

Supporting Collaborative and Joint Assessment, Monitoring and Evaluation, Analysis, and Learning (MEAL)

Extracted and expanded guidance and tools from [Supporting Integrated Child Protection and Education Programming in Humanitarian Action Guidance Note](#). 2026

Contents include:

1. [Desired impact of integrated programming](#)
2. [Examples of Theories of Change](#)
3. [An expanded list of relevant Indicator Frameworks](#)
4. [Example tools and templates of programmatic MEAL tools](#)
5. [Critical questions and sample indicators organized by programmatic areas](#) (as found in the Guidance Note)

What impact do we want to have with integrated programming

- Improve child well-being and healthy development
- Improve learning outcomes through holistic support to well-being
- Prevent and mitigate certain protection risks while improving access, retention, and success in learning
- Prevent children “slipping through cracks” between sectors by centering the child in multi-sectoral, integrated programming
- Contribute to efforts to transform humanitarian delivery, support the localization agenda, and the New Way of Working for stronger systems and communities in crises

Child protection and education work in the same communities, together with other sectors, and aim to meet protection and learning needs of the same children. Although there are some sector specific goals, there are many overlapping and complementary goals which are the focus of the Guidance Note and supplementary tools. Each benefits from the expertise, presence, and approaches of the other even though the two sectors may lead interventions in different socio-ecological spaces.

Theories of Change (ToC) ensure clarity of purpose and intent and indicate broad areas of work that support progress towards their intended impact. Here are several examples of programmatic Theories of Change.

[Embrace Race's Theory of Change](#), Embrace Race, 2025

[We Thrive MEAL Guidance](#), page 3, Save the Children International, 2025

[Theory of Change: Prevent and Respond to Child Marriage in Humanitarian and Forced Displacement settings](#) (Plan International and Save the Children International, 2025)

Collection of Indicator Frameworks and General Guidance

The Sample Indicators are included in the [Guidance Note](#) and are organized by programmatic areas. Programmatic areas¹ align with the domains and standards from both the Alliance's [Child Protection Minimum Standards](#) (CPMS) and INEE's [Minimum Standards for Education](#) (INEE MS).

The Sample List includes indicators to determine impact, outcome, or outcome. These may contribute to the development of robust Monitoring, Evaluation, Analysis, and Learning (MEAL) plans. The list draws from CPMS [indicators](#), INEE MS [indicators](#), and other relevant programmatic resources and is organized against the Socio-Ecological Model. All sources are listed in the table below. MEAL plans must fit the specific objectives and context of each intervention. Many national line ministries and authorities have standard indicators which should be referenced when possible.

The sources of indicators and how they are referenced in the Guidance Note are noted in the table below:

General		
Resource Title & Organization	How Indicators are referenced (noted only for those included in the Guidance Note published 2024)	Languages
<u>INEE Minimum Standards Indicator Framework</u> (INEE)	INEE (followed by the domain and standard, e.g. INEE 3.11)	<u>English</u> <u>Arabic</u> <u>French</u> <u>Spanish</u> <u>Portuguese</u>
<u>The Enhanced CPMS Indicators Table</u> (Alliance)	CPMS (followed by the standard, e.g. CPMS 23.2.2)	<u>English</u>

¹ Determined by the Advisory Group for the Position Paper and adapted during the drafting of the Guidance Note.

<u>Menu of Measures for Gender-Based Violence Risk Mitigation in the Education in Emergencies Sector</u> (ECW, INEE, UNICEF)		<u>English</u> <u>French</u>
<u>Identifying and Ranking Risk and Protective Factors: A Brief Guide</u> (Alliance)		<u>English</u> <u>Arabic</u> <u>French</u> <u>Spanish</u>
<u>Resources for Conducting Ethical Research with Children in Humanitarian Contexts</u> (Alliance)		<u>English</u>
<u>Why Identifying Risk and Protective Factors is a Critical Step in Prevention Programming</u> (Alliance)		<u>English</u> <u>French</u> <u>Spanish</u> <u>Arabic</u>
<u>Guidance Note on Using Implementation Research in Education</u>	Building Evidence in Education, Allison, C. 2023	<u>English</u>
<u>Safe to Learn Diagnostic Tool</u>	Safe to Learn, UNICEF, UNESCO, The World Bank, UK Aid, UNGEI 2021	<u>English</u>
<u>Safe to Learn Global Programmatic Framework and Benchmarking Tool</u>	UNICEF, Safe to Learn Partners and FCDO 2021	<u>English</u> <u>French</u> <u>Spanish</u>
Programmatic or Thematic Areas		
<u>Accelerated Education Programme Monitoring & Evaluation Toolkit</u> (Accelerated Education Working Group)	AEWG (followed by the objective and indicator number, e.g. AEWG 0.1.ai)	<u>English</u> <u>Arabic</u> <u>French</u> <u>Spanish</u> <u>Portuguese</u>
<u>INSPIRE Indicator Guidance and Results Framework Ending Violence Against Children: How to define and measure change</u> Chapter 3: Core INSPIRE indicators and domains and Chapter 4: INSPIRE core indicators: operational definitions, data sources and sample questions (UNICEF)	UNICEF	<u>English</u>
<u>Contextualizing and Measuring Child Well-Being in Humanitarian Action</u> and <u>Defining and Measuring Child Well-being in</u>	Alliance	<u>English</u>

Humanitarian Action: a Contextualization Guide (Alliance) Part 2: Child Well-being Measurement Framework, Part 3: Contextualizing the measurement framework (Alliance)		
A Whole School Approach to Prevent School-Related Gender-Based Violence: Minimum Standards and Monitoring Framework (UNGEI)	UNGEI	English
Minimum Operating Standards - Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse by own Personnel (IASC)	IASC	English French Spanish
Conflict Sensitive Education Indicators (ECCN)	ECCN	English
Comprehensive School Safety Targets and Indicators 2022-2030 (GADRRRES)	GADRRRES (followed by the Pillar and indicator number, e.g. GADRRRES C1)	English Spanish French Portuguese Bahasa Indonesian Russian
CAAFAG Programme Development Toolkit Guidelines (Alliance/CAAFAG)	CAAFAG	English Arabic French Spanish Portuguese
Indicators to Measure Cross-sectoral Contributions to Children's Protection and Well-being (Alliance)		English French Spanish
MHPSS Indicators (ECW)		English
Safer Learning Environment (SLE) Assessment Toolkit (USAID ECCN)		English French Spanish Arabic
IASC PESA Core Indicators Guidance Note		English
Qualitative Assessment Approaches for the Protection of Children with Disabilities Within Humanitarian Contexts (Alliance)		English

<u>Thriving Together: A Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) Toolkit for ECD Practitioners</u> (Global Schools Forum, 2024)		<u>English</u>
<u>We Thrive MEAL Tools and Guidance</u> (Save the Children, 2025)		<u>English</u> <u>French</u>

Example Tools and Templates: Collecting and using information to inform programs

Resource Title & Organization	How Indicators are referenced (noted only for those included in the Guidance Note published 2024)	Languages
<u>Learning Assessment Webinar Slides</u>	Global Education Cluster	<u>English</u>
<u>Suivi de la rentrée scolaire avec U. Report</u> Proposition de questionnaire	DRC Education Cluster, 2023	<u>French</u>
<u>Case Study</u> <u>Pilot Project to Strengthen Collaboration in Child Protection and Education in Emergency Situations in North Kivu</u>	DRC Education Cluster, Child Protection AoR	<u>French</u> <u>English</u>
<u>CPHA-EiE Desk Review Template</u> (Plan International)		<u>English</u>
<u>Holistic Learning Outcomes Measurement Handbook for Education in Emergencies and Protracted Crises</u> (ECW)	Includes substantial process guidance	<u>English</u>
<u>ANNEXES Child-centered and Locally-led Anticipatory Action</u>	Save the Children, 2025	<u>English</u>

Rapid Response, Consultation with Children tools	GEC, 2025	English
--	-----------	-------------------------

Critical questions and sample indicators organized by programmatic areas (as found in the Guidance Note)

Regardless of the response phase, actions must build on earlier work. Knowing where the work started and where it is going is equally important as understanding where it is at this point in time.

Establish what information you have and what you still need. Establish whether everyone who should be involved is. Co-create a shared vision of the impact desired or Theory of Change that includes the steps and stakeholders essential to success. Co-create and implement a plan to measure progress and map accountability of stakeholders. Reassess at key points of implementation.

See the Guidance Note for guidance on using the Socio-Ecological Model to guide integrated approaches.

1. Capacity Strengthening

Quality programming is supported by a strong, well-qualified, and well-supported workforce. Meeting the needs of children and their families requires strong, resilient systems and organizations/practitioners who are prepared and able to support affected communities through protracted responses.

The Competency Framework, developed by The Alliance and INEE, articulates the diverse set of competencies required of child protection and education staff working towards sector-specific goals and should be used in conjunction with national standards as cornerstones for any capacity strengthening initiative. The objectives of both Competency Frameworks are to operationalize Minimum Standards, harmonize and professionalize capacity strengthening for the respective sectors. Both include sections on the competencies required to support mainstream, joint, and integrated programming to prevent/mitigate child protection risks, prepare for, and respond with protective programming. The [Alliance](#) and [INEE](#) Competency Frameworks highlight key competencies necessary to support CPHA-EiE collaboration in the Annex.

Integrated programming requires practitioners to understand and demonstrate some of the key competencies of each sector. Managers should be aware of what integrated

programming means for required competencies and how through cross referencing the competencies they can support staff to deliver more collaborative approaches. In practical terms, this will include some technical skills (See Specific Competencies) but with an emphasis on the softer skills that support cross-sector collaboration and integration (See General Competencies).

