



Embedding Violence Prevention and Response in Education in Emergencies and Protracted Crisis Settings

A Joint Safe to Learn-Education Cannot Wait Guidance Note for Practitioners



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This Guidance Note was co-led and co-written by Dr. Chloë Fèvre, Director of the Safe to Learn Global Initiative (STL) and Fadela Novak-Irons, Chief Forced Displacement Response at Education Cannot Wait (ECW). It benefitted from excellent inputs from Michelle May, Education Specialist leading on Mental Health and Psychosocial Support (MHPSS) and Child Protection and Jihane Latrous, Gender Specialist at ECW. Kristen Hansen, Grant Portfolio and Partnership Specialist at STL played a key role in the development of this resource, in particular its annexes, and led the coordination with peer reviewers in a very effective way. Jailan Zayan edited the Annexes with talent and high professionalism. Peer reviewers of the Guidance Note were instrumental in motivating the development of this new Guidance Note. Safe to Learn and Education Cannot Wait thank them deeply for their true constructive criticism and support. They include Clare Saad (People in Need), Adama Diallo (Global Education Cluster), Jennifer Sklar and Emma Gremley Kate Davis (International Rescue Committee), Alison Joyner (Plan International), Ariel Solari (Inter-agency Network for Education in Emergencies) and others in the Geneva Global Hub for Education in Emergencies.

Cover photo: 13-year-old Kholood (middle) walks with her sisters to their school in Taizz, Yemen, February 2021.

© UNICEF/Al-Basha



INTRODUCTION

About 222 million school-aged children are affected by crises, globally, including 78.2 million who are out-of-school (%54 girls and %16 forcibly displaced). %84 of these out-of-school crisis-affected children and adolescents live in protracted crises. The likelihood that these young people remain displaced throughout their school years is high, given that the average period of displacement is 10 to 25 years.

In any humanitarian crisis, a priority for educators is to resume educational and well-being activities as quickly as possible because education offers crucial physical, mental health, psychosocial and cognitive protections while increasing girls' and boys' resilience. For this to be truly effective, education needs to incorporate critical violence prevention features and be provided in safe places that are easily accessible for all children and education personnel. This Guidance Note explains how to embed violence prevention and response in education in emergencies and protracted crisis programs.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK TO PREVENT VIOLENCE IN AND THROUGH SCHOOL

Safe To Learn (STL) and Education Cannot Wait (ECW) use the World Health Organisation (WHO) definition of violence as the *"intentional use of physical force or power, threatened or actual, against oneself, another person, or against a group or community, that either results in or has a high likelihood of resulting in injury, death, psychological harm, maldevelopment, or deprivation."*

The main conceptual framework to guide action to prevent violence is the ecological model from a public health approach, which deconstructs violence into a combination of risk factors through different spheres of socialization of the child or adolescent. The ecological model identifies entry points for interventions as risk factors are more or less prominent depending on the age group, gender, status and the context, and no one risk factor explains the manifestation of violence. Instead, the accumulation of risk factors makes individuals more prone to become perpetrators or victims of violence.

Recognizing that violence and stress and adversity are often heightened during and in the aftermath of a crisis or emergency and building on the ecological model, it is clear that responses to Education in Emergencies and Protracted Crises (EiEPC) present specific challenges that require heightened risk mitigation and enhanced protective interventions to break the cycle of violence and respond appropriately to violence. This conceptual framework focuses on root causes, and not just on manifestations or symptoms of violence. As such, this Guidance Note acknowledges that the patriarchal system that sustains the (ab)use of power over others and thus justifies the use of violence is one of - if not the - main root cause for violence. Gender transformation, inclusion and violence prevention therefore always need to be linked and build of each other to make schools places where all girls and boys in all their diversity are safe to learn.

PURPOSE, AUDIENCE AND SCOPE OF THE GUIDANCE

This joint Safe To Learn-Education Cannot Wait Guidance Note is specifically designed to assist ECW grantees to embed violence prevention and response in their work; it is also easily adaptable for other practitioners in the field working in EiEPC. It synthesizes information from available resources to provide a quick and easy to follow step-by-step reference for professionals working in EiEPC settings and identifies entry points for education programs; its annexes provide additional background information.

