**Step 1: Joint Needs Assessment & Analysis**

Annexes to facilitate taking the collaboration “steps”

**Annex 1** Key decisions that data is needed for

**Annex 2** Examples of key data needs

**Annex 3** Examples of secondary data sources **(new 2023)**

**Annex 4** Examples of risk factors that drive harmful outcomes for children in education and child protection **(new 2023)**

**Annex 5** Agree how to systematically share information between sectors – checklist & example scenarios

**Annex 6** Benefits and limitations of joint and sector-specific needs assessments

**Annex 7** Collaboration during single or joint sector assessments – checklist for collaboration, example questions & example report **(examples questionnaires & reports new 2023)**

**Annex 1: Key decisions that data is needed for:**

• **Response and operational decisions:** to establish priority areas of intervention, including

o aims of the response / intended outcomes of the intervention

o geographic scope

o child prioritization (age, gender, type of vulnerability)

o number of people who will be supported through the response

o priority response activities for each sector to undertake

o programme modalities (e.g. direct, remote, or partnering with existing actors)

o actors who will respond

o financial, time and human resources required for the response

o adapting the response on the basis of new evidence, throughout the HPC

o exit strategy / planning

• Applying for specific funding streams (OFDA, ECHO, DFID, private donors, etc.)

• **Advocacy decisions**: priority demographics (e.g. IDPs/refugees/host communities)

**Annex 2: Examples of key data needs**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Education data needs** | **Common data needs** | **CP data needs** |
|  | Demographic data – total population by  (agreed) age categories |  |
|  | Displacement data – IDP, Refugee by age |  |
| Enrolment and attendance rates  (children in school & out of school) | Children at risk of dropping out | Children Out of School |
| Barriers to accessing education  - child labour  - child marriage  - children with disabilities  - CAAFAG  - Unaccompanied and separated  children  - Children who are suffering from violence, neglect and/or abuse  - Children without documentation |  | Child vulnerability categories  - children engaged in labour  - married children  - children with disabilities  - CAAFAG  - Unaccompanied and separated  children  - Children who are suffering from violence, neglect and/or abuse  - Children without documentation |
| Availability of qualified education personnel | Education personnel trained on child protection basics (including CP referral pathway) | Availability of qualified social work personnel |
| Functionality of education system |  | Functionality of social welfare system |
| Impact of attacks on education: status of schools (destruction / damage, basic amenities, school occupation by IDPs or military), teachers and students injured. Killed or abducted. | Attacks on Education; presence of armed actors in or around schools | Impact of attacks on education:  children injured, killed or abducted. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Safety on the way to school as a barrier to accessing education (attendance/drop out);  Access to school transportation | Distance to nearest school; Safety on the way to school  Children’s perceptions of risks on the  way to school | Children at risk or injured on the way to school |
| Safety at school as a barrier to accessing education (attendance/ drop out) | Safety at school: prevalence of GBV, bullying, etc.  Children’s perceptions of risks at school | Children at risk or injured at school |
| Accessibility of education to CWD | Prevalence of disability |  |
| Impact of MH/ psychosocial wellbeing on school attendance & learning outcomes | Prevalence of MHPSS needs among children |  |
| Negative coping mechanisms affecting  children’s education | Family economic status;  Access to school feeding programs | Negative family coping mechanisms affecting children |
| Documentation barriers to accessing education | Number or profile of children without documentation | Documentation barriers to accessing services |
| Number of referrals to the CP social workforce | Number of referrals received from the  EDU workforce for examination/triage | Number of referrals received from the EDU workforce which were actual CP cases in need of case management |
| Children’s experiences of the impact of  the crisis on their education  Children’s expectations and hopes relating to learning in the context of crisis | **Child Participation** Children’s awareness of capacities and resources available within their communities to support their learning and wellbeing  Children’s ideas on the design of coordinated feedback mechanisms or other accountability measures | Children’s experiences of the impact of the crisis on their protection and wellbeing  Children’s expectations and hopes relating to their protection and wellbeing in the context of crisis |

\**Joint analysis of common data may entail common pivot tables, with common tagging of domains and themes (e.g.: attacks on schools, drop outs, child labour, etc.)*

**Annex 3: Examples of secondary data sources**

Reviewing **secondary data sources** will help to better understand the risk factors linked to education and protection in context as well as the protective factors that may have eroded as a result of the humanitarian situation which inhibits children from accessing effective formal and nonformal educational opportunities.

