



© Save the Children/Tomas Drefvelin

Project Guidance

SCHOOLS AS ZONES OF PEACE

Version 1 (June 2017)

1 Summary

This guide will give an introduction to the **Schools as Zones of Peace project**. After reading this document, the organisation should be able to (a) understand the purpose of Schools as Zones of Peace, (b) learn about key activities that can be implemented in a Schools as Zones of Peace project (c) and should be able to determine whether Schools as Zones of Peace would be appropriate in a given context.

How to use this Guide:

This Guide should be used by organisations or Save the Children Country Offices that wish to have an overview of what Schools as Zones of Peace is, and how it has been implemented in Save the Children programmes across various contexts. This guide gives a brief introduction to the key activities, and should be of support in deciding whether to implement Schools as Zones of Peace.

Within this Guide there are links to more detailed guidance documents. These provide more details on key components of the project. These guidance documents also provide some links to examples of tools for implementation, but the lists of tools are not exhaustive, and the tools would need to be contextualised.

Schools as Zones of Peace continues to develop, and therefore it is encouraged to also get in touch with Save the Children Norway to know about new developments or lessons learned from implementation.

2 SZOP terms and abbreviations

ANSA: Armed Non-State Actors

CoC: Code of Conduct

GCPEA: Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack

INEE: The Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies

MRM: Monitoring and Reporting Mechanism on grave violations of children's rights in situations of armed conflict

SCI: Save the Children International

SCN: Save the Children Norway

SDMC: School Disaster Management Committees

SSD: Safe Schools Declaration

SZOP: Schools as Zones of Peace

3 Introduction

First developed in Sri Lanka, and introduced to Nepal in 2001, Schools as Zones of Peace was vital to ensure continued access to education for children in Nepal during the civil war. With the global acknowledgement of the problem of attacks on education and the subsequent development and “launch” of the Safe Schools Declaration in 2015, Save the Children Norway decided to build on what had been done in Nepal to develop a new pilot that would be linked to the Safe Schools Declaration.

This project started in oPt and DRC and has been expanded to South Sudan and Niger. Schools as Zones of Peace is contextualised in each of these countries. The activities presented below are adapted to the context, and some are only done in one of the implementing countries. The below seeks to present an introduction of the various activities conducted within Schools as Zones of Peace.

What is included in the guidance document?

This guidance starts with the background on what Schools as Zones of Peace is, when it should be used, and includes an overview of key activities of the Schools as Zones of Peace project. It also includes links to more detailed guidance documents as outlined below.

1. Guide to Baseline Assessment for SZOP
2. Guide to School Safety Management for SZOP
3. Guide to Code of Conduct for SZOP
4. Guide to Reporting, Referral and Follow-up Mechanisms for SZOP
5. Guide to Contextualisation of the Safe Schools Declaration

In addition to the five guides, this document also links to the SZOP illustrations that outline harmful and positive practices at schools, and a guidance for how to use these illustrations with children and adults. This material is available for use in French, Arabic and English (the illustrations are also available in Swahili).

Finally, this document also includes suggested indicators for implementation of the project.

The project is funded by:



European Union
Civil Protection and
Humanitarian Aid

This document covers humanitarian aid activities implemented with the financial assistance of the European Union. The views expressed herein should not be taken, in any way, to reflect the official opinion of the European Union, and the European Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

HISTORY OF SCHOOLS AS ZONES OF PEACE

In Nepal, the SZOP concept was initially established as a strategy to protect schools from the impact of political disturbances and violence during the internal conflict that affected the country from 1996 to 2006. Initiatives established as part of the work on SZOPs included: the construction of boundary walls for schools as a physical protection from attack and stimulation of community engagement to ensure schools were declared “zones of peace”.

Key amongst the underlying principles of the concept of SZOP is the notion that the home, school and the community are all connected for peace. The importance of mobilizing and empowering children themselves as promoters of peace is also crucial.

Successful approaches include: an emphasis on the active and willing participation of the community, the utilization of media and the engagement of academic institutions, NGOs and local civil society to mobilize resources and support and ensure the issue is placed on the public agenda. As a result, in 2011 the Government of Nepal declared all schools, including higher education, zones of peace.