The focus of this Guidance is on the steps that EiEPC practitioner can take to reduce risk factors for any form of violence: psychological, emotional, physical, and sexual; among peers, or from adults to children, be it adults known to students or strangers. It acknowledges the multi-layered vulnerabilities of boys, girls and adolescents when they are forcibly displaced, in particular for refugees. It also takes into account the specific risk factors for children and adolescents with disabilities and/or diverse backgrounds. Gender equality, as a fundamental human right and necessary component of ending violence in and through schools, informs this Guidance Note throughout. Whilst STL and ECW acknowledge that specific resources and frameworks do exist for gender-based violence in emergencies and school-related gender-based violence, this guidance explicitly refers to these specialized resources.

The Guidance Note follows the operational stages of a project or program cycle, from planning and design, implementation, to monitoring and evaluation. Readers are encouraged to go to the sections that directly interest them or use the overall guidance as an introduction to the topic and a support resource when working on violence prevention in EiEPC. While these guidelines emphasize crises and emergencies focused on conflict, attacks against schools and forced displacements, they are also designed to be adaptable to all emergencies and protracted crises. This guidance should be considered in conjunction with ECW's related guidance and standards – including [ECW's Mental Health and Psychosocial Support \(MHPSS\) in EiEPC Technical Guidance Note](#) and [MHPSS in EiEPC Indicator Library](#), [ECW's Disability Policy and Accountability Framework](#) and [ECW guidance on the integration of GBV risk mitigation measures in ECW-supported investments](#).

It is acknowledged that many of the professionals working on EiEPC may not have been trained on violence prevention and response. While this Guidance Note does not replace formal training, it is hoped is that it will increase awareness of what can be done and make it easier to adopt a proactive approach towards preventing violence in and through schools when providing education services in the aftermath of an emergency or in a protracted crisis.

I. PLANNING

The first phase of the program cycle requires that partners carry out a needs analysis based on evidence that will support the design of the prevention and response interventions. Given the importance of the legal and policy environment on progressing the school-related agenda, this first phase should involve mapping laws and policy frameworks in place as well as mapping the actors and stakeholders in this field to ensure that a coordinated and multi-sectoral approach is adopted from the beginning. This phase also requires the gathering of existing data and information and, where this is lacking and possible, collecting such data.

1. Mapping the legal, policy and operational environment: In order to prevent and respond to violence in and around schools, partners need to be aware of the legal and policy framework in which they operate, where it supports or hinders interventions to prevent and respond to violence, and what else may be required to strengthen this framework. Key questions will be around:

- Which relevant international and regional instruments is the country signatory to?
- Has the country endorsed the [Safe Schools Declaration](#), the [GCPEA Protecting Schools from Military Use](#) and/or the [Safe to Learn Call to Action](#)?
- Which national laws have been enacted that support the prevention of and response to violence in and around schools including legislation on corporal punishment prohibition?

It may also be useful to look at the education sector policies including school-related gender-based violence and Prevention of Sexual Abuse and Protection (PSEA) code of conduct, inclusion of diversity, classroom management, socio-emotional learning.

- Are these laws implemented?
- Who are the actors involved in their implementation at national, regional and local levels?
- What is needed to enhance the implementation of the existing framework, in particular when it comes to boys, girls and adolescents at heightened risk of being left behind?

It would also be helpful to conduct a curriculum review to assess whether content and curriculum, including textbooks, may be perpetuating harmful social norms that normalize violence against children and adolescents.

Partners may also wish to consider mapping potential risks and barriers to accessing education services through the use of the Availability, Accessibility, Acceptability and Quality Framework developed by the Global Education Cluster, which aims to identify the barriers that impede access to services and increase the risk of multiple forms of gender-based violence in and around schools.