A **secondary data review** includes both pre-and post-emergency data. It provides a snapshot of the humanitarian context and the key needs and capacities that exist there within. Ideally, a secondary data review will be facilitated during the preparedness phase and should be supplemented with post-crisis data during the entirety of the humanitarian situation, including during the early recovery phase. Once collected, the secondary data should be compiled into a desk review.

However, in some situations, secondary data may be insufficient to identify the causes of harmful outcomes for children – or the *What We Need to Knows (WWNKs) -* and primary data collection will be necessary. Primary data collection, such as key informant interviews or focus group discussions, can be facilitated by either child protection or education actors, or jointly. It can be in the form of an assessment or standalone activities that aim to obtain information related to children specifically for the purpose of prevention and response activities.

**Examples of data sources include:**

* National census
* Joint Education Needs Assessment (JENA)[[1]](#footnote-1)
* Annual State of Education Report (ASER)
* Protection monitoring data
* National education statistics
* Data on school registration
* Reports from the education cluster
* Multi-indicator cluster survey (MICS)
* Education Monitoring of Information System (EMIS)
* UNESCO open data source
* World Bank open data source
* Early Grade Rating/Math Assessment (EGRA/EGMA)[[2]](#footnote-2)
* International Development and Early Learning Assessment (IDELA)[[3]](#footnote-3)
* International Socio-Emotional Learning Assessment (ISELA)[[4]](#footnote-4)
* Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM)

**Annex 4: Examples of risk factors that drive harmful outcomes for children in education and child protection**

The risk factors presented in the table below are examples of information that can be obtained from either secondary or primary sources (for instance, using the recommended questions in Annex 7) that will support education and child protection actors to better understand the risk factors driving harmful outcomes for children in context.

It is often the accumulation of and interaction between various risk factors that combine to increase vulnerability and the probability of harm occurring. The accumulation of risk factors suggests that children who have been exposed to several risk factors are more at risk of experiencing harmful outcomes than children exposed to one single risk factor. Risk factors also tend to be positively correlated to one another and negatively correlated to protective factors. Therefore, children with a few risk factors have a greater chance of experiencing even more risk factors and are less likely to have protective factors present. For example, a household has been displaced (risk factor) to a geographic location where there are poor living conditions (risk factor), poor service access (risk factor), and a lack of decent employment opportunities for persons of legal working age (risk factor), which has resulted in school drop-out as children separate or engage in child labour to supplement the family income.

|  |
| --- |
| There are linkages between the risk factors that drive harmful outcomes for children both in education and child protection, including**[[5]](#footnote-5)**:   * School closures * Educational level of parents * Loss or limited formal or non-formal educational opportunities * Education opportunities away from home (including NGO-run schools) * Corporal punishment in learning environments * Educational facilities that lack universal design standards * Bullying, discrimination, and harassment by peers or education personnel * Peer pressure leading to substance misuse, dropout, recruitment, or other child protection concerns * Loss of livelihoods/employment of adult caregivers leading to school dropout * Unmet basic needs (such as limited access to adequate nutrition, shelter, clean drinking water, and medical care) leading to school dropout * Child marriage * Ill, elderly, or disabled family member who requires care * Violence against children in the household * Geographic proximity of schools to armed conflict or armed group * Social, cultural or gender norms (such as prioritising the education of boys over girls) * Social, cultural acceptance of child labour * Lack of regulation of the labour market or insufficient levels of adult workforce causing children to take on work |

**Annex 5: Agree how to systematically share information between sectors**

**Annex 5a:** Information exchange checklist

Ensure a common understanding between the two sectors and identify opportunities for information sharing / collaboration:

• Compare and align key terminology and definitions used, including children-in-need methodology used for strategies and HNOs.