(from SCN Guidance Note, Schools as Zones of Peace, February 2013)

4 What is the purpose of SZOP?

In the below paragraphs, the rationale behind the need for Schools as Zones of Peace is explained.

What is the Problem: Military Use of and Attacks on Schools

59 million children are out of school worldwide,¹ and about half of these live in countries with armed conflict. Since 2013, there has been a series of attacks on schools in at least 21 countries experiencing armed conflict and insecurity, and military use of schools has been documented in 24 countries.² The consequences for children are serious. Students and teachers can be killed, and their school buildings damaged or destroyed by attacks. Weapons can be left on school premises, and the children also face looting of schools and education material.³ These unnerving barriers to education disrupt their schooling, and prevent these children from reaching their true potential.⁴

To address this problem, 37 states endorsed the Safe Schools Declaration in Oslo, on May 29th 2015. By endorsing the Declaration, which is a political commitment that was drafted through a consultative process led by Norway and Argentina, states demonstrate their political commitment to better protect students, teachers, schools, and universities during armed conflict. The community of endorsing states continues to grow and, to date, there are over 60 signatories to the Declaration. By endorsing the Safe Schools Declaration, states commit to implement the *Guidelines for Protecting Schools and Universities from Military Use during Armed Conflict*.⁵

Although states sign the Safe Schools Declaration, there is no global follow-up mechanism to ensure implementation of the Declaration. The Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack has developed guidance documents for the use of states, local communities and schools/teachers over the past two years, however there is for organisations wanting to work at school level, there are less practical tools. This is the background for this project.

The Global Framework

The Safe Schools Declaration

The Safe Schools Declaration is a declaration that states may sign to express their political support for protecting education during armed conflict. It is a short document that outlines the problem of military use of schools and universities and attacks on education, and the consequences for children. It explains how important it is to maintain education in a conflict situation. By endorsing the Safe Schools Declaration, States also endorse the Guidelines, and commit to bring them into domestic policy and operational frameworks as far as possible and appropriate. Furthermore, States commit to collect data and/or facilitate data collection on military use and attacks on schools, including data on victims, as well as provide assistance to the victims. States also commit to investigate allegations of violations of national and international law, and to develop and promote conflict-sensitive approaches to education. The Declaration also seeks to promote educational continuity in conflict situations, and encourages States to support the efforts of the UN Security Council, the Special Representative of the Secretary General on children and armed conflict, and other relevant UN organs, entities and agencies. Finally, states commit to meet regularly with relevant civil society and international organisations to review implementation of the Safe Schools Declaration and the *Guidelines*.

¹ UNESCO (2015): <http://www.uis.unesco.org/Education/Pages/oosc-data-release-2015.aspx>

² Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack (GCPEA).

³ Based on the Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack's (GCPEA) website: <http://www.protectingeducation.org/what-impact>. Save the Children is a member of and cooperates closely with the GCPEA.

⁴ http://www.savethechildren.org/site/c.8rKLIXMGIpI4E/b.8744729/k.64D9/Attacks_on_Education.htm?msource=pcolpedum713

⁵ For list of endorsing states: <https://www.regjeringen.no/en/topics/foreign-affairs/development-cooperation/protecting-education-endorsed/id2460245/> and more details: <http://www.protectingeducation.org/draft-lucens-guidelines-protecting-schools-and-universities-military-use-during-armed-conflict>

The Guidelines for Protecting Schools and Universities from Military Use during Armed Conflict

The *Guidelines* are a practical tool aimed at preserving the civilian character of schools, and minimizing disruption to education during conflict. They can be used as a tool to advocate for change of behaviour by armed forces and armed groups. There are six key guidelines:

- Guidelines 1 & 2: on Military Use of schools and universities,
- Guidelines 3 & 4: on Attacks on schools and universities
- Guideline 5: on Security and Protection of schools and universities
- Guideline 6: on Implementation: States should incorporate these guidelines into their national laws or rules.

