**Performance Indicator Reference Sheets for Conflict Sensitive Education Indicators**

The term conflict sensitive education (CSE) refers to the use of conflict analysis to plan and implement education programs in ways that minimize negative program impacts on local conflict dynamics and maximize positive impacts. Successful education programming in conflict and crisis-affected contexts depends on the conflict sensitivity of all aspects of program design and all phases of the program cycle, from choosing school sites to designing learning materials to activity monitoring practices.

In response to a 2016 analysis that showed minimal use of indicators for conflict-sensitive education in USAID project monitoring plans, the ECCN support team has developed these fourteen Performance Indicator Reference Sheets (along with a longer list of conflict-sensitive education indicators). Development of the indicators and PIRS has drawn upon conflict-sensitive education concepts and categories used in INEE, USAID, and other guidance and tools, as well as incorporating inputs from various conflict-sensitive education specialists.

This collection of PIRS is offered as a resource for USAID missions, their implementing partners, and other interested organizations. It provides concrete options for intentional and systematic measurement of conflict sensitivity aspects of education strategies, projects, and activities. While the developers hope that readers may find that this collection provides PIRS that are readily applicable with minor customization, their intention is equally to provide a resource that stimulates and inspires contextualized reflection on conflict-sensitive education priorities and on approaches to monitor and measure them.

Some important suggestions and clarifications for the use of these indicators and/or PIRS:

1) The indicators are all custom, though some of the indicators will produce data that can be used to report against standard foreign assistance indicators.

2) All indicators and PIRS will require an understanding of the conflict dynamics, and of how they interact with the education system in order to develop needed instruments and/or sampling approaches.

3) All examples of survey and checklist items provided in the PIRS are intended as illustrative and have not been piloted. Implementers should always pilot new items or new instruments.

4) The instrument development, sampling, and analysis approaches described in each of these PIRS assume the most common use: project monitoring (including CLA monitoring). If an indicator is to be used as an outcome measure in an impact evaluation, for a situational analysis or needs assessment, or for other types of evaluations, then the instrument development, sampling, and analysis should be duly adapted.

5) These indicators should always be used in an M&E plan that has thoroughly integrated Do No Harm and Conflict Sensitivity principles.

