at retention, protection, and learning. Flexibility based on context is also important, as demonstrated by the Ebola situation where attendance was not a useful indicator compared to WASH facilities.

Sabina Handschin, Senior Education Policy Advisory / Head Education Unit - SDC
Sabina recognised that data is important but that we risk going to a data extreme. Of course, data and response are linked but given there is a massive lack of funding across the sector we must remember our priority is to get children into the classroom. We already have a lot of data, but what we need is perhaps less but more relevant and meaningful data. Often the cluster has a lot of data but people do not take the time to analyse it sufficiently. Often basic data for the set up of emergency responses is readily available, the problem is often more serious in protracted crises. Perhaps we should transition from talking about EiE data and funding to leave no one behind and recognising the protracted nature of many crises. The nexus dialogue must lead to greater development funding for data in protracted crises, not just humanitarian funding.

Christian Stoff, Senior Advisor (Economist, Statistician) - Education Cannot Wait
ECW recognises that data and evidence are vital in their results framework. Data is needed for global advocacy and to raise funds for ECW as well as to inform and learn from programming. Regarding where ECW funds programming ECW relies on available data in needs assessments and, where possible, EMIS baseline data. ECW does focus on data for accountability as it needs to show results to donors. This has to go beyond access and inputs to show what changes there are in learning, well-being, and protection, although recognising these are not easy to measure. ECW does fund data for learning and evaluation. 5% of their funds go to their Acceleration Facility that supports the development of public goods and innovations. Given how quickly ECW responds through their first response windows they have to be realistic about data possibilities. Multi-year programmes do focus more on building systems, including related to data, and must include assessments of learning outcomes.

Q&A
Panellists agreed that global advocacy is undermined by poor quality of data and unreliable global figures, as demonstrated by the discrepancies between OECD and FTS financing data. One of the reasons for this is FTS recategorizes humanitarian aid sectors according to their system, which is complicated for programmes that address multiple sectors. Some donors do not report their funding in FTS at all, so their contributions are completely lacking in aid analysis. All agreed on the importance of going beyond access data. On the issue of the nexus it was suggested that the humanitarian community’s approach is more advanced than the development community’s. Some development programming is constrained by donors and thus unable to adjust to new crises or emerging crisis contexts. The Global Compact on Refugees is a good example of an approach that deals with protracted crises through the nexus. Often humanitarian and development actors may be collecting similar data for similar reasons without knowing. Part of the issue is building data management systems with sufficient capacity that are prepared for crises. UNICEF is moving in this direction with more flexible data systems and to prepare all countries in West and Central Africa to deal with population influxes, even if they do not historically have them. For EMIS to be responsive to crises they need to have data on target groups. This requires inclusion as early as the education sector planning stage. It was also highlighted that humanitarian appeals often do not correspond to actual needs, sometimes they underestimate, sometimes they overstate the needs. We also need better data on intervention unit costs in crisis situations, as these may vary far more than in stable situations. On the global architecture it was recognised that the humanitarian-development divide is heavily entrenched in some donors while others have made more progress. A lot of ECW’s funding comes from development sources. It was reiterated that all countries should prepare for an influx of people, this requires building capacity of development sectors so they are prepared to host and deal with crises.
Breakout Group Discussion

The purpose of these breakout discussions was to advance conversations about how to improve data and evidence systems for education in emergencies, and to identify concrete next steps for moving forward on specific issues. Each group discussion generated general recommendations and specific actionable items. Secondary goals included sharing learning, facilitating a deeper understanding of best practices, and identifying challenges and opportunities for improvement.

The topics for each breakout session were designed to be broad enough to engage many different partners and threads of conversation while also being targeted enough to identify paths forward regarding key problems and issues posed by the structure of existing EiE data systems. The selected topics were developed in consultation with numerous partners and in response to specific issues that emerged at previous meetings, including most notably the INEE Working Group meeting in Helsinki. These four breakout groups were:

1. **The humanitarian data ecosystem and its global governance:** Data systems and dissemination at the global level
2. **Refugees, In and Out of National Systems:** How to document refugees in host country national EMIS systems
3. **Education and Internal Displacement:** Conducting EMIS in Emergency contexts and including education in displacement tracking
4. **Beyond Counting:** How to document learning, socio-emotional well-being and other outcomes in EiE settings

Overarching themes

Although not assigned to a specific group key issues that cut across the groups were identified and considered as part of the discussions:

- Equity, disaggregation, and marginalised or vulnerable groups
- Humanitarian-development coherence
- Data protection/privacy and security
- User-friendliness and timeliness of data
- Capacity building and data literacy within EiE
The aim of this group was to agree how, at a global level, to promote the collection and user-friendly availability of education data in emergencies in the short, medium, and long-term.