Resources:

- Safe Schools Declaration (http://www.protectingeducation.org/sites/default/files/documents/safe_schools_declaration-final.pdf).
- The Guidelines for Protecting Schools and Universities from Military Use during Armed Conflict (http://protectingeducation.org/sites/default/files/documents/guidelines_en.pdf).

Save the Children's Response: Schools as Zones of Peace

Save the Children has developed a project that aims to link the global work done on protecting education from attack to what happens at school level in affected countries. Schools as Zones of Peace is a Save the Children led project that aims to secure children's safety at school, and avoid that education is disrupted because of armed conflict. The project builds on the Schools as Zones of Peace-model that was successful in ensuring children's access to education in Nepal during the civil war, and uses components from this while linking it to the Safe Schools Declaration. In the project, we work with children, school management and local communities, and work to influence local, national and global policies. Locally, the project aims to secure protective learning environments in conflict and post-conflict situations, raise awareness among communities, school management and children, and build local and national level engagement to protect education. This includes using participatory tools and methods to engage children. This is a way to implement the Safe Schools Declaration through a bottom-up approach by engaging local schools and communities. Where the context allows, we work through partners to engage armed non-state actors (ANSAs) among others to not disrupt education. Globally, we aim to link experiences from these countries to the global advocacy and policy work.

This project links child protection and education across the interventions. One of the key aspects of the project is to address the issues one has uncovered (for instance ensuring that documentation is follow-up by providing a response, either through referral or through direct support). It is thus important that education and child protection colleagues work together in designing and implementing this project.

The below shows how the Schools as Zones of peace project uses theory of change to achieve its aim⁶.

The SZOP Theory of Change can be defined as follows: *If* schools successfully adapt and utilize the Schools of Zones of Peace project, *then* local, national, and global actors will engage to strengthen the physical protection of schools, co-option of schools by armed groups, and improve the knowledge and awareness of children and communities regarding child rights and protection. **This will lead to** ensuring children are not harmed by conflict and enable them to continue education without disruption.

When is it appropriate to use Schools as Zones of Peace?

Schools as Zones of Peace (SZOP) was primarily developed for a conflict or fragile context where there are threats to schools and education. SZOP is primarily for any situation where children are facing disruption in education because of military use,

⁶ This is taken from the Inception Report for the Evaluation of Schools as Zones of Peace, written by ChangHa Lee and Amber Webb, May 2017.

occupation, attacks on schools, forced recruitment or classrooms used as storage for military or weaponry. The project is linked to the Safe Schools Declaration (SSD), but endorsement of the SSD is not a prerequisite to implement the project in a given context. In some circumstances, implementation of the SZOP project may lead to a state endorsing the declaration.

Working on a project to protect education from attack is sensitive, and may not be appropriate in all contexts. Carefully consider whether this project is appropriate, and take care to ensure that none of the activities chosen put any staff, children or local communities at risk or in harm's way. In some contexts, none or only a few of the presented activities may be possible, while in others, it is appropriate to conduct all the activities. This guide merely aims to present the key activities as they are currently being implemented in the Schools as Zones of Peace countries, but the responsibility for programming will ultimately lie with the implementing organisation choosing the activities. Please take care to contextualise any activities chosen, and be aware that not all tools will be appropriate in all contexts, and most will have to be contextualised.

5 Key Activities: Schools as Zones of Peace

The below activities should be contextualised to your context. Not all would be appropriate in every context, and the activities should be implemented in an appropriate order for the context. Some may be implemented at the same time, whereas others are in a natural order. This should be seen as a Menu of Activities for organisations or Save the Children Country Offices to choose which activities are relevant and appropriate for their context, should the organisation decide to implement Schools as Zones of Peace.

Key Area 1: Understanding the Situation

Activity 1: Baseline Assessment

Key Area Two: Protective Learning Environment

Activity 1: Risk and Resource Mapping

Activity 2: School Safety Management

Activity 3: Code of Conduct

Activity 4: Identify and Strengthening/Establishing referral systems

Activity 5: Rehabilitation of Schools

Activity 6: Training of teachers

Activity 7: Child resilience

Key Area Three: Protecting Education from Attack

Activity 1: Monitoring and Reporting Attacks on Education

Activity 2: Contextualisation of the Safe Schools Declaration

Activity 3: Training of military on the Safe Schools Declaration (Niger)

Activity 4: Engagement with Armed Non-State Actors

Activity 5: Awareness Raising on Safe Schools Declaration and Guidelines

More details on each activity is provided over the following pages.