N.B. Within the text of the PIRS, the term “project” is used in the sense most familiar to implementing partners (IPs). It thus refers to a specific, time-bound program for which an award has been made by USAID (or another donor). It is understood that USAID missions officially refer to such IP-contracted programs as “activities”, and that they reserve the term “project” for broader groupings of such “activities” designed to contribute to common outcomes.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Number | Indicator name |
| [CSE-2](#CSE_2) | [Education sector strategy document's score on Conflict Sensitivity checklist/assessment](#CSE_2) |
| [CSE-5](#CSE_5) | [Number and percentage of ministry of education / district administrators and officials satisfactorily completing customized training on conflict sensitivity in education](#CSE_5) |
| [CSE-7](#CSE_7) | [Conflict Sensitivity checklist score of activity's annual internal implementation quality review](#CSE_7) |
| [CSE-10](#CSE_10) | [Absence of conflict insensitive content from teaching and learning materials](#CSE_10) |
| [CSE-17](#CSE_17) | [Number and percentage of parents reporting that parent-school cooperation mechanisms are inclusive](#CSE_17) |
| [CSE-23](#CSE_23) | [Number and percentage of parents who perceive schooling as inclusive](#CSE_23) |
| [CSE-25](#CSE_25) | [Number of attendees at project-supported events promoting conflict reduction/avoidance](#CSE_25) |
| [CSE-26](#CSE_26) | [Number and percentage of teachers whose instruction and classroom management sufficiently meets conflict sensitive practice standards](#CSE_26) |
| [CSE-27](#CSE_27) | [Number of teachers/head teachers completing appropriate contextualized training in conflict sensitive pedagogy and classroom management](#CSE_27) |
| [CSE-32](#CSE_32) | [Number and percentage of learners who perceive their school as inclusive](#CSE_32) |
| [CSE-35](#CSE_35) | [Number and percentage of students reporting positive perceptions of students from other identity groups](#CSE_35) |
| [CSE-40](#CSE_40) | [Number and percentage of students that learn in a familiar language](#CSE_40) |
| [CSE-41](#CSE_41) | [Number and percentage of students active in extracurricular clubs with a peacebuilding/tolerance focus](#CSE_41) |
| [CSE-43](#CSE_43) | [Number of functioning schools per capita](#CSE_43) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | |
| **Category** | Ministry/State Partners |
| **Result Level** | Output |
| **Name of Indicator:** | **CSE-2. Education sector strategy document’s score on Conflict Sensitivity checklist/assessment** |
| **DESCRIPTION** | |
| **Standard or Custom Indicator:** | Custom |
| **Precise Definition(s):** | **An education sector strategy document** includes the education sector plan or any related documents at the national level. At the sub-national level, it can include operating plans or other documents that articulate the goal, resources, approaches, or accountability mechanisms for the education sector.  **Conflict sensitivity in education involves:**  • Understanding the conflict-relevant aspects of the context in which the system, organization, or program is operating, particularly inter-group relations;  • Understanding the interactions between interventions and the context/group relations; and  • Acting upon the understanding of these interactions in order to minimize negative impacts and maximize positive impacts of a policy, strategy, program, or other intervention.  A minimum requirement of being conflict sensitive is to “do no harm”. However, a conflict sensitive education strategy may go further by intentionally promoting inclusion and equitable access, and even aim to actively transform tension and support peace by teaching respect for diversity, as well as local, national, and global citizenship.  To measure the conflict sensitivity of an education strategy document, a customized low inference checklist can be derived from existing conflict sensitivity guidance and checklists specific to the education sector. ***Low-inference*** means that a scoring decision for each item requires little interpretive or inferential reasoning on the part of raters.  The checklist should reflect existing standards in conflict-sensitive education, and may also include contextually-relevant domains. On the whole, the checklist should rate the conflict-sensitivity of an education strategy document by focusing on the completeness of its analysis of the conflict and of how conflict interacts with the education system, and on the degree to which its strategic objectives, priorities or actions are responsive to the conflict drivers.  For existing conflict sensitivity guidance and checklists specific to the education sector, see especially:   * [*INEE Reflection Tool*](https://inee.org/system/files/resources/INEE_CSE_Reflection_Tool_EN.pdf); * [*USAID Checklist for Conflict Sensitivity in Education Programs*](https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1865/USAID_Checklist_Conflict_Sensitivity_14FEB27_cm.pdf); * [*Guidelines for Transitional Education Plan Preparation (GPE/IIEP)*](https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000244900) *(esp. annexes 1 and 2);* * [*How to Guide to Conflict Sensitivity (Conflict Sensitivity Consortium*).](https://actionaid.org/sites/default/files/conflict_sensitivity_how_to_guide_-_feb_2012.pdf)     The customized conflict-sensitivity checklist can be scored in a way that is appropriate for the project.  Provided here are ***illustrative*** checklist domains and items (derived from the above-listed tools):  **Equity of Access**:   * Does the education strategy document clearly articulate an understanding of how the conflict creates or exacerbates barriers to educational access? * Does the education strategy document provide description and analysis of known disparities among various population sub-groups with regard to access to and completion of primary education? (These may include disparities along ethnic or religious lines, or refugee, displacement, or former combatant status.) * Does the sector strategy document outline concrete strategies and approaches to improve equity of access for identified sub-groups? * Does the sector strategy document propose relevant educational options available for all children and adolescents, such as accelerated or alternative options for over-age children who have never been to school or who have missed significant periods?   **Funding and Implementing Partners:**   * Does the sector strategy document provide a clear, context specific message about the importance of conflict sensitivity to donors and implementing partners? * Does the sector strategy document specify conflict sensitivity requirements for donor and implementing partner cooperation?   **Classroom Level:**   * *Language of Instruction* - Does the sector strategy document acknowledge conflict sensitivity implications of the Language of Instruction policy and address them via implementation strategies? * *Curriculum content* - Does the sector strategy document describe approaches to ensure the conflict sensitivity of official curriculum and teaching and learning materials (i.e., they are free of biased content and accessible to the needs of all learners)?   **Teachers:**   * *Recruitment -* Does the sector strategy document include measures to ensure equitable opportunities for employment in the teaching corps? * *Posting -* Does the sector strategy document explicitly address conflict sensitivity implications of the postings of trained teachers (e.g., to various sub-national regions and communities? * *Training -* Does the sector strategy document include plans for conflict sensitivity training to be included in pre- and in-service teacher courses?   Additional illustrative domains for which items could be developed include:   * Resource distribution (e.g., geographically, among identity groups) * Siting of school construction, rehabilitation, district offices etc. * Procurement policy * Parental/community governance and participation * Safety of learners and teachers |