• Identify common information needs (based on common response and operational needs). From this, develop key indicators that are important to both responses and can be included in data collection initiatives.

• Identify shared datasets, and data regularly collected by a single sector that should be systematically shared.

• Develop SOPs for predictable data exchange and frequency, with clear roles and responsibilities.

• Compare assessment workplans and consider opportunities for joint assessments and analysis.

**Annex 5b:** Example in information exchange options

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Systematic information exchange**  Both sectors have identified information needed for their sector’s decision making and understand the data needs and data collected. Identify shared data sets and information that can be exchanged between Education and CP, and agree roles and responsibilities (SOPs) for predictable data exchange & frequency. | *E.g. 1: CP actors are the primary provider of PFA trainings to teachers. This indicator is collected in the Education 3Ws and shared each month with CP.*  *E.g. 2: Teachers are trained to identify and refer protection cases/concerns to the CP referral pathway. Cases which (when examined by a CP actor) are legitimate and opened as social work cases are reported in the CP 3Ws and shared each month with Education.* |
| **Minimum information sharing**  When you come across data that is relevant to the other cluster, it is shared on an ad-hoc basis. Type and source of data is various and sharing/receiving is unpredictable. | *E.g. an education partner conducted an assessment on school drop- out; a key finding for one region is that child recruitment has increased in the location during the last period. The Education cluster forwards this to CP sub-cluster.* |

**Annex 6: Benefits and limitations of joint and sector-specific needs assessments**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Potential Benefits** | **Potential Limitations** |
| **Joint Assessments** | - Children’s needs are holistic and inter- connected, and analysing them vis a vis other sectors can provide a deeper understanding of their needs and priorities  - Maximises human and financial resources  when doing one assessment  - Capitalises on the strengths of each cluster in data collection (i.e. education assessments are often at facility level, while CP assessments are often household level)  - Supports the fact that many essential data are the same between CP and education  - Facilitates identification of opportunities for collaboration and integrated programming (e.g. with referrals, sharing expertise, etc.)  - Enhances Cross-sector learning in technical  areas of the other sector, statistical data collection and analysis, and the technology platforms used (e.g. Kobo, Power BI)  - Prevents assessment fatigue from the affected  population | - May be time consuming for both sectors to consult, agree, jointly prepare and train enumerators, to meet both sectors’ needs  - The assessment tool may be longer to  accommodate both sector’s questions, increasing the time and resources needed for data collection  - Conversely, the tool may only allow key  questions from each sector to keep it short, limiting the detail and utility of the findings  - Requires enumerators to be conversant and have technical knowledge in both sectors |
| **Single-Sector**  **Assessments**  ***- Without involvement from the other sector*** | - May be quicker, cheaper and easier to facilitate  - The assessment tool can accommodate more / more detailed questions for the sector, to generate richer analysis  - Allows the sector to explore specific data gaps  in depth  - Enumerators may only need technical knowledge in one sector, making it easier to recruit | - If both sectors conduct single sector assessments, the overall human and financial resources required may be higher  - Joint analysis may not be prioritised, and the  inter-connected needs of children may be superficially analysed if assessed separately (e.g. child protection risks that create barriers to education, or barriers to education that create/ exacerbate child protection risks)  - Opportunities to identify areas for  collaboration and integrated programming may  be missed  - Same population might be asked twice questions that can be similar |
| **Single-Sector**  **Assessments**  ***- With involvement from the other sector (e.g.***  ***through providing assessment items***  ***/questions, in data***  ***collection, analysis)*** | - Maximises the opportunity of a single sector assessment to provide useful data to the other sector and enrich the sectoral data collected  - Facilitates joint analysis which enriches and situates single sector data in a broader context  - If one sector does not have access or budget, they can contribute technical and human resources through the other sector and have a (limited) opportunity to collect the data they need but are less able to obtain otherwise  - Facilitates identification of opportunities for collaboration and integrated programming (e.g. with referrals, sharing expertise, etc.) | - Requires (some) time to consult the other sector to include their key questions  - Enumerators would need basic technical  knowledge to collect the data related to other  sector’s questions  - The assessment tool may be (slightly) longer to include key questions from other sector, (slightly) increasing the time and resources needed for data collection |