Key questions considered included:

- How can the global EiE community and partners improve the accessibility, navigability, and usefulness of EiE data collected or collated by actors such as the Education Cluster, UN bodies, and NGOs?
- What are some concrete ways that the EiE community can build improved coherence across data coming from humanitarian and development partners?
- What would it take for the EiE community to come together around a shared data framework with common indicators, definitions, and quality controls? Which key actors would need to be involved in this effort?
- Which partners are interested in funding global EiE data initiatives? And how can EiE data be sustainably funded?
- Are there other sectors that have achieved similar efforts that we can learn from?
- What kind of global public good do you think is currently missing? Any low hanging fruit?
- Are there specific sections of the data production chain that you feel are weaker?
Key discussion points

Discussion focused on five key areas

1. Global norms and standards for EiE data
   It was agreed that although not currently incentivised, greater data sharing would benefit the sector as a whole. This could be achieved through specific data-sharing agreements between agencies and an overall cultural shift in attitudes towards data collaboration. HDX and the Education Cluster agreed to explore a partnership.

2. Primary global norms or standards
   Data sharing could be facilitated through shared norms and standards. This could include the development of core indicators that all actors report on and common definitions that we all use. INEE is already working on shared indicators mapped to the Minimum Standards - it was discussed that this might be a good place to start the conversation on indicators and could be taken on by the expert group to be convened by INEE. Guidance could be developed on data sharing, security, ethics, disaggregation, and metadata. This will require coordination on needs assessments and interoperability from the Cluster. Each humanitarian crisis should at a minimum have a school census.

3. Architecture and a possible global mechanism
   Here coordination, responsibility, and leadership in driving the ecosystem development was discussed. The conclusion was that there is a need for a mapping of key actors and data sources, analysis of how they interact, and of mandates and capacity to lead this work.

4. Capacity building and funding
   There was recognition that capacity building is needed at every level of the ecosystem and that targeted funding will be required to make progress. Possible sources of funding include ECW’s Acceleration Facility, Dubai Cares, ERICC, and foundations.

5. Products and processes
   There was discussion of data collection mechanisms, language issues, methodological standardisation. This could include a global repository or Global EiE EMIS type system, with HDX as one proposed host. It was agreed there would be a publication on outcomes of this summit in the Journal on Education in Emergencies.

Key action commitments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Others involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convene an expert group to oversee improvement of EiE data ecosystem</td>
<td>INEE represents a neutral body through which to convene a conversation and work towards actions proposed above. Any work would require buy-in from key stakeholders in the EiE Data ecosystem</td>
<td>INEE</td>
<td>Data experts and key agencies: ECW, REACH, UNESCO UIS, NGOs, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEC to discuss sharing data in excel format with HDX</td>
<td>HDX is a resource for the sector and could be strengthened by more data particularly from clusters (not in pdf dashboard form)</td>
<td>GEC and HDX</td>
<td>Ideally all will begin to share more data (not in pdf dashboard form) with HDX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor mapping process</td>
<td>Mapping of actors and data collection processes</td>
<td>Expert group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator mapping and development of core indicators</td>
<td>Indicators: need to understand what’s out there, agree on a set of core indicators, core= limited list of mandatory collection of specific indicators in addition to those of each org’s mandate</td>
<td>Expert group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key recommendations

- Standardised indicators and definitions across EiE data would strengthen the sector
- Core indicators should be developed that all agencies report on. This should be accompanied by standards and ethics guidelines for data collection and use.
- Data sharing should become the norm between agencies and can be facilitated by data-sharing agreements. These must be in line with data sharing principles and ethics.
- INEE should convene an expert group to oversee action on these recommendations and improvements in the overall EiE data ecosystem
Refugees, In and Out of National Systems
Facilitated by Elizabeth Buckner, University of Toronto

The aim of this group was to discuss next steps on collection and management of refugee education data, particularly as it pertains to documenting refugee students as they move between informal and formal school systems, and how to accurately document refugee presence in public school systems.

