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INEE

...is a network of more than 16,000 individual members and 130 partner organizations in 190 countries. INEE members are NGO and UN personnel, ministries of education and other government staff, students, teachers, donors, and researchers who do work related to education in emergencies (EiE). INEE exists for and because of its members.

INEE’s goal is to enable quality, safe, and relevant education for all in emergencies and crisis contexts through prevention, preparedness, response, and recovery.
Collective Impact

The provision of EiE is a complex, ever-changing issue. Given the scale of the need for quality EiE, no single entity, no matter how innovative and powerful, has the means to solve this issue alone. INEE believes that substantially greater progress can be made in improving the quality and accessibility of education in emergencies if UN agencies, NGOs, governments, donors, academics, and the public are brought together around a common agenda to create collective impact.

INEE draws on Collective Impact Theory in its approach to supporting the equitable and coordinated provision of safe, quality, and inclusive EiE. INEE uses a collective, inter-agency approach and open, continuous communication to focus member organizations on common goals rather than individual agendas, facilitate the development of shared indicators and learning agendas, and encourage organizations to align their activities to address problems collaboratively and holistically rather than duplicating efforts. INEE enlists the coordinated efforts of its diverse member organizations: academics and practitioners build the evidence base to inform programming, UN agencies and NGOs provide build stakeholders’ capacity and advocate for improved access and quality, governments develop education policies and support national systems, donors support and finance new initiatives.
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● Map measurement tools and frameworks for academic and social and emotional learning
● Policy note to guide global measurement and learning outcomes
● Advocacy strategy for embedding indicators on learning outcomes into funding frameworks
Objective

For EiE actors to produce relevant learning outcomes it requires a shift from access towards access & learning, supported by greater alignment of consistent and evidence-based outcome measurement for academic and social & emotional learning.

Based on the above we seek to:

→ identify bottlenecks to uptake of holistic education and evidence at policy and practice levels;
→ identify relevant measurement frameworks and practices within the EiE field;
→ support alignment of measurement frameworks for EiE (with evidence-based measurement tools that cover academic learning and SEL);
→ drive policies and practices that promote measurement of learning outcomes in order to strengthen responsibility/accountability for comprehensive learning outcomes (academic + SEL) among funders (public and private donors, as well as International Organizations) and subsequently implementers and national education systems working within EiE;
Mapping Exercise

As a basis for an upcoming policy paper on measurement in Education in Emergencies it was important to understand what current practices exist at the field level and to identify the main challenges to measuring learning outcomes (including SEL/PSS) in EiE contexts.

The purpose of the mapping was thus:
- to identify existing measurement tools & approaches for learning outcomes at the programme and country level, and their connection to relevant regional or global frameworks (e.g. SDG 4);
- to help us understand how quality education in emergencies is actually defined through the skills and competencies that get measured.
Overview

I. Project Background

II. Key Findings

III. Implications
Project Background

Overview: The INEE QELO project was designed to identify, code, analyze, and describe existing social emotional learning (SEL) and psychosocial support (PSS) measurement/assessment tools and guidance documents being used in the international Education in Emergencies (EiE) sector.
The aim of the project is to **inform policy** that is grounded in a **shared understanding of learning outcomes and monitoring**.

The work is a priority of the Quality and Equitable Learning Outcomes (QELO) work stream within INEE’s Education Policy Working Group (EPWG) and is funded by Porticus.

This figure illustrates ideal alignment between research, programmatic, and assessment activities in the field of EiE.
Measurement is Critical Link

Therefore, measurement & assessment tools are *critical for the successful functioning* of all aspects of the EiE field.

The INEE QELO Mapping Project is designed to identify the tools that are currently available and used to assess SEL/PSS in EiE contexts, and to better understand their relationships to current guidance documents and programmatic approaches.
Research Questions

1. How, where, and with whom are SEL/PSS tools used?
2. Which SEL competencies are priorities in the field of education in emergencies?
3. Which features of children’s context, background, and experiences are being considered in the SEL/PSS tools?
4. What considerations or barriers exist for including crisis and conflict-affected populations in the SEL/PSS tools?
5. How are the SEL/PSS tools aligned to guidance documents? How well equipped is the field to monitor progress towards global goals for EiE?
Methods

Project methods included the following five phases:

- Desk Research
- INEE Survey
- Interviews
- Coding
- Analysis
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guidance Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amal Alliance Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya Institute of Curriculum Development Basic Education Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia National Standards of Citizenship Competencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Social-Emotional Skills for the Labor Market: PRACTICE Model (World Bank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines on Mental Health and Psychosocial Support in Emergency Settings (IASC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right to Play Holistic Child Development Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRC’s Approach to Social-Emotional Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right to Play Life Skills for Psychosocial Wellbeing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEGO Skills for Holistic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measuring Early Learning Quality and Outcomes (MELQO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Standards for Child Protection in Humanitarian Action (CPWG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INEE Minimum Standards for Education: Preparedness, Response, Recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Cannot Wait Principles and Results Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INEE Guidance Note on Psychosocial Support: Facilitating Psychosocial Wellbeing and Social Emotional Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimagining Life Skills and Citizenship Education in the Middle East and North Africa (UNICEF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Partnership for Education Results Framework (GPE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO Skills for Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASEL Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) Competencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD Social and Emotional Skills: Well-being, Connectedness, and Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room to Read Life Skills Education Learning Outcomes Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toolkit for Measuring ECD in Low- and Middle-Income Countries (World Bank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision of the Haitian Child: Social Emotional Framework</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Measurement & Assessment Tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Instruments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amal Alliance Impact Assessments</td>
<td>International Development and Early Learning Assessment (IDELA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Behavior Questionnaire (CBQ)</td>
<td>International Social and Emotional Learning Assessment (ISELA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Hope Scale (CHS)</td>
<td>Kidcope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence and Curiosity Questionnaire</td>
<td>Malawi Development Assessment Tool (MDAT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextually relevant SEL questionnaires</td>
<td>Measure of Early Learning Environments (MELE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregiver Reported Early Childhood Development Instruments (CREDI)</td>
<td>Measure of Development and Early Learning (MODEL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child and Youth Resilience Measure (CYRM)</td>
<td>Pisa for Development (PISA-D) Student Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devereux Student Strengths Assessment (DESSA)</td>
<td>Preschool Self-Regulation Assessment (PSRA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPOCH Measure of Adolescent Well-being</td>
<td>Social Emotional Health Survey-Secondary (SEHS-S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion Regulation Questionnaire (ERQ)</td>
<td>Short Grit Scale (GRIT-S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSE)</td>
<td>Social Provisions Scale (SPS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holistic Assessment of Learning and Development Outcomes (HALDO)</td>
<td>Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Civic and Citizenship Study (ICCS)</td>
<td>YouthPower Action Soft Skills Tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SERAIS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following SEL/PSS programmatic approaches were included:

1. Better Learning (NRC)
2. Healing and Education through the Arts (HEART; Save the Children)
3. Programa de Aprendizaje Socioemocional (PASE; Honduran Ministry of Education)
4. Safe Healing and Learning Spaces (IRC)
5. Can’t Wait to Learn (War Child Holland)
6. CONVIVIMOS (Mercy Corps)
Key Findings
- The **United States** is the country with the **highest number** of SEL/PSS tools in use.

- The country with the **second highest number** of tools in use is **Turkey**.

- The **African continent** currently has the **fewest SEL/PSS tools** being used.
A small number of SEL/PSS tools have been adapted or validated for EiE contexts.

The validation strategies used for each tool were different and range from simple translation of items to contextualization discussions with local stakeholders.

In general, measures were validated by their developers or by researchers.
Prioritized SEL Competencies

- Overall, global guidance documents for EiE and SEL/PSS measurement tools include all six SEL domains.

- Overall, guidance documents and tools tend to emphasize four domains of SEL: cognitive, emotion, social, and values (see figure below).

![Comparing SEL Domains in Aggregate](chart.png)

- **Measurement/Assessment Tools**
  - Cognitive: 22%
  - Emotion: 19%
  - Social: 18%
  - Values: 24%
  - Perspectives: 6%
  - Identity: 11%

- **Guidance Documents**
  - Cognitive: 24%
  - Emotion: 16%
  - Social: 22%
  - Values: 23%
  - Perspectives: 5%
  - Identity: 11%
Each guidance document has different priorities (see figure).

The social domain is the only SEL domain included in all 24 guidance documents that were coded.

- This may signify that social skills play a particularly important role for children in crisis-affected contexts.
A comparison of SEL across guidance documents indicates, for example, that:

- The **GPE Results Framework** includes only **three** SEL domains (cognitive, emotion, social), which are different from those included in the **SDGs** (social, values, identity).