2. Mapping who is doing what: ECW partners and others are not intervening in a silo, thus looking for points of convergence and synergies on which to build is an effective approach to adopt.

- Who else is working in the area of school violence prevention and/or response? What are their interventions?
- Which capacities and resources are available in the crisis-affected areas? Are there any local Child Protection Area of Responsibility (CP AoR) and/or other child protection actors functioning in this setting?

The mapping exercise should aim to identify how to build on these and connect school-related interventions to other existing relevant programs such as child protection, gender-based violence and their respective referral mechanisms. In line with the commitment at the Grand Bargain to enhance localization, this exercise should also engage local actors and map their capacities and gaps: these would include community leaders and champions, community and civil society organizations, including gender-led organizations and refugee-led organizations in areas hosting refugees.

3. Collecting and analysing data: Evidence-based programming requires data to inform the interventions needed and the prioritization of efforts, as well as a baseline to measure the impact of planned efforts. Partners may need to reach out to other sectors such as Health,

Mental Health and Psycho-Social Support (MHPSS), Child Protection and Gender-Based Violence for data they may have already collected. The data should be disaggregated by gender and informed by the diversity of the boys, girls and adolescents in the crisis-affected area(s), including where relevant, their status as refugees or internally displaced persons.

Education in Emergencies and Protracted Crises is a sector where there is a dearth of data and where data available may not be reliable or complete. What to do when there is no data on violence in and around schools?

The most important thing to acknowledge and retain is that collecting data on violence against children and adolescents is extremely sensitive and should be done only by trained professionals who know and commit to following the highest ethical guidelines. The risk of revictimization, among other risks, is high if data collection is not done properly – even with good intentions. The first collective responsibility is first and foremost to do no harm. Regarding gender-based violence data, it is essential to remember that obtaining prevalence and/or incidence data on GBV in emergencies is not advisable due to the methodological and contextual challenges related to undertaking population-based research on GBV in such settings.

When ethically sound data collection is not available, several methods can help gain a better understanding of risk and protective factors for violence in and around school.

- Focus group discussions asking about contexts and never personal experiences of violence. Focus groups can include girls, boys, and adolescents, as well as teachers, school personnel, caregivers, and community leaders, and should be representative of the diversity of the community. It is often better to organize separate groups. It is crucial that those leading focus groups do not mistake them with group therapy and are therefore vetted and have training in Do-No-Harm principles, Preventing Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (PSEA), GBV core concepts and safe disclosure. They should have received beforehand the most up-to-date local GBV and Child Protection referral pathways. These focus group discussions should never seek out child survivors of gender-based violence.
- Community marches, also called safety marches, from where students live to where they go to learn, asking them to identify unsafe spots along the route. Here too, different groups can be organized depending on the context: girls and boys in mixed and/or sex segregated groups; age groups; displacement status (refugees, IDPs); specific disability or any characteristic that could increase vulnerability to violence. Similarly, these safety marches can be done within the school or learning centre to identify blind and/or hot spots for risk of victimization.
- To establish a baseline, even if imperfect, safety perception surveys and safety audits are useful to monitor progress over time. They should be complemented with surveys capturing risk and protective factors for violence.
- Finally, validating findings with the school community helps make the assessment stronger and more legitimate. A wider sharing can be organized in the community if appropriate.

4. Identifying risks and ensuring the personal safety of all: These considerations are critical when a violence prevention lens is incorporated in the education response as this may

destabilize power dynamics. Therefore, respecting and enforcing confidentiality and the anonymity of beneficiaries and applying the guiding principles of the survivor-centred approach by practicing respect, safety and non-discrimination is extremely important to prevent revictimization and discrimination.

Service providers and staff also need to be aware of the reactions that challenge to power dynamics may produce. Mental health and psycho-emotional support should be available for all stakeholders, from focus group participants to those who collect the data.

5. Planning for an advocacy strategy. Violence prevention requires tailored advocacy interventions to enhance awareness of the various forms of violence in and around schools and the ways these can be prevented by various stakeholders: national and local education authorities, partners including local organizations, and communities, including refugee communities.