Key questions considered included:

- What are the limitations with the refugee label (protection, definitions, inclusion criteria) and what are the implications for EiE data?
- What are the needs and priorities for improving educational data on refugees?
- How do data systems, needs and gaps vary across humanitarian and development actors? What are the implications for coherence?
- How can we gather and make available refugee education data while working within national systems and addressing protection/privacy concerns? And, in situations where inclusion in national systems is not yet possible?
- Are there examples of best practice we can learn from?
- What education data can be made available for public research/advocacy/policy use?

Key discussion points

The group identified key information they would want on refugees:

- Population census data, when it exists
- Number, age, gender, prior schooling experience, gaps in learning, language, special needs/psychosocial needs, demographics, place of origin
- Contextual education information on host countries, such as the location of schools, school infrastructure, numbers of teachers and ratios with students

Participants

FHI 360
Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies NORRAG
Save the Children
UNESCO
UNHCR
University of Toronto
The main challenges in documenting refugee children in EMIS include:

- Country-level EMIS systems vary; some countries do not have functioning EMIS systems before conflict
- EMIS data is annual; slow response times
- Lack of census data
- Lack of data sharing between organisations
- No individual child tracking, although for protection purposes this may not always be desirable
- Data security
- Accelerated learning working group has their own data, but not at the country level
- Potential sensitivity of some questions

The group discussed Refugee EMIS (REMIS):

- The idea for REMIS was that it would be used as a transitional tool until EMIS can capture refugee data. Ideally REMIS would be integrated into an EMIS system further down the line.
- Who has access to REMIS data depends on the context and the government’s involvement in it
- There are several challenges to the integration of refugee data in EMIS. Changing EMIS questions takes a long time and is expensive. Refugee data discussions are best held at national rather than global levels as context and government intentions, and existing EMIS platforms vary so much

A tailored approach was agreed as preferable

- This would need to assess the context, work with host governments, and work within the context of the Global Compact. This would allow for more accurate costing and planning of refugee education, and strengthened advocacy. The group also discussed the roles of EMIS and UNHCR’s mandate and the issue of overlapping responsibilities.

The group identified the March 2020 EMIS conference as an opportunity to advance progress for refugees:

- The purpose of the conference is to discuss linking EMIS and REMIS, assess capacity needs, discuss scope of EMIS, and discuss the gap between EMIS and humanitarian data
- There will be six focus countries. For each it will be key to
  - Assess what’s being collected by who and how, what the legal frameworks for data collection are, and then identify partner data needs, the state of current EMIS, and ministry capacity to manage EMIS
  - There is a role for INEE to help reach out to and include humanitarian partners. The conference risks being too member-state oriented and political at the expense of I/ NGO points of view.
- Conference could be more focused on producing tools that could help manage an EMIS
- Challenges for the conference are that donors rarely fund system strengthening work and it is difficult to demonstrate impact in the short term.
- Recommendations for the conference include
  - Continuing to advocate for systems strengthening and capacity building
  - A focus on tailored approaches
  - Conference could produce guidelines for standards and for tailoring an EMIS for a refugee setting

The group also discussed about children outside of formal systems

- OpenEMIS an open source tool used by MoEs to collect, analyse, and report data to the management of education activities
  - In Malaysia, they use OpenEMIS but refugees are not in accredited schools, they are in non-formal schools, so OpenEMIS is essentially EMIS for those schools
  - In refugee camps, UNHCR can be in control and collect data in its own system

Key action commitments

- The group will support the UNESCO EMIS March 2020 conference to develop tools and standards for feasibility of refugee data integration in EMIS. INEE’s Data and Evidence Collaborative will ensure the participation of relevant humanitarian partners.
- The group will develop refugee education data standards
- USAID MEERS, INEE, and NORRAG will lead a research project on EMIS-REMIS (or other refugee education data tool) integration. This will analyse what data is collected and shared as part of REMIS/EMIS, what the processes are for data sharing and storage, how the data is processed, and what it is used for. USAID MEERS/INEE/NORRAG will advocate to donors around issues of systems strengthening and capacity building. USAID MEERS and NORRAG will provide research support to UNESCO and INEE will play a coordination role. The mapping will be completed by March 1 2020, prior to the UNESCO EMIS conference.