Key Area 1: Understanding the Situation

Activity 1. Baseline Assessment

The aim of the baseline assessment is to assess the situation (baseline) before the project starts, and inform the project design and implementation. This baseline will have a particular focus on uncovering issues which affect children and communities' protection, and include questions on themes such as child protection, the Safe Schools Declaration, attacks on or military use of schools, and natural hazards.

Key Area Two: Protective Learning Environment

Activity 1: Risk and Resource Mapping

The risk and resource map is a sketch of an area or a place made by people in the community. It shows the places where a hazard may occur, the community's vulnerabilities and the risks and resources in the community, including capacities such as safe gathering places and first aid centres. It is a participatory tool used to analyse what hazards and related risks there are in the school community, or on the way to and from school, how vulnerable the boys and girls, teachers and parents are to these risks, and what capacity the school, parents, children, teachers and wider community have to respond to these risks. The Schools as Zones of Peace project has been implemented in countries that are facing both conflict and natural hazard-related risks. One of the findings in the countries has been that there has been a need to address both of these two issues when conducting the risk and resource mapping, and to take the conflict context into consideration when addressing the risks. This combination of conflict and natural hazard has been identified as one of the strengths of the SZOP project, and this mapping is one of the key activities of the project, and conducted in all project countries. However, please be aware of sensitivities and ensure that any activities are appropriate in the context, and do not put children, communities, school staff or organisational staff at risk. Please also remember that boys and girls may be exposed to danger in different ways, and the response must be gender sensitive.

Activity 2: School Safety Management

In the Schools as Zones of Peace project, an important component is to assess and address the conflict and natural hazards related risks faced by children in the schools. To improve the capacity of the school to respond to attacks, and reduce risks linked to such attacks, School Disaster Management Committees (SDMC) have been established in schools. These committees are responsible for managing the school's response plan when there is an emergency, including attacks on education. In some situations, these tasks could be handled by already existing structures, such as a management committee, or the parent teacher association (PTA). Using existing structures is preferred where possible. However, in some situations, the incidents are so frequent that there is a need for a mechanism responsible for following up on these.

School disaster management plans are plans that each school have in order to reduce the risks within the school related to known hazards. This plan must be taking into account different risks and needs for boys, girls, men and women (be gender sensitive). This plan would normally state what to do, who will do it, by when and any costs that would be incurred. It can be the responsibility of the School Disaster Management Committee to follow up on this plan, or this responsibility can be given to already existing structures within the school, depending on the current structures and mechanisms. Once the plan is developed, the school should follow up on the activities identified to ensure these are implemented to reduce risks in and around the school.

Activity 3: Developing or Strengthening Code of Conduct

In general, most Codes of Conduct do not include references to protecting education from attack. However, in some situations this might be needed, for instance in a situation where military use of education may be seen as normal behaviour by the community or school staff. The Code of Conduct in the SZOP project seeks to mitigate this, by establishing clear rules for what is acceptable in the school. It is not necessarily separate from a pre-existing Code of Conduct established by the school and/or formal school system, but a pre-existing CoC can be further developed to include these messages. Together

with awareness raising sessions, the process of developing a Code of Conduct formalizes what should be acceptable in and around schools, and for instance that military use of schools should not happen. This can then be monitored to ensure that the school is a protective environment for children. It is important to also note that all girls and boys should know the content of the Code of Conduct, and how to report if there is a violation of it. It is important that the reporting mechanisms are child friendly.