- The first step is to determine the willingness and capacity of the authorities present in the crisis-affected area(s) to work on violence in and through schools, what could be the barriers to addressing this form of violence, what is needed to engage the authorities into a dialogue, and who is best placed to engage. It is often useful to share some data such as those in the [Investment Case to End Violence in Schools](#) and bring that data to life by highlighting specific challenges, such as the difficulty for teachers and students to get to and from school. Partners should pay particular attention to the children most at risk of being left behind in such a dialogue, girls, children with disabilities and forcibly displaced children. Inviting the authorities to visit schools or learning centres and showing where students and teachers might be at risk of violence could help clarify the challenges at stake. At the national level, the advocacy strategy should encourage authorities to sign the [Safe Schools Declaration](#) or the [Safe to Learn Call to Action](#) as well as for the integration of GBV risk-reduction strategies into national and local laws and policies related to education, and allocate funding for sustainability.
- Communities play a central role in any EiEPC program. They know what their challenges are and are resourceful about solutions that may work. That said, communities are not a homogenous entity; members in the community may have interests that diverge substantially and may not be inclusive of girls' education for instance, or of the LGTQI+ community, or of refugees and internally displaced persons. Key for this engagement is to ensure that the various components of the communities are represented and driving the process, to build on local capacities and to identify community champions, including gender-led organizations, through this process. Working hand-in-hand with them will allow developing a participatory approach that in turn will increase chances for implementation and then results, in particular when the root causes of violence stem from the communities themselves and/or the relationships within and between these communities.
- The role of international organizations and donors in advocacy for violence prevention and response is also key and should be factored in. This will involve cross-sectoral collaboration as a sound response to school-related violence is multi-sectoral by nature. Having a coordinated approach with the Health, MHPSS, Child Protection, GBV and Gender Equality sectors will also help partners give visibility to and prioritize safe learning environments in the Humanitarian Response Plans, Refugee Response Plans, Education Sector Plan and others.

Setting up a Local Safe School Team

When interest is engaged and trust established, it may be worth exploring with the community the setting-up of a Safe School (or Learning Centre) Team that will be in charge of violence prevention and response coordination . Focusing on building the Team's capacity in preventing and responding to violence through short workshops with methodologies they relate to their own lived experiences can be a very effective process to empower the communities in addressing violence in and around schools. These teams will coordinate with the partner(s) to co-create action plans where child participation is encouraged, and make sure that vulnerable and excluded groups - including female adolescents and girls, forcibly displaced persons, and children with disabilities - are effectively represented. These teams can be part of Parent-Teacher Associations and Community Engagement Committees or be ad hoc depending on the context and level of community organization.

6. Preparing for the Design Phase

Costing: As violence prevention interventions are expected to be mainstreamed throughout the various education response components, the specific costs are usually a small portion of each component. That said, it is important to include enough resources for the training of all stakeholders, required construction work e.g. gender segregated latrines, dedicated implementing agencies, and ethical monitoring and evaluation. Whenever possible, multi-year resources are critical to produce results in particular with regard longer-term violence prevention interventions.

Selecting indicators: The monitoring and evaluation part of a project or program gains from being thought through during the preparatory phase. The keyword here is pragmatism. Too often, efforts to prevent violence in and through schools cannot be properly assessed because of unrealistic ambitions or too little risk taking. Finding the right balance is at the core of this exercise. Monitoring systems need to capture meaningful progress – not just outputs. Outcome indicators need to be measured safely. **This cannot be stressed enough: the highest imperative of any violence prevention undertaking is to do no harm.**

Depending on the context and available resources, violence prevention and response-related indicators can be mainstreamed in the education program monitoring framework and incorporated in the instruments designed for the whole education response. For instance, simple questions focusing on risk and protective factors for violence can be added to planned surveys. In addition to the [Safe to Learn Global Programmatic Framework and Benchmarking Tool](#), the table below includes selected indicators that are relevant to EiEPC setting where traditional surveys are difficult to be undertaken. All indicators need to be disaggregated by sex, grade level, age, displacement status, disability, and any other relevant characteristics to allow for a finer understanding of progress and challenges.