- The **INEE Minimum Standards** include all **six** SEL domains, and places greatest emphasis on social and values.

- The **INEE Psychosocial Support Guidance Note** includes all **six** domains, and places greatest emphasis on emotion and identity.
Many SEL/PSS measurement tools focus heavily or exclusively on only four of six SEL domains, typically: cognitive, emotion, social and values.
Notable Differences

A significant number of SEL/PSS measurement/assessment tools do not include skills across all six domains and therefore cannot be used to capture outcomes across all relevant areas. For example:

- The Emotion Regulation Questionnaire includes only the emotion domain
- The Grit Scale includes only the cognitive and values domains
- The MELQO MODEL Direct Assessment includes only cognitive and emotion domains

SEL/PSS measurement/assessment tools tend to have wider variability in the skills they include, compared to global guidance documents.
Across the guidance documents, all of the five contextual factor codes were applied, with the greatest focus on ecology, equity, health, and safety.
Among the SEL/PSS measurement/assessment tools, the **ecology** and **equity** codes were applied with much higher frequency than other codes.
Overall, programmatic approaches include all six SEL domains (cognitive, emotion, social, values, perspectives, and identity).

Across the programmatic approaches, four received all five contextual factor codes (Better Learning Program, HEART, Safe Healing and Learning Spaces, and Convivimos).

Equity, ecology, and adult support were coded across all six programmatic approaches.

This suggests that programs place particular importance on contextual features when providing SEL/PSS interventions in crisis and conflict-affected settings.
Key Considerations for EiE

Do no harm

• The need to be particularly sensitive to the needs and experiences of children affected by conflict and crisis poses a large barrier to ethically measuring SEL/PSS in EiE contexts.

• For example, specific items in a measure, the length of a measure, or even the act of being assessed, which may be acceptable for children in stable contexts, poses the risk of re-traumatizing children and causing harm in the midst of crisis and conflict.
Key Considerations for EiE

**Validation**

- Few studies have shown SEL/PSS tools to be validated in crisis and conflict-affected settings.

- Validation is often conducted with varying levels of quality, which is a challenge for the broader field of SEL/PSS measurement/assessment.

This is particularly so for crisis and conflict settings, as accurate measures are needed to ensure that they serve children as effectively and efficiently as possible, with limited stressors and burden to individuals and resources.
Key Considerations for EiE

Contextualization

• Contextualization was a **major barrier** for many stakeholders, because it requires significant funding, resources, and time.

• When **local adaptation and contextualization** is done well, it seems to be a particularly important component of what makes both **implementing and measuring SEL/PSS feasible and successful**.
Key Considerations for EiE

Tools designed specifically for use in EiE contexts

- Over 90% of the tools have been used in conflict and crisis-affected contexts, however, only four tools were specifically designed with consideration of emergency settings: HALDO, ISELA, IDELA, and SERAIS.

- These tools were developed by Save the Children (3 tools) and NYU Global TIES* (1 tool).

*The SERAIS tool was compiled by NYU Global TIES and is based on existing measures; see Profile section of the Report for more details.
The vast majority of tools included in our analysis are free, but there are underlying costs of using them in conflict-affected contexts:

- Piloting (e.g., training duration, consultant fees, enumerator costs)
- Administration (depending on the mode of the tool)
- Scoring (if external scoring needed)
- Translation and adaptation (costs of time-intensive translation and adaption work)
Based on our analyses, we identified progress and gaps in relation to the field’s capacity to monitor progress towards global goals for EiE:
Progress Toward Global Goals

Alignment between guidance documents.

Major global stakeholders are aligning around SEL/PSS as a global priority for all children, including those in conflict and crisis-affected settings.

Global goals recognize unique EiE needs.

There is an emerging sense that children and youth in crisis and conflict-affected settings have unique needs and circumstances which should influence SEL/PSS goals.

Global goals recognize the importance of contextual factors for EiE.