Activity 4: Identify and Strengthening/Establishing referral systems

In situations where Schools as Zones of Peace is implemented, there are often also other protection related incidents that take place, and children may need support from specialised services. Ensuring that documentation is followed up by providing a response, either through referral or through direct support is therefore key. In many cases, teachers can provide support to for instance stressed children, or support to children who need it can be given within the project. In the case where the violation is of such a nature that the child requires more thorough follow-up from a specialised service, a referral should be made. There might also be a need for extra specialist support for children based on the needs identified in the context, and if so, parents should also be involved. For more details on this activity, please see the specific guidance developed.

Activity 5: School Rehabilitation

When an attack happens at a school, or the school experiences looting or military use, there might be a need for rehabilitation of parts of the school or classroom. From countries where this component was not included in the initial project design, this was highlighted as a gap. As the project focuses on responding to the identified needs, minor rehabilitation and addressing the problems at schools after for instance an attack has been identified as an important component of the project. However, this is not something that has been implemented in all SZOP countries. In some contexts, schools have been provided with an amount that they can utilise as per needs when something happens, or to address the risks uncovered in the risk mappings. The modality depends on the context and needs of the schools. Therefore, take care to ensure that the implementation is contextualised for the specific setting, and is inclusive and gender sensitive. Please use relevant guidelines for school construction.

Activity 6: Teacher Training

Teacher training has been included in the project across the project countries. However, the kind of teacher training provided has varied depending on the context. In some contexts, teachers have asked for positive discipline training to be able to follow-up on the content of the Code of Conducts, in other contexts teachers have been provided with stress management training because of the context and the fact that they are living in difficult situations and under constant stress. The INEE Training Pack for Primary School Teachers in Crisis Contexts has also been used in some of the contexts. The key point is to map what is needed for the teachers in the specific context.

Across the contexts, teachers that are part of the Schools as Zones of Peace project should be introduced to child rights, child protection, the importance of protecting education from attack, and be able to map out available protection services nearby to which they can refer boys and girls in need of support. They should also be able to identify children with psycho-social needs.

Activity 7: Child resilience

In some countries, there has been specific programming on Child and Youth resilience. These are sessions going over a specific period of time for a selected number of children, aimed at increasing their ability to cope with the situation in which they live. This has been seen as necessary in one of the project countries, where this has been a successful activity for the children/youth participating in the sessions.

The links to this programming are available through the Save the Children Resource Centre: [Child Resilience here](#) and [Youth Resilience can be accessed here](#).

Key Area Three: Protecting Education from Attack

Activity 1: Monitoring and Reporting Attacks on Education

In many contexts, there is a problem of military use of schools or attacks on education, or continuously armed presence near schools. Despite these circumstances, school headmasters are not always reporting this through the established mechanisms, seeing armed presence or military use of the school as something normal, or are not aware of the benefits of reporting, nor the mechanisms through which they might submit a report. In addition, in some instances reporting is seen as a nuisance that does not contribute to an improvement of the situation. This can be linked to a lack of feedback in how reports are being used, and follow-up when a report is made, resulting in less reporting. Therefore, training and awareness raising on the importance of avoiding military use of education, the importance of documenting military use and/or attacks on education, how to report these, and what these reports feed into/how they are used is a key aspect of the Schools as Zones of Peace project. For instance, this could involve increased clarity on the mechanisms of reporting through the Monitoring and Reporting (MRM) Mechanism, how this data is used for advocacy, for instance to enable the UN to identify perpetrators, identify trends and compare statistics from one year to another, as well as for advocacy when engaging in dialogue with parties to the conflict. Through the Schools as Zones of Peace project, the aim is to improve the linkages between reporting and follow-up by strengthening reporting (through building on existing mechanisms) and ensure that an appropriate response is given to the child when and if necessary.

Activity 2: Contextualisation of the Safe Schools Declaration

The Schools as Zones of Peace-project seeks to support implementation of the Safe Schools Declaration through a bottom-up approach by engaging local schools and communities, and by engaging national authorities. The aim of the contextualisation is to achieve an institutionalisation of the intentions of the Safe Schools Declaration and *Guidelines*, that these ideas are understood within the framework of the context, and that actions are taken to address the issue of attacks/military use of education that are appropriate and address the problem in the context. One can also draw upon experiences from other processes of contextualisation, such as the INEE Minimum Standards contextualisation, and examples of this can be found on the INEE website⁷. If it is possible to work on the Safe Schools Declaration in the context, without causing any harm and putting anyone at risk, there are several issues to consider that will determine how to proceed. These are outlined in the guidance document on Contextualisation of the Safe Schools Declaration.

