



Policy Brief

MAPPING SCHOOL-BASED SECURITY MEASURES

Measuring the impact on access to education and the psychosocial wellbeing of learners

This is a summary and policy companion to a larger mapping exercise on how EiE and CPHA actors measure four categories of school-based, physical security interventions that address external threats of conflict and violence, as well as their relationship with access to education and the psychosocial wellbeing of learners.



What are school-based security measures and why do they matter?

Around the world, children see their education disrupted due to security risks and incidents arising from armed conflict and armed violence. Insecurity can be acute and lead to displacement and prolonged school closures. It can also be sporadic or chronic and form part of the day-to-day reality that learners and educators have to deal with. Insecurity hampers access to education, but it can also affect the psychosocial well-being of learners and the quality of the learning environment writ large.

A wide range of school-based security-related measures are implemented by education in emergencies (EiE), child protection in humanitarian action (CPHA), peacekeeping actors, as well as communities and authorities to mitigate and manage external risks related to armed conflict and violence. Typically, such measures focus on **physical security of facilities** (e.g., shelters); **physical security risk management** (e.g., early warning systems, evacuation drills for conflict-related threats); **contingency education delivery** due to insecurity (e.g. adjustment

of school schedules/calendar according to patterns of insecurity, relocation of schools, distance education); **advocacy** (e.g., dialogue with arms carriers, monitoring of attacks).

While relatively small in scale and scope, school-based security-related measures are relevant to current and long-standing discussions in the education policy space, notably:

- **CPHA-EiE collaboration:** school-based security-related activities offer an opportunity for EiE and CPHA practitioners to model fully integrated approaches which respond to both protection and education objectives and generate evidence on ways to enhance the overall resilience of education in volatile environments.
- **The Humanitarian-Development nexus:** school-based security-related activities can challenge policy-makers to think of insecurity (external threats) as something that needs to be managed and integrated in longer-term plans, and not just as a temporary crisis requiring an emergency response. Too often, conflict and insecurity are pervasive and protracted and mitigating measures need to be provided for and resourced in longer-term plans, even while efforts are underway to end and to prevent conflict and insecurity from arising in the first place.

What is the mapping about and who can it be useful to?

While many types of school-based security related activities are implemented in areas affected by armed conflict and violence, it is not clear whether and how the various actors measure the impact of these interventions on access to education and on the psychosocial wellbeing of learners.

To shed light on this issue, the Safe and Resilient Education Systems workstream of the Inter-agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE) commissioned a mapping of measurement frameworks and tools applied to the four types of school-based security activities described above, and an examination of how they relate to measurement frameworks and tools used for access to education, and psychosocial well-being of learners. The mapping would be useful in both the EiE and CPHA sectors, in particular for:

- Actors looking to strengthen monitoring and evaluation frameworks and practices for the protection of education from attack;
- Actors looking to develop or enhance integrated CPHA-EiE programs at school level, in areas affected by armed conflict and violence.

The mapping was developed based on a literature review and key informant interviews conducted between May and July 2020. There were limitations to this mapping. It is acknowledged that many project evaluations in this area although not found, likely exist in internal agency libraries, not publicly available. Secondly, the definitions for the project limited the scope of relevant child protection literature, since much of that focuses on interpersonal violence and violence against children and youth inside schools and homes. Lastly, the current global pandemic COVID-19 influenced the amount of time practitioners were able to offer to the project.

Key Findings

- The mapping found a wealth of briefs, guidance notes, and indicators on the topics of interest. However, while practitioner guidance generally describes what should be measured, it does not provide much guidance on how it should be measured. There is also a lack of gender-specific guidance.
- The mapping found that while EiE and CPHA actors are advancing on multi-sectoral coordination and common frameworks for responses and advocacy, cross-sectoral research agendas and methods are lagging behind. There is also an incongruence in goals between EiE and CPHA programs/projects, which is a challenge for research design.
- The mapping found no study in the public domain measuring the specified relationship between security-related measures and access to education and/or psychosocial well-being.

Three key recommendations for EiE, child protection practitioners and donors

- 1. Move CPHA-EiE collaboration further:** incentivize and pilot integrated CPHA-EiE projects with joint results frameworks testing causal linkages between different types of interventions. The shared coordination framework which emerged from the collaborative work of the Global Education Cluster and the Child Protection Area of Responsibility can support such collaboration, including on measurement.
- 2. Develop a cross-sectoral research agenda on the protection of education from attack:** there is a wealth of recommended actions to protect education from attack notably through the types of activities examined in this mapping and in the work of Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack (GCPEA). There is also a wealth of CPHA and EiE indicator lists and guidance, but no cross-sectoral research agenda generating evidence of impact and causal links between different interventions. CPHA and EiE actors could be incentivized, notably by donors, to implement and systematically measure such activities at project level, towards the aim of creating an evidence platform that includes measurement methods.
- 3. Improve measurement methods in programs aiming at enhancing the security and the psychosocial well-being of learners.** Complement measurement tools based on self-reported perceptions of safety and security, with objective, standardized measures. Use more robust measurement tools for examining the psychosocial well-being of learners in school-based physical security projects. Where tools are not available, fund the testing and strengthening of evolving tools. Enhance a gender-specific measurement lens by employing mixed methods research design, rather than relying solely on data disaggregation.

The full mapping is available at inee.org