Socio-Ecological Levels	Guiding Questions	Indicators
Policy	<p>Do national policies exist that enable and support core competencies across the sectors' relevant pre- and in-service professional development programs?</p> <p>Do pre- and in-service training curricula include competencies that build a shared understanding of protection issues and the skills and knowledge to mitigate and respond to risks and violations? Inclusive of programs and structures that bridge the two sectors (for example, referral mechanisms, codes of conduct)</p> <p>Do policies exist that actively encourage the recruitment of professionals and paraprofessionals from communities most at risk?</p>	
Community	<p>Do Child Protection and Education staff have skills and knowledge to actively engage with stakeholders across the socio-ecological levels in support of appropriate protective responses and initiatives?</p> <p>Are opportunities provided to community-based organizations and members to advocate for, design, and support CPHA-EiE actions?</p> <p>Do Child Protection and Education actors have skills and opportunities to effectively collaborate with children and their families to identify and respond to needs as agents of change?</p>	<p>CPMS 17.2.1 - Percentage of child protection or multisectoral assessments that document community capacities and limitations to support children's well-being.</p> <p>CPMS 17.2.2 -Percentage of actions within community action plans or strategies that are planned, led and implemented by the community.</p> <p>CPMS 17.2.3 - Percentage of community members who report increased confidence in their ability to prevent and respond to child protection risks.</p>

	Have these actors used age-appropriate, protection-sensitive methodologies and processes?	
Learning Environment	<p>What professional development structures, policies, and practices exist to enable education personnel's consistent support of protective practices?</p> <p>Do opportunities exist for Child Protection and Education staff to learn and reflect together at a local and sub-national level?</p>	INEE 3.11 - Percentage of teachers whose training included methods for how to engage all students equally and in a participatory way.
Family	<p>Do family cultures and practices reflect an understanding and engagement in supporting protective learning opportunities?</p> <p>Do families receive consistent messaging and support from Child Protection and Education staff?</p>	<p>Alliance - Percentage of caregivers who report the child's ability to express ideas and preferences.</p> <p>INEE MS 1.1 - Percentage of parents actively participating in the conception and implementation of education in emergencies services.</p> <p>INEE MS 1.2 - Percentage of parents satisfied with the quality and appropriateness of response at the end of the project.</p>
Child	Are children and youth provided meaningful opportunities to build skills to actively engage in and lead age and developmentally appropriate activities?	<p>Alliance - Percentage of children who feel a sense of responsibility to serve or contribute to the betterment of their community.</p> <p>Alliance - Percentage of children who report feeling listened to and understood by at least one other person.</p> <p>IASC - Number of focus group discussions organized with affected girls, women, boys and men that have been used to influence decisions made on design of assessments, programmes, standards, selection criteria, etc.</p>

2. Foundational Areas of Work

Across humanitarian action, there are established best practices to ensure programs are context-specific, culturally responsive, effective, and efficient. Much of that is related to the process stakeholders take to determine the most effective and responsive programming, build relationships and work in a coordinated way with others to support families, schools/learning environment, and communities. Those practices and programming evolve as the context and needs of communities change across the life of a response.

For the sake of this Guidance Note, the following areas of work are highlighted to 1) understand the priorities and capacities of those affected by crises, 2) support integrated programmes at a systemic level, by establishing sector strategies and mobilizing sector stakeholders around a common vision, and 3) present opportunities to learn and build evidence on promising practices and impacts of integrated programming. These areas are elaborated further in the Global Education Cluster (GEC) and Child Protection Area of Responsibility (CP AoR) Collaboration Framework. The protection of affected populations and provisions of basic services are the responsibilities of a country's government. Education and Protection Clusters/coordination mechanisms must consider how their activities strengthen and support the government's immediate and long-term response abilities.

2.1 Meaningful Child Participation

Socio-Ecological Levels	Guiding Questions	Indicators
Policy	<p>Do national policies exist that support active child participation in planning, designing, implementing, monitoring, and evaluating their own protection and education-related needs?</p> <p>Are they inclusive of all children?</p>	<p>GADRRRES C4 - Education authority has needs assessment, strategy, and implementation plan to develop staff and student capacity for participation in school based disaster risk reduction and management, at necessary scale.</p>

Community	<p>Have Child Protection and Education actors created opportunities and space for all children to effectively collaborate in identifying and responding to needs as agents of change?</p> <p>Have these actors used age-appropriate, protection-sensitive methodologies and processes?</p> <p>What processes are in place to promote accountability to children?</p>	<p>CPMS 17.2.1 - Percentage of child protection or multisectoral assessments that document community capacities and limitations to support children's well-being.</p> <p>CPMS 17.2.2 -Percentage of actions within community action plans or strategies that are planned, led and implemented by the community.</p> <p>CPMS 17.2.3 - Percentage of community members who report increased confidence in their ability to prevent and respond to child protection risks.</p>
Learning Environment	What internal structures, policies, and practices exist to support consistent and meaningful participation of children in school management?	INEE 3.11 - Percentage of teachers whose training included methods for how to engage all students equally and in a participatory way.
Family	<p>Are families/caregivers supportive and understanding of children's right to participate?</p> <p>Do family cultures and practices promote the meaningful participation of children in decisions and actions?</p>	<p>Alliance - Percentage of caregivers who report the child's ability to express ideas and preferences.</p> <p>INEE MS 1.1 - Percentage of parents actively participating in the conception and implementation of education in emergencies services.</p> <p>INEE MS 1.2 - Percentage of parents satisfied with the quality and appropriateness of response at the end of the project.</p>
Child	<p>Are children and youth provided meaningful opportunities to be advocates for themselves?</p> <p>Are intentional steps towards engaging children as partners (in planning, designing, implementing programs and policies) being taken?</p>	<p>Alliance - Percentage of children who feel a sense of responsibility to serve or contribute to the betterment of their community.</p> <p>Alliance - Percentage of children who report feeling listened to and understood by at least one other person.</p> <p>IASC - Number of focus group discussions organized with affected girls, women, boys and men that have been used to influence decisions made on design of assessments, programmes, standards, selection criteria, etc.</p>

2.2 Community Participation

Socio-Ecological Levels	Guiding Questions	Indicators
Policy	<p>Do national policies exist that support active community engagement in planning, designing, implementing, monitoring, and evaluating their own protection and education-related needs? Are they inclusive of all communities?</p> <p>Do programs explicitly include working with local and national authorities to strengthen and create sustainable links between communities, child protection systems? Do they strengthen longer term services in an integrated manner?</p> <p>Have principles of conflict/context sensitivity been integrated?</p>	
Community	<p>Are participatory methods used to assess (changes in) the root causes of child protection risks, social norms, protection capacities, structures and processes? Are both child protection and education sectors engaged in the process?</p> <p>How are the sectors collaborating on the engagement of the education community, in particular of children, caregivers and education personnel?</p> <p>What processes are in place to promote accountability to children?</p>	<p>CPMS 17.2.1 - Percentage of child protection or multisectoral assessments that document community capacities and limitations to support children's well-being.</p> <p>CPMS 17.2.2 - Percentage of actions within community action plans or strategies that are planned, led and implemented by the community.</p> <p>CPMS 17.2.3 - Percentage of community members who report increased confidence in their ability to prevent and respond to child protection risks.</p> <p>INEE 1.3 - Analysis of opportunity to use local resources is carried out and acted on</p>

		CPMS 6.2.4 - Percentage of participants who actively engaged in design of the child protection monitoring system who are local actors.
Learning Environment	<p>Are structures connecting learning environments to the larger community (e.g., Parent Teacher Associations (PTA), School Management Committees (SMC) using participatory, inclusive and consultative processes?</p> <p>Are there opportunities for the sectors to strengthen connections and collaborations between the processes of participation undertaken at school-level and at community-level?</p>	<p>INEE 1.1 - Percentage of parents actively participating in the conception and implementation of education in emergencies services</p> <p>INEE 1.2 - Percentage of parents satisfied with the quality and appropriateness of response at the end of the project</p>
Family	<p>What is the impact of school disruptions, school closures, and re-openings on families, children and communities?</p> <p>Are caregivers and family members active participants in children's learning? Are caregivers and family members involved in schools/learning spaces through participation in PTAs and other forums?</p>	<p>INEE 1.1 - Percentage of parents actively participating in the conception and implementation of education in emergencies services</p> <p>INEE 1.2 - Percentage of parents satisfied with the quality and appropriateness of response at the end of the project</p>
Child	<p>Are children of all ages, genders, abilities and representing all groups within the community meaningfully engaged in age-appropriate participatory processes? How are child protection and education actors supporting participation across the community and learning environments?</p>	<p>IASC - Number of focus group discussions organized with affected girls, women, boys and men that have been used to influence decisions made on design of assessments, programmes, standards, selection criteria, etc.</p> <p>IASC - Percentage of women/girls and percentage of men/boys satisfied with the quality and appropriateness of response at the end of the project</p>

2.3 Coordination

What can you do as a cluster/working group member to support integration through coordination mechanisms?

Socio-	Guiding Questions	Indicators
--------	-------------------	------------

Ecological Level		
Policy	<p>Do the two sectors have a common understanding of how education and child protection needs affect both sectors?</p> <p>Do they plan their responses accordingly to meet shared goals in children's well-being and healthy development more efficiently and effectively?</p> <p>Do national and sub-national level coordination systems facilitate inter-sectoral communication and collaboration?</p> <p>Are efforts made to ensure that children and families, who are made vulnerable by the crisis, are engaged in designing and conducting assessment of needs and determining potential interventions?</p> <p>What opportunities exist for joint fundraising to support shared goals articulated in plans?</p> <p>How do coordination systems Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability, and Learning (MEAL) systems facilitate monitoring progress against shared goals and learning about the impact of integrated programming?</p>	<p>IASC - Percentage of members of a coordination body (HCT, ICCGs, Clusters) who are WLO or OPDs and other diversity groups</p> <p>IASC - Number of focus group discussions organized with affected girls, women, boys and men that have been used to influence decisions made on design of assessments, programmes, standards, selection criteria, etc.</p> <p>IASC - Percentage of women/girls and percentage of men/boys satisfied with the quality and appropriateness of response at the end of the project</p> <p>INEE 1.4 - Percentage of regular coordination mechanism (i.e., Education Cluster, EiEWG, LEGs) meetings attended by program lead</p> <p>CPMS 4.2.1 - Percentage of CPHA programmes that build on pre-crisis analysis of the child protection system and actors</p> <p>GADRRRES A2 - Organizational arrangements, leadership, and coordination for risk reduction and resilience is established by senior management, and includes designated focal points responsible at all levels</p> <p>GADRRRES A3 - A comprehensive approach to school safety is the foundation for integrating risk reduction and resilience into education sector strategies, policies, and plans</p>

2.4 Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability, and Learning (MEAL)

Socio-Ecological Levels	Guiding Questions	Indicators
Policy	Are there established opportunities and expectations for the two sectors to co-create and continue to use shared assessment, evaluation, and research/learning tools?	CPMS 6.2.1 - Percentage of child protection strategies and programme documents that are informed by child protection monitoring findings.