Activity 3: Training of Military

In some of the SZOP countries, it has been noted that although the country may have endorsed the Safe Schools Declaration, the military on the ground in other parts of the country may not be aware of this endorsement. Therefore, a need has been identified to also conduct training of military forces. It is necessary to highlight that this work may be highly sensitive, and should only be conducted in instances where it does not put any staff at danger, and where it is appropriate. Maintaining the humanitarian principles is a prerequisite for this work. There are currently few experiences from implementation, as this is one of the activities that were not initially part of the project. However, the dialogue has been started in one of the countries implementing, and so far, the lessons learned indicate that although armed forces might have training on this topic in their initial trainings, this is not always highlighted after they begin their service, and they therefore need a refresher training. But it is important to enter into a dialogue with the military on this topic, and ensure that there is buy-in and acceptance of the importance of not attacking schools nor using schools for military purposes. This dialogue has been quite successful in the country that focuses on this activity.

It must be emphasised that this activity should only be conducted if it is considered appropriate in the context. Depending on the country, Save the Children International (SCI) may be able to provide some guidance for how to proceed with training, and the Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack (GCPEA) has also developed a training package together with the Roméo Dallaire Child Soldier Initiative⁸.

⁷ <http://www.ineesite.org/en/minimum-standards/contextualization>

⁸ <http://protectingeducation.org/sites/default/files/documents/toolkit.pdf>

Activity 4: Engagement with Armed Non-State Actors

To ensure successful implementation of Schools as Zones of Peace, it is important to engage as many stakeholders as possible that can affect the protection of educational institutions. This includes dialogue with Armed Non-State Actors (ANSAs). In this project, Save the Children has in relevant contexts partnered with Geneva Call, an organization that specializes in dialogue with these entities.

In selected countries where education is under threat, Geneva Call works to disseminate the *Guidelines for protecting schools and universities from military use during armed conflict* to ANSAs. This is part of its strategy to raise awareness and knowledge by these entities of the importance of safeguarding education during armed conflicts. In this process, Geneva Call has witnessed different roles of ANSAs with respect to education, not only in the context of the conduct of hostilities, but also as providers of education in the territories they control. Geneva Call aims at enhancing the protection of children and education. For this purpose, it has attempted to understand the challenges ANSAs face. In 2016, a research conducted with 10 groups from different conflicts indicates, among other things, that some legal notions related to the protection of schools are not entirely understood.

This analysis has helped Geneva Call to develop its approach to engage ANSAs on the protection of education. Firstly, Geneva Call selects key arguments to increase the awareness of the leadership of ANSAs regarding the importance of protecting education. Geneva Call works to build confidence with these entities. Once this is well-established, Geneva Call provides technical legal advice to ANSAs leadership on how to integrate the highest protective standard for education into their military doctrines and practices. Geneva Call supports ANSAs in the dissemination of these new norms through the training of officers and trainers. ANSAs receive copies of the *Guidelines* in their languages and training kits (video and booklets) for an audience with a lower literacy level.

In addition to working with ANSAs, Geneva Call works with communities affected by the armed conflict and share information with them on the obligations of ANSAs to protect education. The assumption is that ANSAs may be more respectful of education if the local communities can also argue in favor of respecting education in times of conflict.

Tools used by Geneva Call:

[Video on protecting education from attack \(in Swahili\)](#)

[Booklet: How to protect education in armed conflict?](#)

Activity 5: Awareness Raising on Safe Schools Declaration, Guidelines and Risk Mapping

A key aspect of Schools as Zones of Peace is keeping children protected in schools in situations of armed conflict. Therefore, awareness raising and working with local communities to prevent military use or attacks on education is vital for successful implementation of Schools as Zones of Peace. Sustainability is achieved through engagement from key stakeholders, and therefore, the success of Schools as Zones of Peace hinges on the mobilisation of the local community, school and national level stakeholders. Therefore, as the organisation works on this project, it is key to involve the local communities. It is key to work towards reaching the most marginalised children, and therefore, it is important that when conducting awareness raising activities, the facilitator/organisation in question pays special attention to the children who are not the most vocal, and

ensures that the activities are conducted in an inclusive and gender-sensitive way, promoting the participation of all children and adults.