Many of the global guidance documents also highlight important contextual factors relevant to education in emergencies which impact policy and practice.
### Gaps in Current Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common and operationalizable definitions for SEL/PSS</th>
<th>When measuring SEL/PSS outcomes, education in emergencies is not often captured</th>
<th>Lack of measurement/assessment tools for contextual factors in EiE settings</th>
<th>Lack of measurement/assessment tools for SEL/PSS at the population-level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>While the majority of guidance documents include goals related to PSS/SEL, there is not a common definition for PSS/SEL that underlies all the global goals.</td>
<td>We identified only four SEL/PSS measurement/assessments tools specifically designed for use in EiE settings.</td>
<td>There is a lack of measurement/assessment tools designed to capture and understand contextual factors in education in emergencies.</td>
<td>There is a lack of international and national-level measurement/assessment tools to assess SEL/PSS-related outcomes at the population level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Background and Methodology
Key Challenges to Measuring Learning

• The humanitarian sector faces unique challenges in delivering and measuring learning in emergencies:
  • Existing assessment systems are not set up to capture populations on the move or are inadequate in responding to additional strain.
  • Often parallel systems of education exist, which amplifies confusion.
  • National governments, particularly in countries affected by conflict and crisis, are often unable to fulfill the responsibility of collecting data and managing assessment systems.
  • There are some examples of cases where the host country and country of origin do not allow their national curricula to be used with refugee children, e.g. Bangladesh.
  • Children and youth who have been faced with conflict and crisis may face cognitive loads far beyond their peers, which may lead to poor performance on standardized tests.
Methodology

- 31 measurement tools (23 distinct approaches, with a group of 8 citizen-led assessments comprising the remaining tools), 8 guidance documents, and program approaches from 4 organizations used in at least one country affected by conflict or crisis in the past 5 years.

- Four key factors for selection:
  - Coverage
  - Quality
  - Relevance
  - Accessibility

- Uses a framework and coding scheme created by the UNESCO International Bureau of Education (UNESCO-IBE) and the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS) to map content domains and sub-categories in mathematics and reading to identify commonalities and disparities across content area and coverage in the measurement of academic skills.
2. Measurement tools
Coverage

• Mapping included cross-national (used in more than one country) academic learning assessment tools in 61 countries where EiE is provided. Of the 61 countries, only two—Eritrea and Libya—did not participate in any of the cross-national tools.

• Additional data from UNESCO UIS/IBE covered national assessments.

• Assessment tools selected for coding cover a range of target populations from early childhood to age 18.
Age and Grade Range of Multi-Country Tools
Administration

• Tools designed for children under Grade 3, citizen-led assessments (CLAs), assessments embedded into MICS household surveys, and tools designed specifically for displaced or out of school children are most often delivered orally face-to-face by a trained assessor.

  • These occur in a home, school or community center depending on the tool and purpose.

• Assessments administered in school to older children (e.g. PISA-D, PIRLS, PASEC) are typically paper-based with multiple choice and open response questions.
Information on Context

• All measurement tools included in the mapping collect at least information on characteristics like gender, socio-economic status, language, and education levels of the children.

• Some tools collect information on student learning opportunities outside of school, household characteristics, school characteristics, and village/community facilities.

• PILNA, EGRA, PIRLS, TIMSS, and TERCE often incorporate background questionnaires for parents, teachers, and principals that are administered alongside the learning assessments for children.

• Information about refugee or IDP status is not collected with these tools. Only recently have there been efforts to gain consensus on how to collect statistics on refugees and IDPs, including by UNESCO-UIS, UNHCR and the Education Equity Research Initiative.
Validity and Reliability

• All measurement tools assessed in this study have been designed and piloted to determine some psychometric standards of validity and reliability.

• Transparency of the results and the extent to which validity and reliability have been established varies.

• Three tools – Save the Children’s Holistic Assessment of Learning and Development (HALDO), the UNRWA Monitoring Learning Achievement (MLA), and EDC’s Out-of-School-Youth Literacy Assessment (OLA) – have been validated in an EiE setting.
How Assessment is Applied in EiE Contexts

• **Syria**: War Stressor Survey – measuring exposure to conflict and emotional repercussions of trauma – and the Snapshot of School Management and Effectiveness administered alongside EGRA and EGMA to provide a full picture of primary education in opposition-led areas in Syria.

• **Greece**: Oinofyta Community School, founded in a refugee camp in Central Greece serving Afghan refugee children as a project of the NGO ArmandoAid. Classroom assessments were used as a way of monitoring learning and each child’s behavior and general performance. The information on learning was maintained and utilized to improve the operation of the school and teaching and was shared with donors and other development partners to highlight progress and challenges.
Costs

• There are open source tools that are available online, but there are costs associated with in-country administration.