Variable	Indicator
School climate/ safety perception	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of ECW-supported learning spaces that have a code of conduct that is enforced whereby teachers and communities were trained/informed on its application • Teachers' levels of understanding on codes of conduct • Percentage of students reporting feeling safe at school or learning centre
Attendance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of missed school days due to safety concerns (in or on the way to and from school) in past month
Corporal punishment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of students currently attending school who report being physically punished by a teacher in the past 12 months
Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of students who trust their teachers will help and protect them if needed
Gender Equality/ Inclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of students who report believing that all girls and boys in all their diversity are equal and have the same right to pursue quality education • Number of ECW-supported teachers who demonstrate more equitable gender attitudes and beliefs
Gender-Based Violence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of learning spaces with GBV risk mitigation measures implemented • Number of female teachers in ECW supported schools/learning spaces that report feeling their school environment is safe for women, gender inclusive and supportive to female teachers

II. DESIGN

Effectively incorporating a violence prevention and response lens in the design of education in emergencies and protracted crisis programs requires looking for **synergies with other important objectives** by the Health, Child Protection and Gender-Based Violence sectors in particular, and build on these while ensuring **the prioritization of quality interventions with continuity, correct targeting and relevant measurement.**

Violence is the result of an accumulation of context-based risk factors - no one single risk factor explains violence by itself alone. As such, several interventions targeting different risk factors are often needed in a given community or school to address the multi-causality of violence. Further, perpetrators of violence have often experienced violence themselves; and a person can simultaneously be perpetrator and victim. Participatory processes involving the Safe School (or Learning Centre) Teams is more likely to be an effective mechanism to prevent and reduce violence in and through school.



Inclusion and targeting

The most protective factor from violence is for a girl, a boy or an adolescent to be and to stay at school. As such, all efforts targeted at enrolling out-of-school children and adolescents are precious, not only to the children themselves but to the whole community. As violence results from layers of discrimination, children and adolescents exhibiting differences are more prone to be discriminated against and are also at higher risk of both being victimized and perpetrating violence. Consequently, violence prevention and inclusion efforts always need to work together.

While this Guidance Note encourages universal interventions that prevent and respond to violence in and around schools targeting all children and adolescents, and mainstreamed in education programs and systems, partners may need to go beyond and also consider interventions that focus on girls, boys and adolescents at heightened risk, or children and adolescents who have already been victimized or have perpetrated violence. This can be done through after-school and/or specifically tailored programs. This is where targeting is important to ensure relevant interventions are designed for those most in need.



Below are suggested entry points to make the design of school-related violence prevention and response efficient and effective. By no means are they exhaustive. Yet, considering how they could be incorporated in the education in emergency or protracted crisis response should give a solid program design. Quality, and continuity are key factors to produce results; if one is missing, chances that an intervention will have a positive impact are lessened.

1. Attack prevention and preparedness: In conflict contexts, where schools and/or education at large are under attack, partners should ask themselves how they can embed interventions that enable learning spaces and schools to have protection committees, early warning systems that allow education personnel to warn and transfer students and staff to safe locations and alert parents, as well as contingency plans such as alternative delivery of education. Given the limitations on humanitarian access, using a community-based approach and localising the response, with the necessary capacity building involved in such approaches may help strengthen the program. Collaboration with UNMAS and the Protection Cluster could help restore access in case mines were used.

It is also important for partners to ensure a gender lens is applied in case girls and/or boys are targeted because of their gender as part of the attacks on education. In such contexts, programming would gain from a **targeting approach for girls** as well as the engagement and mobilization of local women organizations, if possible with local knowledge and expertise, and the strengthening of referral mechanisms.

As such contexts tend to be extremely complex with state armed forces, non-state armed groups, private security groups and/or terrorist groups potentially involved, designing an advocacy strategy to prevent attacks against schools and/or education may be an important component of the program.