	<p>How do the sectors systematize analysis of needs and impacts of interventions? Do they include unintended consequences, particularly increased protection risks, challenges to access education and lack of progress towards learning outcomes?</p> <p>Are there central or collective points of data collection that allows for more complex or robust analysis of needs and impacts?</p> <p>Do data collection and management standards include disaggregation by age, sex, disability, and international protection status (at a minimum)?</p> <p>What shared learning objectives specific to integrated programming drive the establishment of Monitoring and Evaluation frameworks?</p>	<p>INEE 1.7 - Percentage of education needs assessments carried out in defined time period</p> <p>INEE 1.8 - Number of evaluations carried out</p> <p>GADRRRES A5 - Child-centered Risk Assessment is in place at all levels in the education sector</p> <p>GADRRRES A6 - Monitoring and Evaluation for Comprehensive School Safety (CSS) is underway</p> <p>GADRRRES D6 - Monitoring and Evaluation</p>
Community	How are shared learning and protection objectives/agendas created and supported? How are outcomes shared?	<p>INEE 1.5 - Percentage of education needs assessments, carried out by the relevant coordinating body the program has participated in</p> <p>CPMS 6.2.4 - Percentage of participants who actively engaged in design of the child protection monitoring system who are local actors.</p> <p>CPMS 6.2.5 - Percentage of monitoring teams where age, gender, and diversity reflect the characteristics of the community where monitoring is being implemented</p>
Learning Environment	<p>Are the sectors coordinating data collection efforts at the school-level?</p> <p>Are the sectors monitoring against joint and/or integrated school-level indicators?</p> <p>Are measures and procedures in place to ensure data protection, including identification of designated individuals to manage the data at the various levels (school, district, etc.)?</p>	CPMS 5.2.1 - Percentage of staff involved in information management that can demonstrate knowledge or confidentiality procedures.
Family	How do parents/caregivers contribute to MEAL? Are parents/caregivers engaged in learning across programming spaces?	<p>INEE 1.9 - Percentages of evaluations shared with parents</p> <p>CPMS 5.2.3. - Feedback mechanism in place in affected communities to share information with children and adults on results of data collection activities.</p>

Child	<p>How are children engaged in voicing their own priorities, aspirations, and their understanding and expectations of programmatic impacts?</p>	<p>Alliance - Percentage of children who report feeling a sense of empowerment and independence.</p> <p>Alliance - Percentage of children who report believing in their ability to make a difference in their community.</p> <p>Alliance - Percentage of children who report that their views are listened to and valued by caregivers.</p>
-------	---	---

3. Enabling Interventions and Approaches

3.1 Crisis-sensitivity, Context Sensitivity and Peace Building

Socio-Ecological Levels	Guiding Questions	Indicators
Policy	<p>Do child protection and education policies and practices reflect and support crisis- and context-sensitive planning and programming?</p> <p>Do national policies and practices reflect and enable peace-building processes and programs?</p> <p>What opportunities exist to collaborate on advocacy, policy development, and accountability systems?</p> <p>Do policies and practices in teacher recruitment, promotion, professional development, and expected behaviors reflect and incorporate crisis- and context-sensitivity principles?</p> <p>Is there a neutral, diverse, and respected body of professionals authorized to review curricula, teaching and learning materials, supplementary resources, professional development curricula and resources to identify and address potentially problematic content?</p>	<p>ECCN - Number of (new) Education sector policy and planning documents explicitly informed by Rapid Education Risk Assessment (RERA) or similar formal conflict analysis</p> <p>ECCN - Number and percentage of learning materials containing distinct social cohesion/peacebuilding content</p>

	<p>Do joint and sector-specific MEAL and planning tools have a crisis- and context- sensitive lens? Is data regularly shared and analyzed by both sectors?</p>	
Community	<p>Are both sectors using similar disaggregated data (age, sex, disability, and international protection status, at a minimum) to understand specific protection risks, concerns, and barriers/opportunities for children's participation in learning?</p> <p>Do child protection and education teams have the competencies to approach contexts, communities, and programs using a crisis-/context-sensitivity and peace-building lens?</p> <p>Do interventions and opportunities exist to orient child protection and education teams to support crisis/context-sensitive and peacebuilding initiatives?</p>	<p>ECCN - Number of Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) trained on crisis/context-sensitive and/or peacebuilding education</p> <p>INEE 1.6 - Strength of analysis of context, of barriers to the right to education and of strategies to overcome those barriers</p>
Learning Environment	<p>Do School/Learning Environments embody crisis-/context-sensitivity and peace-building in all aspects of access and learning?</p> <p>Are there explicit class-based activities that promote competencies and behaviors that enable peacebuilding? Look at Transformative Pedagogy For Peace-Building as an example.</p>	<p>ECCN - Number and percentage of learners reporting positive perceptions from other identity groups</p> <p>ECCN - Number and percentage of classrooms employing teaching materials that emphasize social cohesion/peace-building content</p> <p>INEE 3.11 - Percentage of teachers whose training included methods for how to engage all students equally and in a participatory way</p>
Family	<p>Do all families feel equally supported and engaged in all aspects of analysis and programming?</p> <p>Are families aware of mechanisms to address or redress pre-existing tensions as well as those created by actions during humanitarian response?</p>	<p>Alliance - Number and percentage of parents who perceive school to be safe</p> <p>Alliance - Number and percentage of parents expressing tolerance/acceptance of other identity groups/minorities</p>
Child	<p>Do children feel they have the competencies and opportunities to be agents of change for sustainable peace?</p> <p>Are children protected from community-level tensions?</p>	<p>ECCN - Mean student score on conflict sensitivity/avoidance/peaceful coexistence assessment instrument</p> <p>Alliance - Number and percentage of students who perceive their school as inclusive and safe</p>

		INEE 3.4 - Percentage of targeted crisis-affected children and youth benefiting from relevant skills development (SEL/PSS/risk awareness/environmental education/conflict prevention)
--	--	---

3.2 Inclusivity (Combatting Discrimination and Exclusion)

Socio-Ecological Levels	Guiding Questions	Indicators ²
Policy	<p>Do both sectors collaborate on policy analysis for discriminatory content? How can the sectors support each other in assessing the relevance of policy, adherence to equitable policies, and establishment or maintenance of an accountability system?</p> <p>Do education and other sectors have complementary policies in place that explicitly prevent discrimination and actively seeks equity for all? How might the sectors address discriminatory policies and practices?</p> <p>Has the crisis disrupted and weakened the social services and justice system's ability to protect children's rights and respond in the best interests of a child? What are the resulting impacts on a child's ability to access/participate in education?</p> <p>Do policies and practices support access to protective services and learning opportunities regardless of the availability of identity and status documentation?</p> <p>If policies and practices discriminate, either deliberately or through omission, what opportunities exist to advocate and support amendments to ensure inclusion of all (learners, teachers, child protection, and community outreach staff, etc.)?</p> <p>Are national and sub-national data systems collecting disaggregated data based on characteristics of High-Risk Populations? How is that data used across and within sector-specific authorities, coordination systems, and implementing agencies?</p>	<p>INEE 3.11 - Percentage of teachers whose training included methods for how to engage all students equally and in a participatory way</p> <p>INEE 4.1 - Education personnel selection process is transparent, based on selection criteria that reflect diversity and equity</p> <p>ECCN - Number and percentage of education policies/plans incorporating consultations with stakeholders from all main identity groups</p>

² All standard access and quality indicators should be **disaggregated** by a representative range of identification. As a minimum level of data disaggregation, CPMS proposes sex, age, and disability data disaggregation. More guidance is included in the glossary.

	<p>What accountability systems exist if issues are identified?</p> <p>Do professional development opportunities provide guidance and support on meeting the needs of the most marginalized and At Risk children, adolescents, and youth?</p> <p>Do the FE/NFE/AE curriculum and teaching/learning materials include learning respect for diversity and inclusion?</p> <p>Do teaching and learning resources accommodate the needs of all learners (e.g. braille, large print or varying font, etc.)?</p>	
Community	<p>What are the socio-cultural beliefs, attitudes, and power dynamics that enable the stigmatization and discrimination of different children and teachers/education personnel?</p> <p>If the barriers to protective, educational opportunities are cultural in nature, how are the communities been consulted in identifying and working through cultural barriers?</p> <p>How can the sectors support communities to become agents of change in decreasing and eliminating discriminatory beliefs and practices?</p> <p>How are diverse community members, including children from At Risk Populations, engaged at every point of the program cycle to explicitly understand and address issues?</p> <p>Are communities, and the services that support them, prepared to support the protection and learning of children? Are there gaps or weaknesses in services that can be addressed through integrated programming? How can both sectors support communities advocating for access to opportunities for all children?</p>	<p>ECCN - Number and percentage of schools where there is regular, active participation of children, parents and community members in school management/governance</p> <p>ECCN - Number of civil society organizations (CSOs) trained on Conflict Sensitive Education</p> <p>ECCN - Number and percentage of education policies/plans incorporating consultations with stakeholders from all main identity groups</p>
Learning Environment	<p>Do school policies and disaster plans reflect the specific needs of all children?</p> <p>Do teachers and other education personnel have professional development plans and continued support to explicitly address discriminatory practices that limit access for all children? Do professional development plans and continued support to build teacher capacities address specific protection and learning needs in the classroom and school grounds?</p> <p>Are schools and learning spaces able to provide services that allow for a reintegration or integration into school and account for different</p>	<p>INEE 3.4.6 - Percentage of teachers who show increase understanding of and practice Teacher's Role & well-being: Child Protection, Well-being; Inclusion; Pedagogy; Curriculum & Planning; and Subject Knowledge</p> <p>CPMS 2.2.11 - Number and percentage of staff who come from the beneficiary population</p>

