

INEE Working Group on Education in Emergencies Data
Work Stream 4: Data Standards

Background and rationale:

As part of the INEE Data Summit Action Agenda, it was acknowledged that lack of a core set of common indicators with agreed definitions and methodologies is an identified gap across the sector. Measurement of the situation of education and response is fragmented amongst EiE actors but also in relation to the development sector. This makes changes over time and comparisons between groups and countries increasingly inaccurate as different data sources are aggregated. While every agency will have their own indicators aligned with their own priorities, a common core set would greatly facilitate improved data coherence within the EiE sector and also across humanitarian and development actors working in EiE.

The Summit therefore suggested that there should be a common core set of indicators, agreed upon by a broad range of humanitarian and development actors, connected to the INEE Minimum Standards, that all organizations can use as a reference. It is expected that progress made in the area of indicators definitions and synergies will support the work done by any organization and donor working in the field of education (EiE and development) but also other INEE RG on EiE Data workstreams by improving standards for data production, analysis, use, and sharing.

Priority Areas:

1. Map and assess existing EiE indicators building off the work already being carried out by UIS, INEE and the GEC, and including an examination of EiE data that is currently available. For example, the following types of indicators could be reviewed, amongst others:
 - a. Indicators that can measure the severity of humanitarian crises.
 - b. Response indicators.
 - c. Programme indicators.
2. Develop recommendations on how to promote uptake of these indicators across agencies and governments.

Potential Outputs:

1. Core set of agreed-upon EiE indicators that measure, at minimum, severity, response and programme evaluation.
2. Set of recommendations on how to promote uptake of these indicators across agencies and governments.
3. Matrix linking EiE indicators with INEE MS (potentially linking with outcome-level indicators developed by WS 3).

Proposed Process:

1. Map and assess existing EiE severity, response, and programme evaluation indicator banks, building off the work already being carried out by UIS, INEE and the GEC, and including an examination of available EiE data in order to identify gaps and synergies.

2. Select 1-2 topics (i.e. response indicators) to begin with and pilot a process of examining existing indicators in depth, carrying out consultations with those responsible for collecting and using that data, and build buy-in for a process of standardizing a set of 1-3 core indicators (per topic) among relevant agencies and governments.
3. Learn from the process described in Step 2 and repeat for the other topics, liaising with other groups (i.e. DRG workstreams, INEE groups) as appropriate for specific topics.
4. Carry out consultations and build consensus around the emerging set of core indicators.
5. Finalize the core set of indicators and methodologies along with guidance for agencies and governments on how to promote uptake.