2. Recruiting female teachers whenever possible: In addition to supporting gender equality through gender transformative interventions, the recruitment of female teachers is an effective way to prevent violence as female teachers tend to use corporal punishment and sexual harassment less than their male counterparts. It is also an effective **GBV mitigation risk measure** at school. The program should also foresee the training of these teachers to ensure they are aware of violence in and around school and are empowered to address it.

3. Training of educational staff in violence awareness, emergency preparedness, disaster risk reduction, risk management, xenophobia and gender-based violence risk mitigation may also help prevent violence in and around schools and embed response measures in the program. Training should incentivize positive discipline in class, positive pedagogy and classroom management, how teachers can embed MHPSS and social-emotional learning into their everyday interactions with students and the classroom environment, and help teachers react when they observe violence among students. Training should also raise awareness of the school Code of Conduct on bullying and corporal punishment. Mine risk education activities may also need to be planned for in contexts where mines are used in attacks against schools.

However, training in and as of itself is unlikely to result in significant and sustainable violence prevention; hence the importance to ensure that teachers are heard on how best to incentivize behavioural change at school in their specific context. Quality training is not a one-time activity; it is an on-going process that is followed up with genuinely supporting professional supervision. In some situations, this may involve engaging with teachers' unions as they often have the power to accelerate or block teachers' engagement in preventing violence in and through schools. Embedding violence prevention training in wider system-strengthening approaches also further enhances the sustainability of efforts on this front.

Existing training programs will need to be reviewed, objectively assessed, strengthened or adapted with in mind the specific school context at hand and an intersectional violence, gender, inclusion and diversity lens. In contexts with forcibly displaced children and adolescents, the training may need to take into account the specific forms of violence that develop in contexts of discrimination, xenophobia and/or racism against LGBTQ+ population, refugees and internally displaced children.

The education in emergencies response could also be further strengthened by programming for training for school counsellors in school-related violence detection. In partnership with the Child Protection and Gender-Based Violence sectors, school staff's (including teachers, school counsellors, and/or a PSS focal point) capacity to identify girls and boys (including adolescents) at risk could be further developed and referral mechanisms connecting schools to expert service providers established or strengthened. In many settings, those **referral pathways** are incomplete, or lack enforceability. As such, understanding limitations is key to prevent revictimization and further harm. When protection services are unable to provide timely and child-friendly services, arrangements can be made with civil society organizations (CSOs) specializing in child protection and gender-based violence, with trained personnel who follow high ethical requirements when working with children. When schools or learning centres do not have counsellors, as will often be the case, it is best practice if there is a highly trained and caring psychosocial support focal point at the school and that all school staff are trained on how to respond in an appropriate manner when a girl or a boy reaches out to disclose an experience of violence needs to be prioritized.

4. ECW requires that education in emergencies and protracted crisis programs to include a mental health and psychosocial support (MHPSS) as a key precursor to children being able to learn and teachers being able to teach. In contexts where violence in and around schools is also an issue, MHPSS may address the effects of the ongoing violence experienced by all or some of the boys and girls. MHPSS may also help prevent violence by reducing the potential that survivors of violence may in turn also use violence in and around school.

5. Supporting teachers' mental health: Teachers have experienced the same stress and adversity due to the emergency or protracted crisis as learners (and the community at wide). Because of this, it may be essential to address issues relating to their own mental health and plan for MHPSS interventions that support them too.

6. Code of Conduct and Safeguarding: ECW-supported schools are encouraged to develop strong inclusive codes of conduct for both teachers and students that enhance gender equality and the protection and well-being of children with disabilities and of forcibly displaced children in schools and in their communities, in order to reduce harmful attitudes and stigmatization. ECW-supported programs are also expected to program for the delivery of training to teachers and communities to ensure these are informed on existing Codes of Conduct and their application.

