



**INEE Education Policy Working Group
Safe and Resilient Education Systems**

***Please be sure that you assign a note taker to take notes and capture any action points. Email all minutes to Margi.*

Meeting Date: Thursday, November 7th

Time: 8h30-11h EST

[Call-in Link](#)

[Google Sites Link for Documents](#)

Call host: Lauren Gerken (INEE)

Facilitators: Filipa Schmits Guinote (ICRC) and Muriel Gschwend (SDC)

Notetaker: Lauren Gerken (INEE)

Participants (remove members who are not able to attend virtual meeting):

- Maria Agnese Giordano (Global Education Cluster) - Geneva, Switzerland
- Filipa Schmitz Guinote - Co-convener - (ICRC) - Geneva, Switzerland
- Muriel Gschwend (SDC) - Co-convener - Bern, Switzerland
- ~~Leonora MacEwen (UNESCO IIEP) - Paris, France~~
- Jacqueline Mosselson (UMass Amherst) - Amherst, USA
- Nicolas Herbecq (ECHO) - Nairobi, Kenya

Agenda:

- ~~Introduction with update on work over the last 6 months including presentation of current [concept note](#) and Q&A (Filipa, 15 Min)~~
- Review and finalize [consultancy ToR](#) and clarify funding and HR issues (required qualifications, hiring process, supervision) with INEE Secretariat (Muriel, 1 h)
- Agree on the composition of the Reference Group and outreach to possible referees (Filipa, 40 Min)
- Identify questions for SPWG and AWG to be asked during Cross-Working Group meeting (Muriel, 20 Min)
- Agree on action points for the next 6 months (Filipa, 20 Min)

Notes:

- Introduction with update on work over the last 6 months including presentation of current concept note and Q&A (Filipa, 15 Min)
 - Not going to discuss the concept note, as all of the people on this call already discussed the concept note on the last call.
- Review and finalize [consultancy ToR](#) and clarify funding and HR issues (required qualifications, hiring process, supervision) with INEE Secretariat (Muriel, 1 h)

- ToR has been reshaped more towards impact monitoring of school safety and security measures
- Parts highlighted in yellow need to be clarified. Review the scope and the deliverables
- Comments on summary and rationale:
 - Some discrepancies between the objectives, scope and outputs. Doesn't follow the same line of thought
 - Might help to start from the objectives and see how everything follows from there.
 - Not clear how the desk review and key informant interviews relate to each other
 - Need to ensure that the product is useful and achievable
 - Beef up the mapping —> goes back to feedback on the concept note
 - Could go back to the original plan for a more robust mapping
 - Clarify the purpose of the mapping and what specifically it would look at —> clarify in the deliverables
 - Change the title of the first paragraph to “background”. Don't name the aims as aims for the consultancy, they're aims for the workstream more generally.
- Missing the audience - Why are we doing this and who are we doing it for?
 - There's a little in the summary, but it's very broad. Each component could be used by different groups. Refine this section a little.
 - Start with the background on INEE, then background on the SRES —> combine into one section
 - Add a separate section on the purpose of the consultancy —> clarify that this consultancy is focused on the first SRES aim
- Shorten the rationale
 - Should be more focused on why we're doing this work
 - Shorten the section on what we know and what we don't know
- Looking at contexts
 - This initiative looks at methodologies for measuring monitoring, not looking at impact from methodologies in certain contexts
 - If we want to have a section on how agencies are monitoring security related issues, it should be more general rather than focusing on specific programs in specific contexts
 - There are all of these frameworks, but it all depends on how it's being implemented. Interesting to look at how feasible/relevant M&E frameworks are on the ground.
 - It might be more useful if it's linked to a context
- Link the concept note in the ToR
- Indicative List of Protection Measures
 - Need to consider hardware and software issues. Might be more difficult to find someone who can do both.
 - Not about the expertise on hardware vs. software, more about including both in the scope