This can be done through a variety of methods, by engaging for instance:

- Children's clubs⁹
- Parent-Teacher Associations
- Teachers
- Communities
- Local and National Authorities

Local schools need to be aware of the importance of protecting education from attack. Therefore, there is a need to work with local schools, teachers, parents, and students to ensure that this is institutionalised. This can be done by, for instance using the Schools as Zones of Peace-illustrations that are accompanied by a guidance note, both available under tools below. Communities can be sensitised through activities organised by schools; for instance, children's clubs can devise and stage plays for the community which address the relevant issues. Child clubs have been established in several of the Schools as Zones of Peace contexts. This should be done only if appropriate in the context, and the activities must be contextualised. Furthermore, it should be an aim to make use of existing structures rather than creating new ones, also for awareness raising activities. Engagement with national authorities on the Safe Schools Declaration will vary depending on whether the country has endorsed or not. This is further elaborated in the guide below on Contextualisation.

Tools:

The SZOP illustrations available in Arabic, English, French, and Swahili

Guidance for using the SZOP illustrations (includes tools on risk mappings, engaging parents etc.) available in Arabic, English and French

Some of the activities described above are explained in more detail in the following guidance notes:

1. [Guide to Baseline Assessment for SZOP](#)
2. [Guide to School Safety Management for SZOP](#)
3. [Guide to Code of Conduct for SZOP](#)
4. [Guide to Reporting, Referral and Follow-up Mechanisms for SZOP](#)
5. [Guide to Contextualisation of the Safe Schools Declaration](#)

⁹ These clubs have been established in several of the SZOP implementing countries, and are involved in a range of activities conducted, such as the risk and resource mappings, development of Codes of Conduct, and awareness raising activities. These have been facilitated by two teachers, one female and one male. The SZOP awareness raising activities that are explained in the SZOP Guidance for using the SZOP illustrations and the SZOP illustrations can also be used in the child clubs if appropriate in the context.

6 Menu of Indicators

To streamline the project, we have suggested indicators for implementation of the activities below. These indicators have been chosen based on the current implementation of the project. For the countries currently implementing, the average length of the project period is one year, and therefore most of the indicators have been chosen so as to be achievable within a one year timeframe, while some can be used for a second or third year of implementation. Please choose the indicators that work for the specific context, and edit/add indicators as per need.

Preliminary Suggested indicators:

Key Area 1: Understanding the Situation

- 1) Baseline conducted

Key Area 2: Protective Learning Environment

Child level outcome: Enhancing the resilience and positive development of children in targeted schools

- 1) # of children attending resilience sessions
- 2) # of initiatives at schools and communities carried out by youth leadership
- 3) # of students participating in the youth leadership summer camp
- 4) # of students trained on MRM and the Safe Schools Declaration

The indicators on youth leadership were specific for a context where there was a lot of focus on child resilience, and transferring that knowledge through youth leaders to others in the schools. These may not be applicable across all contexts, and would also require sustained work over a period of time to build up the youth leaders.

School level outcome: Children have access to education in a safe and protected environment or Build the capacity of schools to develop a safe learning and protective environment

First phase:

- 2) # of students enrolled in target educational institutions
- 3) # of classrooms constructed or rehabilitated
- 4) # of parent teacher associations or school (disaster) management committees members trained
- 5) # of educational staff trained (on Safe Schools Declaration, Code of Conduct and Positive Discipline)
- 6) # of school (disaster) management committees in place and functional (meeting regularly)
- 7) # of headmasters trained on monitoring and reporting attacks and military use of schools through existing mechanisms
- 8) # of school risk and resource mappings conducted
- 9) Risk reduction plans in place and followed up on by school (disaster) management committee or other relevant mechanisms
- 10) # of child clubs or peace clubs formed and meeting regularly
- 11) # of teachers trained on referral and when and where to refer cases
- 12) # of school days lost.