• Regional assessments as well as a few of the international assessments require countries to pay a participation fee in addition to the costs of administering the assessment in country.

• For international assessments, test administration represents about half of the total cost (largely driven by the cost of field testing and supervision) while institutional costs (driven by personnel costs and fees) accounts for around 25% of total costs.
3. Guidance Documents
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Framework</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SDG 4</td>
<td>UIS is custodian agency for all indicators except 4.2, which is UNICEF</td>
<td>Global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education 2030</td>
<td>UNESCO/UIS</td>
<td>Global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INEE Minimum Standards</td>
<td>INEE</td>
<td>All education in emergencies settings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agenda 2063 and Continental Strategy for Education in Africa 2016-2025</td>
<td>African Union</td>
<td>55 African countries (North and Sub-Saharan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimagining Life Skills and Citizenship Education in the Middle East and North Africa: Conceptual and Programmatic Framework</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>MENA region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Regional Education Framework</td>
<td>Countries of the Pacific Islands Forum</td>
<td>Pacific Island Countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Partnership for Education (GPE) Results Framework</td>
<td>GPE</td>
<td>72 developing country partners, around half of which are considered fragile or conflict-affected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Cannot Wait (ECW) Results Framework</td>
<td>ECW/UNICEF</td>
<td>19 crisis-affected ECW countries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sustainable Development Goals

• As agreed in 2015, do not provide common definitions or constructs of minimum proficiencies for what should be measured within reading and mathematics.
  • UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS), as the custodian of SDG 4, has been tasked with developing standards and guidance for measurement of the indicators.
  • In August 2019, the Global Alliance to Monitor Learning (GAML) met to agree upon minimum proficiency standards for reading and numeracy for grades 2-6.
  • SDG 4.5 includes data collection and disaggregation on multiple equity indicators, including “conflict-affected”
• Sustainable Development Goals used as a reference point for many regional and organizational guidance documents.
Regional Frameworks

• Regional frameworks often define themselves as a regional extension of the SDGs, owning the sustainable development goals and adapting them to regional aspirations. For example,

  • *Continental Strategy for Education in Africa* uses the same SDG indicators for monitoring progress on learning.

  • *Pacific Regional Education Framework* does not specify targets but outline that the region will maintain alignment with SDG4 and prioritize a coordinated approach to SDG related monitoring.

• In line with the equity goals of SDG4, all frameworks highlight the importance of disaggregating data by gender, socio-economic status, disability, language, context and other indicators of marginalization. However, disaggregating by refugee or IDP status was not included in the global guidance documents reviewed.
Education in Emergencies

• In the EiE sector, the INEE Minimum Standards serve as the main reference point.
  • Referenced in several other frameworks, including *Reimagining Life Skills and Citizenship Education in the Middle East and North Africa: Conceptual and Programmatic Framework* and the *Education Cannot Wait (ECW) Results Framework*
• INEE Minimum Standards do not recommend, require, or align to specific assessment tools.
4. Program Approaches
Program Approaches Reviewed

Selected four examples from the many program approaches in the world that strengthen learning and equity in conflict-affected settings.

• Save the Children’s Literacy Boost and Numeracy Boost
• World Vision’s Unlock Literacy
• Education Development Center’s Read Right Now!
• UNRWA’s EiE program, which includes the Monitoring Learning Achievement (MLA) tool
Themes Across the Four Approaches

• Programs tend to tweak existing tools to align with their program goals.
• These interventions tend to show evidence of improvements in academic outcomes.
• Academic learning assessments are sometimes supplemented with contextual surveys about the student background and school context.
5. Academic Domain Mapping
Academic Competencies

• To enable comparisons across the different tools, we adopted the framework and coding scheme created by the UNESCO International Bureau of Education and the UNESCO Institute for Statistics to map content domains and sub-categories in literacy and math.
  • Literacy: reading, linguistic and metalinguistic competencies.
    • Writing was added
  • Math: math proficiency, number knowledge, measurement, statistics, geometry, and algebra.
## Literacy Domains Coverage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System-monitoring tools</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Linguistic</th>
<th>Metalinguistic</th>
<th>Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>International assessments</strong></td>
<td>PHAS-I, TVWS, FIELD, LAMA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional assessments</strong></td>
<td>ILESE, SEARUC, Basic MLA, SEA-PIM, UNRWA MLA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household</strong></td>
<td>MCES-ICED, MICS-ILM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multipurpose tools</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Linguistic</th>
<th>Metalinguistic</th>
<th>Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foundational skills</strong></td>
<td>MLIQ, EDRA, STAR, Literacy Boost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Citizen-led</strong></td>
<td>ASER, LIANE20, learnNigeria, etc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Designed for ECE contexts</strong></td>
<td>HALDO, IDELA, OLA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Darkest color indicates all tools in the category include sub-domain; Lighter color blue indicates half or more tools in the category include sub-domain; Lightest blue indicates one or a few tools in the category include sub-domain; No color indicates that no tools in the category include sub-domain.
Literacy Domain Coverage