	<p>circumstances (e.g. gap in schooling, disabilities requiring specialized learning materials)?</p> <p>Are school-level practices (including access, teacher codes of conduct, disciplinary codes, etc.) conducive to equitable access, learning and protection for all children, including At Risk Populations?</p> <p>What systems exist to address issues of access, learning, and protection within the school? And together with the community?</p> <p>Are functional monitoring systems collecting disaggregated data to track access, learning, and protection? Who has access to that data and how is it used?</p>	<p>CPMS 23.2.1 - Percentage of non-formal or formal learning centers surveyed in target locations that meet 100% of agreed upon safety and universal design standards</p> <p>CPMS 23.2.2- Percentage of education staff who demonstrate knowledge of participatory, inclusive, positive discipline and gender-sensitive approaches</p> <p>CPMS 23.2.4 - Number and percentage of formal and non-formal learning centers that are accessible to children with disabilities</p> <p>INEE 2.7 - Percentage of learning spaces with gender- and disability-sensitive WASH facilities</p>
Family	<p>Are parents/caregivers aware of or do they recognize discriminatory policies at school which may affect their children?</p> <p>Do parents/caregivers have a mechanism through which to flag discriminatory policies and practices?</p> <p>Are families oriented to support services, able to access referral mechanisms, and feel empowered to support their children to fully participate in protective learning opportunities?</p> <p>Are families teaching discriminatory or promoting inclusion practices at home?</p>	<p>Alliance - Percentage of caregivers who know where to go in the community to report a concern involving their child(ren) (e.g. if they are hurt or need a doctor)</p> <p>ECCN - Number and percentage of teachers/parents perceiving texts and learning materials to be inclusive</p> <p>ECCN - Number and percentage of parents reporting that parent-school cooperation mechanisms are inclusive</p>
Child	<p>Do children understand the principle of non-discrimination and equality?</p> <p>Have children assisted in designing and leading assessment of protection risks and impact on their ability to access protective learning opportunities?</p>	CPMS 15.2.5 - Percentage of group activities that demonstrate that the views and feedback of children have informed the design of the group activities

	<p>Are children encouraged/supported to promote non-discriminatory practices and take action to flag discriminatory ones (e.g., do they have a trustworthy mechanism to safely flag/report such practices)?</p> <p>Do programs respond to specific needs or circumstances of at risk children? Are their needs explicitly targeted in programs? Or is it assumed that programs accommodate all children?</p>	<p>ECCN - Number and percentage of students perceiving texts and learning materials to be inclusive</p> <p>Alliance - Percentage of children who report a sense of belonging in their community.</p> <p>Alliance - Percentage of children who report that their views are listened to and valued by caregivers</p> <p>Alliance - Percentage of children who know where to report a concern (e.g. to a group activities worker or through a feedback and reporting mechanism in the community).</p> <p>Alliance - Percentage of children who report that their social environment is free from bullying and discrimination</p>
--	--	---

3.3 Child Safeguarding, Feedback and Reporting Mechanisms

Socio-Ecological Levels	Guiding Questions	Indicators
Policy	<p>What safeguarding policies exist or are needed in relevant line ministries? How are they linked and mutually supported?</p> <p>How can safeguarding mitigation measures be funded? Is there sufficient budget allocation for child safeguarding through national authorities and community structures?</p> <p>Do the global humanitarian coordination systems collaborate with national and local authorities to ensure existing safeguarding and reporting mechanisms are strengthened and expanded for the crisis?</p> <p>Do individual agencies understand how to effectively engage?</p>	<p>INEE 2.9 - Percentage of targeted learning spaces that offer referrals to specialized health, psychosocial, and protection services</p> <p>INEE 4.5 - Percentage of targeted learning spaces in which a code of conduct (i) exists (ii) is enforced and (iii) teachers and communities are trained in / informed about its application</p> <p>INEE 4.10 - Percentage of targeted learning spaces that have clear disciplinary actions in place for teachers,</p>

	<p>What accountability system exists that monitors all humanitarian and response stakeholders?</p>	<p>school leaders, and administrators who have broken the code of conduct</p> <p>CPMS 2.2.2 - Percentage of child safeguarding concerns reported that received an outcome following the existing protocol.</p>
Community	<p>What steps can be taken to contribute to capacity strengthening in safeguarding of children jointly by both sectors? Are there any communities of practice that the capacity strengthening efforts could be linked to?</p> <p>Is it possible to link with accountability initiatives that are led by the Education Cluster and/or the Protection Cluster?</p> <p>Are communities, including pre-school/Learning Environments, schools and families, aware of child safeguarding and its relevance to all humanitarian programming and intervention?</p> <p>Are systems of reporting and monitoring clear and effective?</p> <p>Do community-based projects support and promote help-seeking behavior within communities, families, and from children?</p> <p>Are there multiple entry-points to reporting which accommodate needs of C/FBO, NNGOs, service providers who work with families and children who experience multiple forms of inequality and abuse.</p> <p>Are best practices, such as the IASC Best Practice Guide for Inter-Agency Community-Based Complaints Mechanisms used?</p>	<p>CPMS 2.2.2 - Percentage of child safeguarding concerns reported that received an outcome following the existing protocols</p> <p>CPMS 3.2.1 - Percentage of surveyed population in target local that demonstrates an increase in knowledge of a specific child protection issue as a result of awareness-raising campaigns and messaging</p> <p>OCHA - There is guidance provided to the field on how to design the community based complaints mechanisms (CBCM) to ensure it is adapted to the cultural context with focus on community participation.</p>
Learning Environment	<p>Can program interventions be tailored to support risk mitigation? For example, what role can children's clubs and Parent Teacher Associations (PTAs) play in contributing to safer learning environments?</p> <p>What specific mitigation measures are needed to safeguard children involved in contributing to safer learning environments?</p> <p>Are teachers aware of and involved in creating and maintaining robust feedback and reporting systems? Is school leadership oriented to the appropriate channels of reporting and focal authorities/ministries?</p>	<p>CPMS 2.2.3. - Number and percentage of child safeguarding focal points at the individual agency level trained to respond to child safeguarding cases.</p> <p>INEE 2.7 - Percentage of learning spaces with gender and disability-sensitive WASH facilities</p>

	Do learning spaces have gender segregated WaSH facilities and are they accessible to persons living with disabilities?	
Family	<p>Are families aware of and using safeguarding and reporting systems?</p> <p>Do safeguarding and reporting systems provide families with updates and support for their claims?</p> <p>Are families confident that their concerns and reports are taken seriously and acted on? Are they provided updates and engaged in follow-up?</p>	Alliance - Percentage of caregivers who know where to go in the community to report a concern involving their child(ren) (e.g. if they are hurt or need a doctor)
Child	<p>Are the feedback and reporting mechanisms child-friendly and gender-sensitive? How are they understood by children in integrated programs? Do children understand how to use them?</p> <p>Are feedback and reporting mechanisms designed, implemented, and monitored with inputs from a diverse representation of children?</p> <p>Are children confident that their concerns or reports are taken seriously and acted on?</p>	Alliance - Percentage of children who report that their views are listened to and valued by caregivers.

3.4 Multi Sectoral Referral Mechanisms

Socio-Ecological Levels	Key Questions	Indicators
Policy	<p>How can child protection and education actors collaborate to ensure policies exist to establish and safeguard standards of protection within education, are strengthened as needed, are fully funded, and supported by appropriate and well-trained staff at national and sub-national levels?</p> <p>³</p> <p>Do data systems capture and follow the use of specialized services of children in and out of school? Or of children out</p>	

³ Such policies may include mental health services in schools, policies that allow pregnant students to continue school, young mothers to return to school, or reintegration policies for adolescents returning to school after extended break (due to child labor, engagement in armed forces/groups, mental health issues, contact with the law, etc.).

	<p>of school who return to school? If yes, how is data used and protected?</p>	
Community	<p>Have existing specialized services been mapped, and their cultural relevance and effectiveness assessed? How can child protection and education actors ensure the availability, quality, and responsiveness of protective learning services?</p> <p>What specialized services exist in communities that address risks or protection concerns of school age children, their caregivers, and their teachers? Do they connect or interface with Learning Environments/schools?</p> <p>How can gaps in specialized services be addressed? What alternatives may be provided temporarily through humanitarian actors or as a transition into formal systems?</p> <p>Are communities aware of referral mechanisms and how to access them? Do communities opt to seek support from available services?</p> <p>How can referral mechanisms and specialized services be strengthened to enable more equitable access to learning opportunities?</p>	<p>CPMS 18.2.5 - Number and percentage of appropriate referrals of children made by CPCM staff to other sectors</p> <p>OCHA - Number of inter-agency referral workshops (or trainings) conducted</p> <p>CPMS 18.2.4. - Number and percentage of appropriate referrals of children to CPCM services that are made by community members in target locations</p> <p>CPMS 18.2.5. - Number and percentage of appropriate referrals of children made by CPCM staff to other sectors</p> <p>OCHA - Number of documented successful referrals (made & received) disaggregated by service, gender and age. Level of satisfaction of people with MHPSS problems regarding the referral/ or referral process</p> <p>OCHA - Number of clients (out of the total number of clients) who were successfully referred to other services.</p> <p>OCHA - Number and percentage of referrals received from other service providers. Increase in staff and volunteers' knowledge and capacity to make successful referrals</p> <p>OCHA - Number and percentage of medical facilities, social service facilities and community programmes that have and apply procedures for the referral of people with MHPSS problems</p> <p>UNGEI - Percentage of students (male/female) who know about reporting mechanisms and procedures and are confident in using them.</p>