A decrease in the indicator # of school days lost does not measure success of the project, rather it is used as a proxy to illustrate that now the number of school days lost is actually reported. The fact that schools are reporting is the indication of success.

To capture all aspects of number of school days lost, the principal should have record of two things:

- Track number of school days lost due to attacks/military use
- Track number of school days lost for students because of denied access due to presence of armed actors (by knowing the students/hearing about what happens)

Second phase (most of the indicators above should also be repeated):

- 1) # of Code of Conducts developed/reinforced through child participatory methods
- 2) # of risk reduction measures taken and in place
- 3) # of regular drills taking place

Community level outcome: Communities are engaged in children are referred and supported according to appropriate protection mechanisms

The below are a mix of first and second phase indicators:

- 1) Sensitisation and awareness raising of teachers and communities to ensure that they understand child rights and child protection violations
- 2) # of referral networks in place and functioning
- 3) # of cases referred
- 4) # of cases supported through for instance listening points or other relevant protection mechanisms

Key Area Three: Protecting Education from Attack

Community level outcome: Communities are engaged in ensuring education is safe from attack

The below are a mix of first and second phase indicators:

- 1) Awareness raising sessions and training of Armed Non State Actors (ANSAs) on Child Protection and the Importance of Protecting Education from Attack
- 2) # of ANSAs that sign the Geneva Call Deed of Commitment (long term commitment)

National level: see below for three suggested outcomes

Suggested Outcomes:

- A. National systems and capacities strengthened towards the institutionalization of the Schools as Zones of Peace programme (long term).
- B. Attacks on schools are monitored and gaps in national laws are identified to support implementation of the Safe Schools Declaration (first phase or second phase).
- C. National and regional level mechanisms/structures are strengthened to ensure safe access and quality education for children (first or second phase).

Indicators:


1. Legal review conducted to establish the current level of understanding of the Safe Schools Declaration in country, identifying any existing policies or directives in line with the SSD as well as outlining gaps
2. # of schools that monitor and report attacks on education and military use of education regularly (regular monitoring is an indication that the training is working)
3. School Inspectors are trained on the importance of child protection and protecting education from attack
4. Military forces are trained on the importance of protecting education from attack and the Safe School Declaration
5. The government (Ministry of Defence, Mo Education, and Ministry of Social Affairs) has approved an implementation/action plan for the activities endorsed by the government of the Safe Schools declaration. (this could for instance be to address gaps identified in 1., and is not expected in the first year)

7 Conclusion

The aim of this guidance document has been to give an introduction of the Schools as Zones of Peace project. If there are any questions on this, or a wish to know more about the project, or learn more about the countries currently implementing this project, please do not hesitate to get in touch with [Save the Children Norway](#).

Annex 1

These key activities can also be seen as linked to the Save the Children Quality Learning Framework.



The Schools as Zones of Peace project seeks to address at least one component of each pillar in this framework in addition to access, but can also be used together with other projects focusing more on the quality of education. This has also been done in some of the countries implementing Schools as Zones of Peace, where SZOP has been complemented at school level by activities such as distribution of teaching and learning material, construction of for instance latrines, and improved quality learning. Currently, the SZOP project is addressing the following components. Please see the brackets for examples of activities:

- 1.1 Positive and respectful interactions (child clubs, child rights training, and teacher trainings)
- 1.2 Social and emotional learning (child and youth resilience activities)
- 2.1 Safe and accessible learning spaces (school rehabilitation, addressing attacks on education)
- 2.4 School safety management (risk mappings, risk reduction, school management committees)
- 3.1 Teacher development and wellbeing (for instance stress management trainings)
- 3.4 Pedagogical practices (for instance teacher trainings on positive discipline)
- 4.1 Child, parent and community participation (active participation in risk mappings etc)
- 5.1 Inclusive and protective policies (Code of conduct development)