7. Curriculum: In many contexts, a systems-approach may require a review of existing curricula to embed violence prevention. As with teachers' training, partners are encouraged to look for synergies to streamline violence prevention in other modules on gender equality, MHPSS, positive discipline and positive pedagogy/classroom management, and/or social-emotional learning. These modules are directly linked to violence mitigating risk factors or enhancing protective factors. As such, there is no need to multiply modules; instead attention should be given to the quality and continuity of the curriculum.

8. Construction: Incorporating a violence prevention lens in the built environment is another important mainstreaming step. The guiding principle is to always allow for natural surveillance and eliminate hidden corners to reduce opportunities for violence to happen. Keeping schools well maintained and repaired and inviting students to improve the appearance of the school through paintings and murals are other useful activities. Corridors and sanitation facilities for boys and girls should be separate, easily accessible, well-lit and have a lock in the inside. Where schools may be under attack, strengthening school safety infrastructure through measures that include building boundary walls may be recommended.

9. Safe routes to school: The participatory mapping exercise during the planning phase will have revealed hot spots on the way to and from schools. It is important to repeat these mapping exercises regularly as conditions keep changing. In addition to clearing the way (removal of litter or other sight-blocking elements), ensuring positive natural surveillance including by training and rewarding street vendors, “walking buses” or similar mechanisms where parents and/or trusted community members take turn in accompanying groups of students to the school. In contexts where girls are at heightened risk of violence around school, the program could also design mechanisms to support the safe transportation of girls such as cash based interventions.



III. IMPLEMENTATION

The implementation stage is full of challenges and requires flexibility and constant adaptability. This is why focusing on risk and protective factors for violence is so important; this allows the response to build a surveillance system that adapts to events while keeping the course of action focused on what matters to build up resilience and prevent violence in and through schools.

The implementation phase, during which partners are in close and regular contact with the children and adolescents they seek to reach, their teachers and communities, is the ideal time to ensure partners proactively and regularly draw on their perspectives and ask for their feedback on the interventions and key aspects of partners' performance, including service quality, relevance, appropriateness and responsiveness to their concerns. This two-way engagement with students, teachers, school personnel, caregivers, community members, including girls and women, children with disabilities, forcibly displaced persons, and local actors in particular MHPSS-led, Women-Led and Refugee-Led Organizations, provides a solid feedback loop mechanism during the implementation phase. This ongoing dialogue should take place through channels that the communities prefer and with which they feel safe. It should also aim to enhance partners' understanding of the communities' practices, capacities and coping strategies throughout the implementation phase, and serve as a basis to strengthen community engagement and empowerment as well as localisation.

STL and ECW are committed to the prevention of sexual abuse and exploitation (PSEA). As such, partners should ensure they have put in place safe, confidential, appropriate, equitable and inclusive mechanisms to register, refer, investigate and respond to survivors' and at-risk person's protection issues, and facilitate access to quality support for sexual abuse and exploitation.





IV. MONITORING AND EVALUATION

The purpose of monitoring and evaluation is to learn and strengthen programming. This ongoing two-way feedback communication channel between partners and school-related communities is about exchanging information and learning. It is also and fundamentally about managing the performance of the interventions and seeking to ensure effective action is taken in response to inputs received. This should be done in tandem with monitoring and evaluation focused on MHPSS, gender and disability inclusion.

Monitoring systems need to capture meaningful progress – not just outputs. Outcome indicators, identified and selected in the Planning phase, need to be measured safely as the highest imperative of any violence prevention undertakings is to do no harm.

Reliable data disaggregated by sex, age, diversity and status, is crucial to informing the response to violence. In contexts where stakeholder capacity allows it, school-related violence case reporting and data management may be supported to collect, safely store and analyze harmonized data on violence in and around schools in crisis settings. Case reporting and data management should aim to enhance service provision in response to violence in and around schools as well as data and trends analysis to support better violence prevention. Key to such endeavour is the safe and ethical sharing of reported violence incident data.



Safe to Learn



**EDUCATION
CANNOT
WAIT**

The global fund for education in emergencies