**Annex 7: Collaboration during single sector or joint assessments**

**Annex 7a:** Checklist for cross-sector collaboration in single sector or joint needs assessment and analysis

In sector-specific needs assessments, involving the other sector through the following actions will enhance assessment outcomes to the benefit of both sectors:

* Adapt existing education and child protection assessment and monitoring tools for joint analysis, monitoring, and response.
* Provide input and review to questionnaires and methodology: in order to incorporate topics or questions of interest to the other sector, as far as possible and relevant.
* Conduct joint needs assessments to gather relevant child protection and education data and produce a joint report with findings. When it is not feasible to facilitate a joint assessment, incorporate questions related to child protection and education in the other sector’s assessment. Questions should aim at understanding barriers to enrolment, issues related to school retention, risk and protective factors driving harmful outcomes for children. Always:
* Include children’s own perceptions in all assessments and monitoring;
* Disaggregate data by gender, age, and disability at a minimum.
* Data collection participation: partners from the other sector can be highly valuable additional resources, to access different areas or certain population groups as well as encourage joint learning. For example, involvement of child protection actors in education assessments can help provide expertise needed to interview certain groups of children and reaching certain vulnerable population groups.
* Referrals during data collection: ensure referral mechanisms are built-in to the assessment and consider a collaborative approach when doing so (e.g. if education actors conduct assessments with out-of-school children who may need to be referred to child protection actors).
* Conduct joint analysis: joint analysis workshops with members from both sectors can encourage alternative interpretations of results, and build a common understanding of the situation between sectors.
* Use analysis to inform programming: work together to identify potential opportunities for integrated programming, based on the results of the assessment. Also analyse:
* Safety risks in accessing centers of learning (such as if they are located in close proximity to a military zone);
* Best timing for interventions, for instance, to ensure child protection activities do not interfere with school hours;
* Needs of specific groups.

**Annex 7b:** Example assessment questions for single or joint education and child protection assessments.

The questions listed below are ***recommendations* for possible areas of inquiry that can be selectively incorporated into assessments, routine monitoring, or standalone primary data collection activities** undertaken by education and child protection actors. Questions may be adapted. It is not necessary to include all the questions, rather select questions based on identified information gaps. Wherever possible, primary data collection activities should be inter-sectoral and interdisciplinary, with education and child protection actors working in partnership.

These areas of inquiry are categorised as per the **building blocks of child well-being**.[[6]](#footnote-6) The information generated from these areas of inquiry should be analysed to inform the planning of education programmes in ways that prevent and respond to harmful outcomes for children, as well as the planning of child protection programmes to improve educational outcomes for children. This information may highlight priorities and gaps that need to be addressed when planning new programmes or adjusting existing programmes.

Key target groups for primary data collection

* Children (ages 6-17 years) in and out of school
* Caregivers of children
* Key stakeholders in education: local and national governments (Ministry of Education); local leaders or religious leaders; school administrators; teachers; parents and parent-teacher associations; students; national and international NGOs in education; teachers unions and civil society organisations
* In IDP/refugee settings, members of receptor/host communities

Possible areas of inquiry (Note: this list is not exhaustive)

**Promoting children’s participation and agency**

1. Are children meaningfully engaged in community-based activities related to formal and nonformal education? *(e.g. student associations)?*
2. Do the opinions and inputs of children influence decisions taken by the school administration or parent-teacher associations? In what ways?
3. Are children involved in decisions about the location of schools or other learning environments?
4. Are formal and nonformal education opportunities available for older children?