Learning Environment	<p>Do referral mechanisms for both children and education personnel exist at the school/learning space level?</p> <p>Are teachers, other education personnel, caregivers, and community leaders aware of the existence and process to refer children to specialized services?</p> <p>Are teachers, other education personnel, caregivers, and community leaders oriented and able to recognize signs of physical or psychosocial distress and other protection concerns? Are they oriented and able to use referral pathways properly? Do teachers know where to refer a child if they are in imminent risk?</p>	<p>INEE 2.9 - Percentage of targeted learning spaces that offer referrals to specialized health, psychosocial, and protection services</p> <p>CPMS 23.2.3 - Number and percentage of safe and ethical referrals of children to child protection services made by education worker</p>
Family	<p>Do families seek support from program staff to help understand and respond to the needs of children and caregivers (e.g., support for distress, learning difficulties, eating, or sleeping disorders, social "misbehaviors", etc.)?</p> <p>Are caregivers and family members aware of referral mechanisms and specialized services available to them and how to access them?</p> <p>What barriers remain that prevent children's return to learning or successful participation in learning?</p>	<p>Alliance - Number of caregivers who know where to go in the community to report a concern involving their child(ren) (e.g. if they are hurt or need a doctor)</p>
Child	<p>Do children receive the support needed for their healthy development and well-being that allows them to fully participate in learning opportunities?</p> <p>Are they aware of specialized services available to them? Do children understand how to access them? Are these services child-friendly and gender-sensitive?</p>	<p>Alliance - Percentage of children who demonstrate knowledge about how to avoid risky behavior (such as drug or alcohol use, unsafe sex, etc.).</p> <p>Alliance - Percentage of children who report feeling able to speak openly to a caregiver(s) about matters that are important to them</p> <p>Alliance - Percentage of children who report that they have a caregiver present whom they can rely on.</p> <p>Alliance- Percentage of children who report that their peers are kind and supportive.</p>

3.5 Non-Formal, Alternative and Flexible models of Education

Decision trees for [accelerated education](#) and what [learning platforms/modules are most appropriate for remote education](#) provide guidance on the type of program that meets specific learning needs as well as mitigating and preventing protection risks.

Socio-Ecological Levels	Guiding Questions	Indicators
Policy	<p>Do national and local education policies include the needs of vulnerable and marginalized learners, including provision of programmes for learners who have had long disruptions in their learning or are beginning at an older age?</p> <p>How are NFE/AE program development and implementation funded? Are NFE/AE programs developed in response to specific crises funded for multiple-years or is there opportunity to secure funding for multiple years?</p> <p>Does reliable data exist indicating access and retention of at risk and other vulnerable learners? Are learners in these programs captured in Education Management Information Systems (EMIS)?</p> <p>Is learning content relevant, accessible in relevant languages, age-appropriate, leveled, and accessible to learners in the current crisis? Does it reflect gender-sensitive and inclusive education practices? Does it integrate psychosocial well-being and life skills' acquisition in the curriculum to address young people's experiences in crisis contexts?</p> <p>Does current Teacher and SSW Professional Development accommodate staff supporting NFE/AE? Does professional development include relevant pedagogy and practice to best meet the needs of At Risk learners ?</p>	<p>NFE and alternative education indicators are found in INEE's Accelerated Education Programme Monitoring & Evaluation Toolkit</p> <p>AEWG 0.1.ai - Equity Indicator: Gap in transition rate to formal education, other education, or livelihoods by gender, disability, displacement status, etc.</p> <p>AEWG 3.11.a- Exit and sustainability plans are developed and implemented</p> <p>AEWG 3.17.c - AE funding aligns with MOE policy and national priorities</p> <p>AEWG 3.15.a - Clear policies / procedures established for AE completers to enter formal school system</p> <p>AEWG 2.6.a - Percentage of AE centers operating in accordance with national policy framework</p>
Community	<p>What specific barriers exist for children accessing age-appropriate formal center-based education?</p> <p>How is the community involved in identifying and supporting learners?</p> <p>What services exist to support at risk children, including child laborers, young parents, survivors of abuse and neglect, etc.?</p> <p>What opportunities exist to connect those services with NFE/AE opportunities by creating or strengthening flexible support structures to accommodate specific needs?</p>	<p>ECCN - Satisfactory use of rolling conflict assessments for adaptation of programming</p> <p>AEWG 3.10a - Number of community leaders, community members, and parents / guardians trained to support AE learners' education</p>
Learning Environment	Are teachers and paraprofessionals compensated appropriately?	CPMS 23.2.5 - Percentage of identified school-aged children in target location

	<p>What preparations and continued support do teachers need to effectively facilitate alternative education? Do teachers have access to all relevant technologies and teaching resources?</p> <p>How are NFE/AE programs linked with local and national FE systems, including data management, curriculum and teaching/learning resource development?</p> <p>Does the timetable allow for adequate time to cover the curriculum? Does scheduling accommodate specific needs of learners or potential learners?</p>	<p>regularly attending school or other centers of learning</p> <p>INEE 3.5 - Percentage of targeted learning spaces utilizing curriculum aligned to national standards</p>
Family	<p>How are parents/caregivers expected to support the child (e.g. monitoring distance learning, providing guidance or instructing child, purchasing and maintaining equipment, etc.)? How are they supported?</p> <p>Do the NFE and alternative options align with families' expectations and aspirations?</p> <p>Do families feel specific needs and protection risks are accommodated in program design and content?</p>	ECCN - Number and percentage of parents who perceive the activity/project as inclusive
Child	<p>Are children engaged in designing flexible alternative modalities of learning? Are their educational aspirations reflected in the available programming?</p> <p>Are there reliable, confidential, and easily accessible ways for children to report abuse or neglect and seek support for mental health issues through NFE/AE, including remote learning programs?</p> <p>What additional protection and learning needs of children exist that are unique to remote learning programs?</p>	INEE 3.4 - Percentage of targeted crisis-affected children and youth benefitting from relevant skills development (SEI/PSS/risk awareness/environmental education/conflict prevention)

3.6 Cash & Voucher Assistance to Support Access

Socio-Ecological Levels	Key Questions	Indicators
Policy	<p>Are CVA or Cash-Based Interventions (CBI) designed to ensure transition into sustainable interventions?</p> <p>What accountability measures are in place to ensure the most marginalized benefit from CVA and CBI?</p>	

	What data is collected to understand the impact on child protection risks and access/retention in education programming?	
Community	<p>Are feedback mechanisms child-friendly and easily accessible?</p> <p>How is the community, including education leaders and child protection staff, involved in designing and monitoring CVA and CBI? How are public services connected in monitoring impact on children?</p>	<p>CPMS 17.2.2 - Percentage of actions within community action plans or strategies that are planned, led and implemented by the community.</p> <p>CPMS 17.2.3 - Percentage of community members who report increased confidence in their ability to prevent and respond to child protection risks.</p> <p>INEE 1.3 - Analysis of opportunity to use local resources is carried out and acted on</p> <p>CPMS 6.2.4 - Percentage of participants who actively engaged in design of the child protection monitoring system who are local actors.</p>
Learning Environment	<p>What data is collected at school level (and between school and community levels) to understand whether CVA and CBI recipients are enrolling, regularly attending, and successfully participating in learning?</p> <p>Are there means to decrease or eliminate additional hidden costs in education to mitigate financial barriers?</p> <p>What are educators able to do to ensure the most marginalized children enroll and regularly attend education programs?</p>	
Family	<p>Are parents and caregivers involved in the design and monitoring of CVA and CBI?</p> <p>Do decisions on spending explicitly take into consideration the protection and education of all children in families?</p>	<p>INEE 1.1 - Percentage of parents actively participating in the conception and implementation of education in emergencies services</p> <p>INEE 1.2 - Percentage of parents satisfied with the quality and appropriateness of response at the end of the project</p>

Child	<p>Are children involved in age-appropriate design and monitoring of CVA and CBI?</p> <p>Do children perceive a benefit to their protection and ability to access and remain in quality education programs?</p>	<p>Alliance - Percentage of children who report feeling listened to and understood by at least one other person.</p> <p>IASC - Number of focus group discussions organized with affected girls, women, boys and men that have been used to influence decisions made on design of assessments, programmes, standards, selection criteria, etc.</p>
-------	---	---

4. Safe Access and Protective Learning Environments

4.1 Safe Learning Environment and Access Routes

Socio-Ecological Levels	Guiding Questions	Indicators
Policy	<p>Are the specific risks and unique vulnerabilities of children understood and reflected in contingency plans, crisis-specific plans and responses? Are the plans inclusive of natural hazards, conflict, the climate crisis, and infectious disease?</p> <p>Do national policies and infrastructure standards include risk-responsive standards and principles of universal design (for disability access) , and reflect the needs of all learners (in learning spaces, recreational spaces, and WaSH facilities)?</p> <p>Does site planning for new schools (e.g. replacing destroyed buildings and new construction for influx of displaced and refugee students) consider vulnerabilities of children, vulnerability of attack, and/or natural hazards?</p> <p>Is adequate funding allocated to maintain the physical integrity of existing infrastructure, retrofit buildings as needed, and build new buildings to accommodate all learners?</p> <p>What are the national policies and practices on use of education and community infrastructure during crises?</p>	<p>GADRRRES A1 - Legal Frameworks & Policies Enabling policies and legal frameworks are in place at national and/or sub-national levels to address key elements of comprehensive school safety.</p> <p>GADRRRES A3 - A comprehensive approach to school safety, is the foundation for integrating risk reduction and resilience into education sector strategies, policies and plans.</p> <p>GADRRRES B1 - Guidance and regulations are in place from appropriate authorities for safe school construction. This includes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) safe school site selection b) safe design, and c) safe construction <p>GADRRRES B.3 - A systematic plan for assessment and prioritization for retrofit and replacement of unsafe schools has been developed, and is being implemented.</p>