- Should look for someone with M&E experience
- Hardware measures should be included to capture interventions from agencies that may not be education agencies
- The mapping may add some measures
- Keep the list in the CN. Add a summary to the ToR.
- Scope and methodology
 - Bullet point 4: How are we determining which measures are effective? —> add “according to agencies and stakeholders”
 - Started more as finding out what agencies are doing and how they think about it, and it’s turned more into M&E of what agencies are doing
 - The proposed work is looking at how stakeholders and agencies connect the school safety and environment measures to improved quality of learning
- Deliverables
 - Inception report - I wonder what the inception report would have before the mapping
 - Clarify the expectations, develop a shared understanding
 - 40-50 days to do quite demanding work —> timing to do with moving the work forward
 - This timing may not be enough to realistically achieve these deliverables
 - Double the number of days
 - Maybe 2 consultants - one with M&E experiences
 - Budget is \$22,000
 - Develop a more realistic budget
 - Margi can find out if there’s flexibility
 - Could we do this in 2 stages?
 - Start with a mapping, which will determine the scope
 - Then another piece, building off of the mapping
 - Mapping (25 days)
 - Determine the relative weight of the different measures
 - Include evaluations, reviews, and assessments
 - Add authorities, local governments
 - There may not be much they can find in a desk review. If we include interviews in the mapping, they will need more time —> add stakeholder interviews
 - Include an overview of challenges of monitoring and impact for these measures?
 - Shorten the description
 - Leave the description more generic
 - Preliminary Findings workshop
 - Validate the findings
 - Stakeholder Interviews and a first draft of the analytical report (15 days)
 - Use to drill down to the findings of the mapping (remove the word “report”)

- Use interviews to further validate and contextualize findings
 - How to distinguish from the interviews in the mapping?
 - It's more of a discussion on learning environments, challenges, whether interventions are fit for purpose
 - More in depth process
 - What is done?
 - What is the framework for monitoring impact?
 - What impact has been measured and achieved in practice?
 - OR: What? Who? How? What are the interventions? Who is involved? How are we measuring the interventions?
 - Impact is too complicated to assess
- Do we need to split the mapping and the stakeholder interview report into separate deliverables?
 - Could merge into one report
 - The content is merged, but the schedule to check in could stay roughly the same
- Try to tie draft report to INEE Meetings to validate the report
- Final report (15 days)
 - 2 rounds of feedback - from stakeholders and SRES and Reference Group
 - Each round of comments will take at least 3 days to address
- **Plan to finalize the text offline.**
- Qualifications of potential candidates
 - Leave the # of years of experience at 6 for now. Consider increasing to a more senior position at a later date.
 - Staying open to a consultant team with expertise in M&E, EiE, CP
- Hiring process
 - Put together a workplan and a budget to clear through INEE Admin/Finance Officer
 - Finalize ToR and send to IRC legal and HR (can take 2 weeks)
 - Advertise through IRC and INEE websites
 - Vet the CVs and documents of the candidates
 - Hold interviews
 - Hire
 - Formal supervision through Margi, with the SRES
- Agree on the composition of the Reference Group and outreach to possible referees (Filipa, 40 Min)
 - Looking for subject matter experts - can also be interviewed as key informants
 - Wish to have more than just the usual suspects
 - But also include some of the usual suspects
 - GCPEA
 - NRC (working in EiE, CP and DRR) - Annelies on the SG or

Robin Salvage at NRC Mali

- UNICEF working on MRM and attacks on schools - Coco? [Saji Tomas](#) (Chief of Child Protection, based in Cairo), Laurent (peacekeeping side)
- EAA-PEIC (may be more involved in inception phases) - don't have subject matter experts
- Save the Children - at what level? Elise (global overview)?
- ECCN - Cornelia
- global partnership to end violence against children
- Safe to Learn
- Inputs from the child protection and peace keeping sectors, M&E experts
 - People that have more than an education background
- This could be a question for the SPWG - Is there anyone that has an M&E background
- Consultants that worked on the UNICEF Child Alert report
- Filipa to consider co-leading the RG
- Plan to reach out to potential RG members and get confirmation of names by the end of next week
 - Maria Agnese to support the development of a ToR for the Reference Group
 - Muriel to reach out to Laurent and Safe to Learn
 - Maria Agnese to Francesca
 - Filipa to GCPEA and Save (Elise for guidance on a field-based rep)
 - Jacqi to reach out to Cornelia
 - Nico to Robin
- Identify questions for SPWG and AWG to be asked during Cross-Working Group meeting (Muriel, 20 Min)
 - Do you have any suggestions for consultants or reference group members with expertise in M&E?
- Agree on action points for the next 6 months (Filipa, 20 Min)
 - Muriel and Filipa to finalize the ToR
 - Reach out to RG members
 - Schedule a call for the week of the 9th of December - plan to have next call on Zoom.