Key recommendations

The group recommends a tailored approach to improving refugee education data based on country context, that takes into account: existing EMIS, capacity, government willingness/relationship, and potential risks.
The aim of this group was to highlight key challenges faced while collecting education data for IDPs, suggest a number of priorities for the global education community to work on to improve the collection, production and dissemination of education data for IDPs and explore solutions to ensure that IDPs are progressively integrated in the global education data ecosystem in a more systematic and sustainable way.

It covered both how to include educational data in existing displacement tracking processes and systems, and how national EMIS systems can be responsive to changing populations.

Key questions considered included:

- What are some of the key gaps in terms of education data for IDPs? How does education data collection for IDPs differ from education data for other populations?
- How to solve the critical issue of mandate when it comes to IDP populations?
- Presumably a large part of the education data is collected by local NGOs which might not have the means, time or expertise to produce actionable education data. How best to support them?
- Are there examples of best practice that we can learn from?
- What education data can be made available for public research/advocacy/policy use?
- How to protect privacy concerns in situations where governments are a cause of displacement?
- How is education data collection for IDPs currently funded and how to ensure systematic and commensurate funding of education data collection in IDPs settings?
Key discussion points

The group highlighted that IDPs are neglected in a way that refugees are not, and need global champions to advocate for their rights. The neglect of IDPs comes from the absence of political leadership as discussions on IDPs are often opposed to the question of State sovereignty and are consequently often obfuscated in global discussion. Nevertheless, there are far more IDPs than refugees and the right to education of IDPs children should also be realized. This is an instance where statistical leadership could lead to better visibility of an issue and eventually to stronger political leadership. This requires actors to change how they approach indicators for IDPs and adapt existing methods to IDP contexts. For example, we only have age disaggregated data for IDPs in 14% of countries. The lack of funding is a key issue and to build a global coalition will need financial support.

There was discussion around the use of IDP data. Although greater generation of data is important, more could be done with existing data if it were made available at different levels. This could be facilitated through minimum standards for reporting education and displacement indicators and/or standardised structures that filter data to HDX. This ties in to an increased culture of data sharing and needs greater data literacy across the sector. A challenge to data sharing is the competitive nature of the sector and the competitive advantage data can bring to an individual organisation, meaning organisations will need to be incentivised to share data. The group agreed that any advancements on data sharing must be in line with data ethics.

The group recognised the issues of mandates and responsibility. IDMC, for example, reports on national figures from a global perspective, but does not have the resources or mandate to operate in each country. IDP data is often dominated by INGOs with local actors crowded out, despite the value they bring.

Barriers to accurate IDP data include:

- Governments not wanting IDP situations highlighted due to their complicit role in the displacement
- Lack of funding as IDPs are often in the poorest countries and a lack of prioritisation due to lack of clearly defined mandates at international level
- Difficulty in counting as 80% of IDPs are not in camps but use personal networks of family and friends instead

Key action commitments

- Given the lack of prioritisation for IDPs, compared to refugees, a coalition to strengthen statistical leadership and advocacy for IDPs should be set up. At the UN level this should include UN Special Rapporteur on IDPs and UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Education, at the expert level the IDMC and UIS, and at the community level INEE members.

Key recommendations

- Local actors should be more involved in the collection of IDP education data
- Capacity building investment should happen before crises, this includes data accessibility and data literacy.
- Data collection must be coordinated, ethical, and respect the safety and integrity data collectors and IDPs
This session focused on key developments in data and evidence beyond access and included dimensions such as learning outcomes and social-emotional outcomes.

Key questions considered included:

- What tools are being used among EiE partners to measure learning outcomes in humanitarian contexts? How are they being used across different stages and types of emergencies?
- What processes, resources and tools exist for adapting existing tools to emergency settings?
- What non-access data - such as learning outcomes, socio-emotional well-being, teachers, school safety - is useful in humanitarian contexts?
- What are the barriers to producing actionable data on learning in emergencies?
- What factors can influence learning outcomes in a humanitarian context? (ex: language barriers for refugees/IDPs, continued exposure to trauma, etc.)
- How do practices for measuring learning outcomes align between humanitarian and development partners?