	<p>Does the data regularly gathered in learning environments and communities explicitly capture protection risks and ability of vulnerable learners to continue education (see Annex 3 on At Risk Populations)?</p> <p>Are codes of conduct (including disciplinary measures) child-friendly and mandatory for all learning spaces/environments and opportunities?</p> <p>Are safe, accessible, child-sensitive mechanisms in place for reporting sexual exploitation and abuse, particularly in high-risk areas?</p>	<p>GADRRRES B6 - Planning is undertaken for limited use of schools as temporary shelters or collective centers, during the school year.</p> <p>GADRRRES C1 - Education authorities have national and subnational plans for education sector risk reduction and management, with focus on safety and security, educational continuity, and protection of education sector investments</p> <p>GADRRRES D1 - National Disaster Management Authority and Education authority have nationally adopted, consensus- and evidence based, action-oriented key messages as foundation for formal and non-formal education.</p> <p>CPMS 23.2.9. - Percentage of identified formal and non-formal education facilities in target location being used as temporary shelters by community members/ displaced population.</p> <p>INEE 4.5 - Percentage of targeted learning spaces in which a code of conduct (i) exists (ii) is enforced and (iii) teachers and communities are trained informed about its application</p>
Community	<p>Are there opportunities to strengthen links between community-level and school-level identification of and response to risks?</p> <p>Are community members trained in assessing and responding to specific protection issues? How is the community engaged in identifying and responding to those protection risks? What roles and responsibilities do they have?</p>	<p>INEE 1 - Community Members participate actively, transparently, and without discrimination in analysis, planning, design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of education responses</p>
Learning Environments	<p>Are teachers, other education personnel, and community members trained in assessing and responding to specific protection issues among other risks? Are appropriate codes of conduct in place and followed?</p> <p>Are Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (PSEA), gender equity and inclusive approaches applied consistently in the classroom? How do systems link into IASC Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse <u>victim assistance</u> and</p>	<p>INEE 2.6 - Percentage of targeted learning spaces that meet EiE access, quality, and safety standards for infrastructure</p> <p>CPMS 23.2.1 - Percentage of non-formal or formal learning centers surveyed in target location that meet 100% of agreed-upon safety criteria and universal design standards.</p>

	<p>accountability systems within community and national systems?</p> <p>Are both sectors actively engaged in supporting the <u>reopening of schools</u> and (safe) return of all students?</p> <p>Is school leadership supportive of and ensuring positive and protective forms of discipline for learners and personnel?</p>	<p>CPMS 23.2.6. - Percentage of educational facilities with a child-friendly, safe and confidential feedback and reporting mechanism in place.</p> <p>OCHA E-1-06 - Percentage of damaged or occupied education facilities rehabilitated and reopened in affected area</p> <p>GADRRRES C2 - Schools annually review school disaster risk reduction and management measures (eg. as part of school-based management and/or school improvement).</p>
Family	<p>Have families contributed to risks' assessments and development of school safety and resilience plans, including access issues?</p> <p>What additional opportunities exist to link efforts to support parents'/caregivers' education and child protection across the home, community, and learning environments?</p>	<p>ECCN - Number and percentage of parents who perceive the school as safe for their children</p> <p>ECCN - Number and percentage of parents reporting that parent-school cooperation mechanisms are inclusive</p>
Child	<p>Do children feel safe going to school? How are they supported in identifying risks and working with stakeholders to mitigate or address concerns?</p> <p>Do children understand their rights? Do they understand how to respond (report) if their rights are violated, for example abuse or exploitation?</p>	<p>GADRRRES D2 - Education authority has infused climate-aware risk reduction and resilience education into regular curriculum.</p> <p>GADRRRES D3 - Schools convey risk reduction and resilience education through non formal education through participation in school disaster management, and through after school clubs, assemblies and extracurricular activities.</p> <p>CPMS 23.2.7. - Percentage of children reporting a concern to an education worker or through the educational facility's feedback and reporting mechanism who report satisfaction with the response.</p> <p>ECCN - Number and percentage of learners who feel safe en route to school</p> <p>ECCN - Number and percentage of learners reporting being subject to bullying</p>

4.2 Protecting Education from Attack, Military Use, and Other Uses of Force

Socio-Ecological Levels	Guiding Questions	Indicators
Policy	<p>Is there an inter-sectoral Working Group on MHPSS that maps all available services? Do both sectors participate? How do both engage in relevant lines of communication, advocacy, and accountability?</p> <p>Are national MHPSS (including SEL) competencies well developed and informed by robust community participation from diverse groups?</p> <p>Are there supportive policies in relevant line ministries, including the integration of MHPSS into national Professional Development schemes?</p> <p>What evidence needs to be gathered to determine promising practices for children and their caregivers across levels of the MHPSS pyramid? How can both sectors use evidence to inform practices and policies?</p>	
Community	<p>Are services mapped out and are community members, including teachers and other community leaders, oriented to them?</p> <p>Are there continued barriers to accessing non-specialized and specialized services that teams can address together?</p> <p>What plans, processes, and capacities exist to mobilize teachers/others to support PSS activities in communities during disruptions in education?</p> <p>What plans are in place to ensure PSS programs in CP Center-based programs create a bridge into school-based interventions?</p>	Alliance - Number of support services available within community that explicitly support MHPSS
Learning Environment	<p>Are the MHPSS needs of teachers and other education personnel incorporated into integrated Professional Development Plans?</p> <p>Are there school-based support systems for teachers to continue to receive support for their professional development (e.g Teacher Learning Circles provides peer support and opportunities to discuss challenges)?</p>	INEE 2.3 - Percentage of targeted learning spaces featuring psychosocial support (PSS) activities for children that fulfill at least three out of the four following attributes: a) structured, b) goal-oriented, c) evidence-informed, d) targeted and tailored to different sub-groups of vulnerable children

	<p>Do teachers have access to basic psychosocial support? This is "a basic, humane and supportive response to suffering and an entry point to further support and referral" (MHPSS MSP, 2021)</p> <p>Are MHPSS interventions easily incorporated into daily routines? For example, is SEL integrated into daily lessons and reinforced through classroom routines?</p> <p>How do both sectors contribute to continued support and evaluation of school-based MHPSS programs?</p> <p>What evidence can be gathered through integrated programming to understand causation or correlation between provision of quality PSS/SEL programming and improved learning outcomes?</p>	<p>CPMS 10.2.2 - Percentage of children identified as needing specialized mental health services who are referred to the percentage of children who feel</p> <p>Alliance - Percentage of children who feel motivated or optimistic about school or future opportunities appropriate services</p> <p>CPMS 2.2.6. - Number and percentage of staff who participate in one or more agency-level activities that promote staff well-being each quarter.</p>
Family	<p>Are caregivers provided MHPSS to address their own needs?</p> <p>Are caregivers provided MHPSS to support the needs of children?</p> <p>How are family-based MHPSS interventions linked to or complement school-based MHPSS interventions?</p>	
Child	<p>How do children perceive and report their sense of well-being?</p> <p>Are peer-to-peer support groups established and are all children able to, and feel comfortable, actively participating?</p>	<p>Alliance - Percentage of children and their caregivers who report improvement in their mental health and psychosocial well-being following program completion.</p> <p>Alliance - Percentage of children who report that they have a caregiver present whom they can rely on</p> <p>CPMS 10.2.1 - Percentage of children who report a sense of empowerment and independence</p> <p>Alliance - Percentage of children who feel motivated or optimistic about school or future opportunities</p> <p>Alliance - Percentage of children who report a sense of belonging at school</p> <p>Alliance - Percentage of children who report that their peers are kind and supportive.</p>

4.4 School-Related Gender-Based Violence (SRGBV)

Socio-Ecological Levels	Guiding Questions	Indicators
Policy	<p>Are cohesive and comprehensive policies to prevent and respond to SRGBV, including disciplinary policies for persecutors, in place between Education, Social Affairs, and Justice ministries?</p> <p>Do pre-service training sessions and curricula include expectations and orientation to referral mechanisms to safely identify and report Gender Based Violence (GBV) and School Related GBV?</p> <p>Was a gender analysis conducted within the past 6-12 months to identify norms and practices that enable SRGBV (e.g. gender discrimination)? Are the results incorporated into immediate and longer-term behavior-change plans in child protection, education, and other sectors targeting the same communities?</p> <p>Is there an active Gender-Based Violence Information Management System (GBVIMS)? Is it efficient, and connected through relevant line ministries?</p> <p>Is all education and child protection data collected disaggregated by sex, age, disability, and displacement status?</p>	<p>CPMS 9.2.1 - Percentage of target locations where gender-, age-, disability- and culturally sensitive response services for child survivors are currently operating.</p> <p>UNGEI - Number of teacher training institutions that include curricula and training on SRGBV and positive discipline.</p> <p>UNGEI - Proportion of teachers and union members (male/female) that have received in-service and/or pre-service training on SRGBV.</p> <p>INEE Gender - Number and percentage of stakeholders (male/female) trained to implement early warning and early response mechanisms to prevent and respond to gender-based attacks on education</p> <p>INEE Gender - Number of gender-based attacks on education reported</p>
Community	<p>What are the underlying social norms that contribute or enable SGBV in this community? Were these considered in relevant community level interventions?</p> <p>Are men and boys actively engaged and committed to mitigating risk and supporting survivors of SRGBV? To what extent are men and boys involved in SRGBV awareness raising, and capacity building programming around SRGBV?</p>	<p>OCHA - Percentage of surveyed communities indicating there is a risk of physical or sexual violence</p> <p>UNGEI - Gender assessment on local drivers of SRGBV conducted</p> <p>UNGEI - Number and percentage of community outreach and dialogue sessions on SRGBV that include/target women and girls and/or are facilitated by women and girls</p>