**Access to and availability of formal and nonformal educational opportunities**

1. In what ways has the humanitarian situation impacted the access to and availability of formal and nonformal education programmes?
2. Are there particular groups of children who face barriers to attending formal or nonformal educational opportunities *(such as girls, children with disabilities, street living or working children, girl mothers, LGBTQI children, children formerly associated with armed forces and armed groups, etc.)*?
3. Are there existing social or gender norms that act as barriers to accessing education for certain groups of children *(e.g. gender norms that prioritise education for boys over girls; domestic responsibilities; sexuality norms that result in families/communities refusing to support educational access of LGBTQI children; refugee children living in urban areas denied equal access to local education facilities, etc.)?*
4. Are there existing gender norms that prohibit children from taking certain courses or pursuing specific fields of study as a result of their gender, particularly at the secondary level *(e.g. segregation of courses according to gender such as boys being encouraged to pursue the sciences)?*
5. Are there strategies in place for the reintegration or re-enrollment of children who have dropped out *(e.g. children engaged in the worst forms of child labour or children formerly associated with armed forces and armed groups)?*
6. Who makes decisions about access to education within the household?
7. Are schools and other learning facilities built based on universal design to ensure accessibility for all children, including those with disabilities?
8. Are learning materials inclusive and relevant to all groups of children, including children with disabilities or children of indigenous decent?
9. Do methods of teaching respect and encourage all children equally *(e.g. girls are encouraged to ask and answer questions, etc.)?*
10. Is there an effective and inclusive learning outcomes assessment mechanism?

**Safety and security**

1. Are schools and other learning environments located in areas that are safe and equally accessible for all groups of children and teaching personnel?
2. Are the distances and routes to schools and other learning environments safe for all students ,teachers and other education personnel *(particularly girls, children with disabilities, LGBTQI children),* and acceptable to parents/caregivers?

* Are strategies in place to accompany children to schools and other learning environments as necessary?
* Has safety mapping been conducted with students and teachers to identify at-risk zones in and around schools and other learning environments?
* Are there evacuation plans in schools?
* Are there safety patrols for potentially insecure areas?

1. Are schools and other learning environments physically secure?

* Is there sufficient lighting?
* Are toilets accessible, private, safely located, adequate in number, and sex-segregated?
* Are sanitary supplies available in schools for female students of reproductive age and teachers?

1. Are there common risks experienced by students or education personnel while accessing formal or nonformal education *(e.g. sexual exploitation by teachers or school staff; harassment or bullying perpetrated by either teachers, school administrators, or other students against certain groups of children)?*
2. Are there referral pathways through which children experiencing violence, abuse, exploitation, or neglect can access appropriate care and support that are linked to formal or nonformal educational settings?

* Is information provided to students and education personnel on reporting mechanisms and follow-up procedures?
* Are there age- and gender-responsive materials and services available to support children in formal or nonformal learning environments?
* Are there risks to children related to reporting an incident?
* Do legal frameworks put survivors at risk if they report abuse to their teachers, or put teachers at risk if they respond to such reports?
* Are students regularly asked to provide feedback/input on the quality of reporting and referral mechanisms?

1. Has training been provided to education personnel on safe identification and referrals, particularly:

* How to engage with children who may disclose incidents of violence, abuse, exploitation, or neglect?
* How to provide referrals in an ethical, safe, and confidential manner?
* How to best support a survivor to remain in or return to school once a report has been disclosed?