Key discussion points

The group recognised that there is a sector-wide desire to go beyond access to measure impact and outcomes. Also, harmonizing indicators of quality learning sector-wide is desirable to encourage coordination and agreement on standards of quality. However, it was debated to what extent all agencies need to agree on the same indicators of achievement since doing so in a coordinated way presents a
trade-off between harmonisation and flexibility. Currently, every organization has its own curricula, measurement tools, etc. Indicators would need to be general enough to account for this flexibility. Data-sharing between organisations is not the norm, partly due to inter-agency trust issues, competition for funding, and lack of incentives. One of the major issues highlighted was that many organizations struggle with basic M&E like student registration and attendance. Basic M&E systems and staff need to be in place before attempting learning outcomes. To achieve better data collection relating to education quality, agencies need to build data skill capacity and M&E needs to be more central to initial programme design, with funding and internal prioritization reflecting this M&E importance. The group highlighted that there is not just a need for more data, but a better use of existing data. One issue identified was the lack of awareness in organizations about what it takes to collect good data and clarity around which learning outcomes we should be prioritizing in general and also prioritizing in terms of measurement. The INEE is working on a Measurement and Metrics initiative - led by IRC, NYU Global TIES, and others, and funded by Porticus. This will involve eight research-practice partnerships to pilot learning outcome measures in MENA region with specific measures of learning outcomes, such as numeracy, literacy, SEL, mental health, quality of implementation. Research findings, training materials, and guidance on how to identify and use the right measures will be shared on INEE’s website. This raised the issue of there being multiple learning outcome initiatives aimed that are not aware of or informing each other. A central platform of tools could include initiatives like the INEE Quality and Equitable Learning Outcomes workstream mapping, the IRC/NYU Measurement and Metrics Initiative, the INEE Data and Evidence Collaborative, and the UNICEF Learning Passport. The INEE Data and Evidence Collaborative is working on a guide to what data systems exist, which would detail what they are used for and how to access them. The group suggested there be an agreed set of principles for engagement in EiE data efforts – especially with regards to putting the learning outcomes of children, and therefore their teachers first.

Key action commitments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Others involved</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data Summit participants to lobby internally to prioritize capacity building on data literacy for staff</td>
<td>Address data capacity issue within humanitarian sector</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing of information and work plans and planned products – more publicly related to work in creating standards and tools for measuring learning outcomes, E.g. on QELO, PSS-SEL, Measurement &amp; Metrics Initiatives, Data &amp; Evidence</td>
<td>Organisations often share information when products are completed, but partners would like to know about initiatives under development.</td>
<td>INEE Coordinators</td>
<td>INEE Working Group Members</td>
<td>By end September 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect IRC with MENA EiE Task Force</td>
<td>Connecting MENA EiE Task Force with Measurement and Metrics Initiative</td>
<td>INEE</td>
<td>UNRWA</td>
<td>Asap</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key recommendations

- Connect global level initiatives on quality learning outcomes to teacher and classroom level, ensuring children, youth and their teachers are front and centre of data collection efforts
- Advocate for better data sharing between organizations
- Advocate for senior leadership within organizations to prioritise data skill capacity building for internal staff
- INEE should facilitate the sector to share data initiatives and tools when they are in the development stage, not just when finalised, to avoid duplication and encourage cooperation
- The Education Cluster should support contextualised tools for dissemination at the national level that include outcome indicators, which would inform dashboards
Plenary Discussion and Reporting Back: Towards an Action Agenda

Chaired by Sébastien Hine, Consultant - USAID MEERS

This final session drew together remaining questions. Discussion included how to balance the education needs of children and the data needs with extremely limited resources. It was suggested that in some contexts we may have to be satisfied with increased measures of access without data on learning outcomes. Others disagreed indicating that unless we are achieving quality education, we have not met our objectives. There was a suggestion that we could be more creative with our data collection, so instead of trying to measure school safety directly we could measure student perception of safety. On the issue of limited resources, it was suggested that it would be better value to strengthen systems to work better with existing data rather than significantly expanding data collection. In conclusion it was agreed that this meeting had been held in good spirit and that significant progress had been made towards improving data in education in emergencies.

Closing comments

Annie Smiley, Sonja Anderson, and Joost Monks thanked all the relevant organisers and participants, confirmed that next steps would include the circulation of a draft Action Agenda for comment, and reiterated that this is just the start of a process of improving data in education in emergencies.

Next steps

This 2-day summit feeds in to the Action Agenda which details the commitments participants and their organisations have made to advancing work on education in emergencies data as well as stating recommendations for the sector overall.
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