	<p>Are community leaders, including religious leaders and women's rights advocates actively engaged in SGBV programming?</p> <p>How are community-based groups and interventions, inclusive of local police, judicial, and child welfare agencies, partnering with schools to prevent and respond to SRGBV?</p>	<p>UNGEI - Number and percentage of community outreach/capacity building sessions on SRGBV that specifically target men and boys and engage them around SRGBV</p> <p>INEE Gender - Percentage of women and girls who feel that their gender-related concerns are addressed by SGBV programming</p> <p>UNGEI - Percentage of parents (male/female) and community leaders (male/female) who are members of the SMC who understand the key forms of SRGBV.</p> <p>UNGEI - Number of local organizations (civil society, private sector, police and justice systems, community-based organizations) that have partnered with schools to implement a whole school approach to prevention.</p> <p>CPMS 9.2.1 - Percentage of target locations where gender-, age-, disability- and culturally sensitive response services for child survivors are currently operating.</p>
Learning Environment	<p>Do teachers and education personnel receive training on gender-responsive services, identifying children at risk, and supporting survivors of SRGBV in appropriate ways and through multisectoral referral mechanisms? Do they feel comfortable/confident in their ability to identify and respond to SRGBV concerns and incidents?</p> <p>Does school leadership support the protection of all children and staff?</p> <p>Do schools teach children about consent and body autonomy?</p> <p>How confident are children/youth talking about these topics and using them in school and home lives?</p> <p>Do children and educators feel safe approaching Teachers and school personnel about SRGBV concerns?</p>	<p>UNGEI - Proportion of school management team (male/female) involved with establishing the whole school approach.</p> <p>UNGEI - Percentage of schools that have developed and put into practice a code of conduct with a reference to SRGBV.</p> <p>UNGEI - Proportion of budget allocated to implementation of a code of conduct at school level.</p> <p>UNGEI - Proportion of parents (male/female), teachers and support staff (male/female), and students (male/female) who were involved in decision-making processes for the development of the code of conduct.</p>

	<p>How receptive are teachers and education personnel to report on SRGBV?</p> <p>Are schools flexible and encouraging children and teachers impacted by SRGBV to engage in learning and teaching?</p> <p>Do school structures promote women's leadership and support teachers who experience violence?</p> <p>Are Healthy peer relationships promoted and student awareness and attitudes about gender norms and SRGBV improved?</p>	<p>UNGEI - Percentage of teachers (male/female) using participatory, gender responsive approaches and positive discipline teaching methodologies.</p> <p>UNGEI - Percentage of new staff (male/female) who have received in-service training on SRGBV, participatory, gender-responsive approaches, and positive discipline teaching methodologies.</p> <p>UNGEI - Proportion of schools that use curricula on gender equality, child rights, and SRGBV for students.</p> <p>UNGEI - Percentage of schools with safe spaces or school clubs (male/female) that provide opportunities for dialogue on gender and violence</p> <p>UNGEI - Percentage of staff (male/female) who know how to respond to incidents of SRGBV and clearly understand their roles and responsibilities in reporting procedures</p> <p>UNGEI - Proportion of schools with women comprising at least half of management roles.</p> <p>UNGEI - Number of SRGBV incidents formally reported to the education institutions.</p> <p>INEE Gender - Number and percentage of reported cases followed up through referral mechanisms.</p>
Family	<p>Are caregivers trained, able and committed to identify signs of SRGBV/children at risk, support survivors in appropriate ways and use referral mechanisms?</p> <p>Are caregivers aware of available services for survivors of SGBV? Do they feel comfortable/confident using them?</p> <p>How do parents/caregivers/caregivers understand and support body autonomy/integrity and children's consent?</p> <p>What systems are in place to support concerns or violence within families?</p> <p>Are parents using positive parenting and disciplinary techniques?</p>	<p>CPMS 9.2.2 - Percentage of children and/or their caregivers who have received response services for SGBV who report satisfaction with the service provision.</p> <p>INEE Gender - Percentage of caregivers who have received training on recognizing SGBV and using appropriate referral mechanisms.</p> <p>INEE Gender - Percentage of caregivers who report feeling comfortable/confident using referral mechanisms</p> <p>INEE Gender - Percentage of caregivers who have received training on positive parenting/discipline</p>

		INEE Gender - Percentage of children who report experiencing a change in parenting techniques/reduction of violence in the home?
Child	<p>Do children and youth understand their right to body integrity? Do they understand consent and their right to unwanted/inappropriate touching and attention? Do they feel comfortable/confident expressing these rights to adults or other children and youth?</p> <p>Do children and youth know who they can approach with concerns or to report incidents?</p>	<p>CPMS 9.2.2 - Percentage of children and/or their caregivers who have received response services for SGBV who report satisfaction with the service provision.</p> <p>UNGEI - Percentage of students (male/female) who can identify signs of healthy and unhealthy intimate relationships.</p> <p>UNGEI - Percentage of students reporting decreased use of corporal punishment (in the past 12 months).</p> <p>UNGEI - Percentage of students (male/female) who report feeling safe and protected (defined as free of all forms of SRGBV) in and on the way to and from school.</p> <p>UNGEI - Percentage of students (male/female) who report feeling safe while using WASH facilities at school or boarding house</p> <p>UNEGI - Percentage of students (male/female) who are familiar with the code of conduct and have a clear understanding of SRGBV.</p>

5. Support the Well-being of Caregivers, Teachers, and Child Protection teams

5.1 Caregivers

Socio-Ecological Levels	Guiding Questions	Indicators
Policy	Do laws exist banning violent punishment of children by parents, teachers or other caregivers? Are they	UNICEF 3.1 - Laws protecting children from physical punishment (violent punishment) Existence of legislation prohibiting all forms of physical punishment of children, by setting (home, schools, alternative care

	<p>enforced through policies and practices at national and community levels?</p> <p>Do domestic violence laws exist? Are they gender-sensitive, reflect the rights of women and children, and are enforced?</p> <p>Do national alternative care interventions, including foster care, promote and support family strengthening and reunification when it is in the best interests of a child?</p> <p>Do national policies and services to support and strengthen families exist alongside legislation and interventions addressing harmful social norms and practices?</p>	<p>settings and day care, penal institutions/in places of detention, and as a sentence for an offense)</p>
Community	<p>How are the needs of caregivers understood and accommodated within and between the two sectors? Are there services that aim to support at risk caregivers or caregivers with children with specific needs (e.g. children with disabilities)?</p> <p>Do social groups, peer-to-peer support groups, and self-help groups exist that provide specific support for caregivers? Do they accommodate all caregivers?</p> <p>How do various stakeholders understand and contribute to positive parenting practices through multi-sectoral services and interventions? Do services and interventions directly mitigate protection risks, strengthen protective factors, and support the health and well-being of caregivers and families, including caregivers' mental health, psychosocial well-being and parenting skills among others?</p> <p>Are there effective mechanisms to identify caregivers and families who are at risk and refer them to the appropriate multisectoral services, including case management?</p> <p>Is intimate partner violence (IPV) prevented and/or responded to through a cohesive and coordinated set of interventions?</p> <p>How do community networks/committees support caregivers' understanding of protection risks and</p>	

	protective factors including safeguarding messaging, referral mechanisms, enrolment and retention in education programs?	
Learning Environment	<p>How do teachers and school leadership perceive the role and responsibility of caregivers to support participation and success in learning?</p> <p>How are caregivers empowered and supported as partners in children's learning? What additional support is provided for more marginalized caregivers?</p> <p>What support is provided to ensure caregivers are confident and capable to support learning at home regardless of their own educational training?</p> <p>Do schools include components of parenting education to improve consistent, positive support to children by strengthening parenting practices?</p>	<p>INEE 1.1 - Percentage of parents actively participating in the conception and implementation of education in emergencies services</p> <p>INEE 1.2 - Percentage of parents satisfied with the quality and appropriateness of response at the end of the project</p> <p>INEE 1.3 - Analysis of opportunity to use local resources is carried out and acted on</p>
Family	<p>Are mental health and well-being services available to caregivers, specifically those who are at risk, to support them in caring for themselves and their children? Are they accessed regularly by caregivers identified as needing support?</p> <p>Do caregivers feel they are valued partners in identifying and responding to child protection risks in the community, school, and home?</p> <p>Do caregivers feel confident in their knowledge and abilities to engage as partners with community-based services, schools, and case management systems?</p> <p>Do at-risk caregivers, including adolescent parents and child-headed households, feel supported across home-school-community spaces?</p> <p>Do caregivers feel they have adequate guidance and assistance to support responsive parenting and positive discipline, including a focus on their children's cognitive development and learning in the home?</p> <p>Do caregivers have access to additional services provided by other sector stakeholders that impact their</p>	<p>CPMS 16.2.1 - % of targeted caregivers who report increased knowledge of caring and protective behaviors towards children under their care following their participation in a family strengthening programme.</p> <p>CPMS 16 - Family and caregiving environments are strengthened to promote children's healthy development [including cognitive development], and to protect them from maltreatment and other negative effects of adversity.</p> <p>UNICEF 4.1 - Agreement with the necessity of physical punishment for child-rearing Percentage of female and male adults or adolescents who agree that physical punishment of children is necessary for child-rearing</p>

	well-being and mitigate protective risks for themselves and their children?	
Child	<p>How are children impacted by the well-being of caregivers?</p> <p>Are children confident their caregivers understand their experiences and emotions and are able to support their safety and well-being?</p> <p>Are the children of IPV survivors and victims provided services and continued support at home, school, and within the community?</p>	<p>UNICEF 1.1 - Violent discipline by caregivers, past month (SDG Indicator 16.2.1) Percentage of girls and boys aged 1–17 years who experienced any physical punishment and/or psychological aggression by caregivers in the past month, by sex and age</p> <p>UNICEF 1.10 - Child exposure to households affected by physical partner violence against women Percentage of female and male adolescents and young adults aged 13–24 years who report that their father or stepfather ever hit or beat their mother or stepmother during the respondents' childhood, by sex and age of respondent</p> <p>UNICEF 6.2 - Early childhood caregiver engagement and nurturing Percentage of girls and boys aged 36–59 months with whom an adult household member engaged in four or more activities to promote learning and school readiness in the past three days</p> <p>UNICEF 6.3 - Parent/guardian understanding of adolescents' problems, past month Percentage of female and male adolescents aged 13–17 years who report that their parents or guardians understood their problems and worries most of the time or always during the past 30 days, by sex and age</p> <p>Alliance - Percentage of children who report that a caregiver cares for them when times are difficult</p> <p>Alliance - Percentage of children who report that they have a caregiver present whom they can rely on.</p> <p>Alliance - Percentage of children who report feeling safe at home.</p> <p>Alliance - Percentage of children who report having at least one caregiver who teaches, guides, or mentors them</p>