• Reading competency is the most prevalent domain; all tools reviewed include some form of decoding and/or reading comprehension sub-domains.

• Reading and comprehending a simple text are understood as fundamental skills.

• Beginner tasks such as decoding are more frequently found in assessments of early childhood and early grades, while more complex tasks such as reading comprehension are found more frequently in assessments of higher grades.
# Mathematics Domain Coverage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Tools</th>
<th>Math proficiency (e.g. problem-solving, reasoning)</th>
<th>Number knowledge (incl. operations)</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Statistics &amp; Probability</th>
<th>Geometry</th>
<th>Algebra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>System-monitoring tools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International assessments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional assessments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multipurpose tools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundational skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen-led</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designed for EIE contacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Darkest color indicates all tools in the category include sub-domain;
Lighter color blue indicates half or more tools in the category include sub-domain;
Lightest blue indicates one or a few tools in the category include sub-domain;
No color indicates that no tools in the category include sub-domain.
Mathematics Domain Coverage

• All tools, regardless of their intended use measured number knowledge.
• No tools cover all sub-domains, and tools covering more advanced content – like vectors and probability – are particularly sparse.
• Regional and international assessments (PISA-D, TERE, SEACMEQ, SEA-PLM, TIMSS) have a greater breadth of domains covered than the household surveys, early childhood/early grade assessments, or tools designed for EiE contexts.
6. Summary
Are Children Affected By Conflict and Crisis Included in Assessments of Academic Learning?

• The majority of learning assessments do not gather data on refugee or IDP status.

• Many learning assessments do not construct a sample to ensure inclusion of refugees and IDPs or for conflict- or crisis-affected regions.

• Most learning assessment studies are conducted in schools, with some in homes. Therefore, children affected by conflict and crisis and those who are out of school are unlikely to be included in a study unless they have been resettled in a home and enrolled in a government school.

• Even if children are enrolled in government schools, they are sometimes excluded from an assessment, as in the examples of EGRA, SEACMEQ and PASEC. The protocols for most large-scale assessments require testing in the national languages and excluding conflict zones for the safety of the test administrators.
Conclusions

• Measuring learning in EiE contexts is challenging, as transplanting assessments used in other contexts can result in assessments that are too difficult, not contextually valid, or do not capture contextual factors.

• Guidance documents, measurement tools, and program approaches have the potential to increase equity for children in conflict-affected and fragile contexts, but by and large they do not currently.

• Guidance documents do not provide robust details on which academic domains should be measured, or specifics on how assessment of learning should be contextualized in EiE settings. Of 30 measurement tools examined, only three were developed specifically for EiE contexts.

• There are some common domains across measurement tools, such as number knowledge and operations, decoding, and reading comprehension.
Thank you!
Questions?
Next Steps - Policy Paper

On the basis of the mapping a team of consultants, in close coordination with QELO, will develop a policy paper that aims to provide guidance, particularly for donors in the sector; on how to strengthen measurement of holistic learning outcomes, both in humanitarian and protracted crises.

The policy paper will aim to:

- Promote a shift, primarily within donors, from the current access orientation towards a focus on access AND learning outcomes (why and how both objectives need to be realized in order to achieve meaningful, relevant, and quality education);
- Provide shared messages around quality learning outcomes in education across the humanitarian-development nexus;
- Based on the mapping exercises, list policy barriers and opportunities, as well as potential technical issues education providers are confronted with when it comes to outcomes assessment and ways to address them;
- Outline arguments to articulate the cost of measurement, as well as the negative cost of inaction on this issue;
- Provide guidance on what is specific to measuring learning in crisis contexts or emergency situations;

We expect an inception report well ahead of the upcoming INEE meeting and aim to present the policy paper either around UNGA or for the INEE meeting in fall 2020.