**Fostering peer-to-peer relationships amongst children**

1. Are student associations, after-school clubs, extracurricular activities, and sports clubs available to students of all ages to encourage strengthening their interests in specific topics, as well as to foster peer-to-peer relationships and teambuilding?
2. Are after school recreational activities available for younger children?

**Annex 7c:** Example CP questions included in Education needs assessment (from Libya JENA)

1) Are there existing reporting and referral mechanisms in schools?

a. If so, is the reporting mandatory?

2) Who is responsible for reporting at the school level, and who’s providing assistance for children affected by

violence?

3) What is (i.e. to the teachers’ knowledge) available in terms of assistance (MHPSS, referral, etc.)?

4) Are there existing PSS/ PFA services available in schools (# of available MHPSS counsellors/ social workers, trainings they received/ by whom, # of girls and boys received MHPSS in schools?

5) What are the main causes of drop-out children and adolescents? (disaggregation for girls and boys)

6) What are the main barriers for displaced children/ migrant children / host community children to access education? and what support is required for them to access/ return to school?

Other examples of needs assessment frameworks and questions can be found using the links:

* [Niger Cadre d'évaluation et questionnaire (fr)](https://educationcluster.app.box.com/s/vsxm2t5d0rqkz2rp8441xdvvs2gyvfbb)
* [Northwest Syria JNA Assessment Framework and questions](https://educationcluster.app.box.com/s/gr53okuph3kex19ny7wda0tch7ivx6r9)
* [Myanmar Assessment Framework and questions](https://educationcluster.app.box.com/s/u3u5rgzpjnoz8hfs0u3qtvsdsu832vns)
* [Burkina Faso Cadre d'évaluation et questionnaire (fr)](https://educationcluster.box.com/s/jogzgu0p8bp58wavp2lv9xui2icnrhx2)

**Annex 7d:** Example of assessment report and sections to include

Once data has been collected, it will be analysed and included in an assessment report. Main sections of an assessment report can include:

Executive Summary

1. Introduction
2. Methodology

* Key objectives
* Sample and sampling procedure
* Data analysis
* Limitation of data collection

1. Findings
2. Conclusion and Recommendations

Annexes (e.g. questionnaires)

A full joint [needs assessment report](https://educationcluster.box.com/s/bl4i24uuumjjjd1cfqnwykxu2h967351) and [summary](https://educationcluster.box.com/s/gwd8agqxwl3x1a6hyb26vyu4tjfso6qy) from Niger can be found using the links as an example (available in French).

1. The Joint Education Needs Assessment (JENA) can help identify priority areas for education interventions and inform the development of education sector strategies. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The Early Grade Reading Assessment (EGRA) and Early Grade Math Assessment (EGMA) are standardized tests designed to measure students' proficiency in reading and math skills in the early grades (usually grades 1-3). These assessments can be used to identify gaps in early grade learning and inform targeted interventions to improve learning outcomes, including in emergency contexts where access to quality education may be limited. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The International Development and Early Learning Assessment (IDELA) is a tool that measures children's development in a range of areas, including cognitive, language, socio-emotional, and motor skills. IDELA can be used to assess children's school readiness, identify areas where children may need additional support, and evaluate the impact of interventions designed to promote early childhood development. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The International Socio-Emotional Learning Assessment (ISELA) is a tool designed to measure children's socio-emotional skills, such as self-awareness, social awareness, responsible decision-making, and relationship skills. ISELA can be used to assess the impact of interventions aimed at promoting social-emotional learning, which is critical for children's overall well-being and academic success. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. This list is not exhaustive. It will also be added to as risk factors or patterns of risk factors are identified. If you have identified additional risk factors or patterns of risk factors driving harmful child protection outcomes in context, please reach out to the Global Education Cluster to update this table. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. This is in reference to the Alliance for Child Protection in Humanitarian Action’s global definition of child well-being and its ‘building blocks’ or domains: Agency, Safety and Security, Basic Needs, and Relationships with Family and Others. The building blocks are slightly modified for the purpose of this Annex. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)