5.2 Professional Development and Technical Support

Socio-Ecological Levels	Guiding Questions	Indicators
Policy	<p>Do certification policies and labor laws include refugee and displaced teachers into national education systems, including support for cross-border certification, equivalency, and teacher professional development? Do similar accommodations exist for other SSW?</p> <p>Do professional development interventions include a balance between professional content and the well-being?</p> <p>Are the roles and responsibilities of management, technical, and support positions clear? Are they supported with strong, role-specific competency-based training programs?</p> <p>Is data collected on protection risks and protective factors within the education system and impacted communities to inform the development of comprehensive professional development interventions (pre-service and in-service) for teachers, school leadership, and SSW?</p> <p>Are there established multisectoral referral pathways? Are education and child protection staff trained on how to identify children who require specialized services and safely refer children with protection needs?</p> <p>Is there regular coordination between the sectors in terms of training, sustained support, and compensation?</p> <p>Do policies and practices in recruiting and retaining education and child protection personnel from marginalized communities to work with marginalized communities exist and are supported?</p>	<p>CPMS 2 - Child protection services are delivered by staff and associates who have proven competence in their areas of work and are guided by human resources processes and policies that promote equitable working arrangements and measures to protect children from maltreatment by humanitarian workers</p> <p>INEE 3.10 - Degree of professional development recognition and/or certification</p> <p>INEE 4.1 - Education personnel selection process is transparent, based on selection criteria that reflect diversity and equity?</p> <p>INEE 4.5 - Percentage of targeted learning spaces in which a code of conduct (i) exists (ii) is enforced and (iii) teachers and communities are training in/informed about its application</p> <p>INEE 4.7 - Percentage of teachers and other education personnel compensated</p> <p>INEE 4.8 - Percentage of teachers and other education personnel who have signed a contract specifying their compensation and conditions of work</p> <p>INEE 4.9 - Percentage of teachers supported through coordinated conditions of work across education actors/partners</p> <p>INEE 4.11 - Percentage of teachers supported through coordinated compensation agreements across education actors.partners</p>

Community	<p>Do communities respect, support, and have realistic expectations of education and child protection staff?</p> <p>Are there opportunities for education and child protection staff to participate in joint peer-to-peer support activities?</p> <p>Are education and child protection personnel selected, if possible, from the affected community?</p> <p>How do communities engage through informal and formal channels in designing and supporting the professional development of child protection and SSW?</p>	INEE 4.5 - Percentage of targeted learning spaces in which a code of conduct (i) exists (ii) is enforced and (iii) teachers and communities are training in/informed about its application
Learning Environment	<p>Does school leadership have the resources and capacity to support sustained, quality professional development?</p> <p>What support is needed and provided to ensure teachers are able to effectively teach protection and well-being-relevant content and mitigate or respond to protection risks in the learning environment? Including PSS-SEL, gender- and disability-sensitive approaches; positive discipline; and participatory methods.</p> <p>How are teacher competencies and performance assessed? How are those results used to inform professional development content and approach? How are the results shared back with teachers in constructive ways?</p> <p>Were teachers and other education personnel consulted about their motivations, incentives, and needs when planning professional development? Were they consulted when designing assessments?</p> <p>Are peer-to-peer support activities supported (e.g. Teacher Learning Circles, Teacher Mentors, etc.) which specifically empower teachers to improve competencies to support learners' well-being and protection?</p> <p>Have education and child protection staff/actors been trained in and signed safeguarding procedures and policies that prohibit corporal (physical) punishment and other degrading forms of punishment? (See CPMS Standards 2 and 8.)</p>	<p>CPMS 23.2.2. - Percentage of education staff who demonstrate knowledge of participatory, inclusive, positive discipline and gender-sensitive approaches.</p> <p>INEE 3.6 - Percentage of teachers who show increased understanding of and practice Teacher's Role and Well-being; Child Protection; Well-being; Inclusion; Pedagogy; Curriculum and Planning; and Subject Knowledge</p> <p>INEE 3.7 - Teacher satisfaction level with TPD activity/activities they have participated in</p> <p>INEE 3.8 - Percentage of teachers who report feeling confident in their ability to teach effectively</p> <p>INEE 3.9 - Percentage of teachers and other education personnel benefiting from professional development according to assessed needs</p> <p>INEE 3.11 - Percentage of teachers whose training included methods for how to engage all students equally and in a participatory way</p> <p>INEE 3.12 - Appropriateness of teaching method to the age, development level, language, culture, capacities, and needs of learners</p> <p>INEE 4.5 - Percentage of targeted learning spaces in which a code of conduct (i) exists (ii) is enforced</p>

	Were teachers trained in and comply with teacher codes of conduct that set clear standards for teachers and other education personnel?	and (iii) teachers and communities are training in/informed about its application INEE 4.10 - Percentage of Targeted learning spaces that have clear disciplinary actions in place for teachers, school leaders, and administrators who have broken the code of conduct INEE 4.13 - Percentage of teachers reporting being sufficiently supported by school leadership INEE 4.15 - Percentage of teaching personnel participating in ongoing coaching/mentoring
Family	Do caregivers have access to processes and structures that support education and child protection staff?	INEE 3.14 - Frequency of parental engagement in communications that inform them of learning content and teaching methods
Child	Are children and youth regularly engaged in assessment and evaluation processes regarding teacher performance, teacher and child protection personnel behavior, concerns about learning and community-based programming and environment, and protection issues?	INEE 3.4 - Percentage of targeted crisis-affected children and youth benefiting from relevant skills development (SEL/PSS/risk awareness/environmental education/conflict prevention)

5.3 Well-being and Support Systems

Socio-Ecological Levels	Guiding Questions	Indicators

Policy	<p>Are compensation packages for education personnel and SSW comprehensive?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are compensation systems and conditions of work coordinated between all relevant stakeholders to ensure consistency and sustainability? Does compensation reflect cost of living and responsibilities of positions? Are leave (vacation, sick, family, etc.) policies comprehensive and accommodate a range of circumstances that consider context, gender, age, and family? <p>Are there systems to report abuse, harassment, and other protection issues against teachers and education personnel within the education system? Do systems exist for SSW?</p> <p>Do pre-service and in-service training programs encompass the full range of competencies required of the position and their own self-care?</p> <p>Do pre-service and in-service training programs for technical supervisors and management staff prepare supervisory staff to support teachers, case managers, and other SSW in their daily work? Do policies and practices reflect and ensure robust supervision?</p> <p>Are MHPSS services for teachers, other education personnel, and child protection personnel responsive to the specific needs of teachers? Is the use of services normalized and encouraged through policy and practice?</p> <p>Are teachers, other education personnel, and child protection personnel engaged in policy development or inform policies in meaningful ways?</p>	<p>CPMS 2.2.1 - Percentage of child protection staff that demonstrate proven competencies with regards to their individual roles and responsibilities (as specified in their individual job descriptions) in line with the Child Protection in Humanitarian Action Competency Framework at the time of hiring.</p> <p>INEE 4.15 - Percentage of teaching personnel participating in ongoing coaching/mentoring sessions</p> <p>INEE 4.13 - Percentage of teachers reporting being sufficiently supported by school leadership</p> <p>INEE 4.9 - Percentage of teachers supported through coordinated conditions of work across education actors/partners</p> <p>CPMS 2.1.22 - Provide staff and associates with rest, recuperation, access to psychosocial support and regular supervision to promote well-being, manage stress and create a healthy working environment.</p>
--------	--	---

Community	<p>Are child protection services delivered by staff and associates who have proven competence in their areas of work and are guided by human resources processes and policies that promote equitable working arrangements and measures to protect children from maltreatment by humanitarian workers?</p> <p>Do support and supervision mechanisms for child protection personnel and other SSW function effectively?</p> <p>Is appropriate, accessible, and practical psychosocial support available to child protection personnel and other SSW? Is accessing it normalized?</p> <p>Do child protection staff working in communities and schools understand the importance of maintaining their well-being as a factor in influencing the well-being of children and youth, other staff, and the well-being of their family and community?</p> <p>Are they able to identify signs of their own stress as well as effective methods to manage stress and support their well-being? Do they acknowledge and have strategies to vary methods of self-care as needed?</p> <p>Are they aware of and comfortable accessing local mental health and psychosocial support resources and referral systems should they or their colleagues need specialized support?</p> <p>Do child protection personnel and SSW believe their well-being is a priority for their employers, other sectors, and relevant ministries?</p> <p>Do they feel they have a voice, agency, and lead in identifying and designing interventions to promote their own well-being?</p>	CPMS 2.2.6. - Number and percentage of staff who participate in one or more agency-level activities that promote staff well-being each quarter
-----------	---	--

Learning Environment	<p>Do support and supervision mechanisms for teachers and other education personnel function effectively?</p> <p>Is appropriate, accessible and practical psychosocial support available to teachers and other education personnel? Is accessing it normalized?</p> <p>Do education personnel and child protection staff working in schools understand the importance of maintaining their well-being as a factor in influencing the well-being of children and youth, other staff, and the well-being of their family and community?</p> <p>Are they able to identify signs of their own stress as well as effective methods to manage stress and support their well-being? Do they acknowledge and have strategies to vary methods of self-care as needed?</p> <p>Are they aware of and comfortable accessing local mental health and psychosocial support resources and referral systems should they or their colleagues need specialized support?</p> <p>Do teachers, education personnel and SSW believe their well-being is a priority for relevant Ministries and/or their employers?</p> <p>Do teachers feel they have a voice, agency, and lead in identifying and designing interventions to promote their own well-being?</p>	<p>INEE 4.13 - Percentage of teachers reporting being sufficiently supported by school leadership</p> <p>CPMS 23.2.11 - Percentage of education personnel trained on the identification of protection concerns, signs of psychosocial distress and the appropriate referral pathways.</p> <p>CPMS 2.2.6.- Number and percentage of staff who participate in one or more agency-level activities that promote staff well-being each quarter</p>
Family	<p>Are families aware of and respect the range of responsibilities of education and child protection personnel working with their children?</p> <p>Are families aware of the limits of the professional expertise and support provided to their children through school and community services?</p> <p>Do families respect and encourage the separation between personal and professional lives of community-based education and child protection personnel?</p>	
Child	<p>How do children understand the relationship between the health and well-being of their teachers and other caregivers (inclusive of case managers and other SSW) and their own well-being?</p>	