| **Unit of Measure:** | Conflict sensitive education checklist score |
| **Disaggregated by:** | N/A |
| **Rationale or Justification for indicator *(optional)*:** | The indicator provides insight into the level of conflict sensitivity of an education authority’s current education strategies, and thus into Ministry’s (and government’s) understanding, capacity, and will to apply conflict sensitive principles in planning. The indicator is most relevant for projects that include a focus on supporting the creation of education sector strategies or plans. The checklist can indicate changes to the level of conflict sensitivity detected in revisions or updates to strategies over time if used appropriately. |
| **PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION** | |
| **Data Source:** | Conflict-sensitive education checklist applied to strategy documents |
| **Method of data collection and construction:** | Document or documents are reviewed and scored using the conflict-sensitive education document checklist. Review ideally conducted by a committee including M&E and relevant technical experts, reaching consensus on scoring. (See document links and illustrative items above.) |
| **Reporting Frequency:** | Upon creation or revision of relevant documents |
| **DATA QUALITY ISSUES** | |
| **Known Data Limitations:** | Reliability of ratings over time, especially if there is turnover in relevant staffing. |
| **Actions Taken or Planned to Address the Data Limitation** | The checklist is intended to be *low inference*, meaning that a scoring decision for each item requires little interpretive or inferential reasoning on the part of raters. The checklist items could therefore be simple binary (yes/no), or at most have a third possible response level (such as “partially”). The illustrative questions above are intended to lend themselves to this approach, which favors reliability across raters and across applications of the checklist. A committee approach to applying the checklist is recommended. If the indicator is used to track conflict-sensitivity over time for updated strategy documents, the same committee should be convened to the extent possible. |
| **THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON October 3, 2019** | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | |
| **Category** | Ministry/State Partners |
| **Result Level** | Output |
| **Name of Indicator:** | **CSE-5. Number and percentage of ministry of education / district administrators and officials satisfactorily completing customized training on conflict sensitivity in education** |
| **DESCRIPTION** | |
| **Standard or Custom Indicator:** | Custom |
| **Precise Definition(s):** | This indicator counts the number and percentage of education ministry administrators and officials at central and decentralized levels who complete a customized training course in Conflict Sensitive Education (e.g., appropriately adapted from the essential content of the INEE course for the target audience).  For the purposes of this indicator, *education administrators and officials* are individuals involved in the organization, management, operations, and support systems within the education system and employed by the Ministry of Education and its decentralized departments and offices. Their roles do not involve teaching or direct instruction of students. Examples include, but are not limited to, the following: principals; superintendents; head teachers; coaches; trainers; inspectors; technical specialists; managers; etc.  Ministry of Education administrators and officials who benefit from the services or training delivered by the individuals or organizations directly trained by the partner as part of a deliberate service delivery strategy (e.g. cascade training) are counted.  **Satisfactory training completion** must be defined for the context in terms of minimum hours of verified attendance at a structured training and/or by a passing score on an assessment administered post-training. A certificate may or may not be issued at the end of a professional development activity.  **Customized training** refers to a training on conflict-sensitive education that has been duly adapted to the capacity, experience, and prior relevant knowledge of the targeted ministry and/or district staff learners.  **Conflict sensitivity in education** involves:  • Understanding the conflict-relevant aspects of the context in which the system, organization, or program is operating, particularly inter-group relations;  • Understanding the interactions between interventions and the context/group relations; and  • Acting upon the understanding of these interactions in order to minimize negative impacts and maximize positive impacts of a policy, strategy, program, or other intervention.  When calculating the total number of education administrators and officials each administrator and official should be counted only once (regardless of how many conflict-sensitive education professional development activities he or she successfully completed).  **\*Relationship to ES.1-12:** This indicator can be used to report against ES.1-12 if the USAID mission chooses ES.1-12 as a CDCS or PPR indicator. The definition and disaggregates are fully aligned. The value add of this indicator is that it specifically tracks two types of information: (a) the content of the training and (b) the coverage of the training within a project area. If the project proposes to spend a large share of time or budget on this type of training or if the knowledge acquired in the training is a critical step in the theory of change then using this indicator instead of ES.1-12 may be appropriate. |
| **Unit of Measure:** | Number and percentage of administrators and officials (persons) |
| **Disaggregated by:** | Central and regional offices, number of males, number of females, number of officials or administrators who are crisis- or conflict-affected  \* See USAID Education Policy for the definition of crisis- or conflict-affected |
| **Rationale or Justification for indicator *(optional)*:** | The indicator highlights the diligence of the project in terms of outreach and providing opportunities to increase MoE understanding of conflict-sensitive education and the capacity to plan and implement accordingly. |
| **PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION** | |
| **Data Source:** | Verified attendance forms; CSE training post-tests |
| **Method of data collection and construction:** | * Attendance at training sessions should be verified at least twice daily to ensure minimum hours attended. Where possible, eligible staff names and unique IDs should be pre-populated in attendance forms, ideally tablet- or laptop-based. * Where training post-tests of CSE knowledge are used to assess satisfactory completion, the assessment must be valid, and its administration proctored. * For reporting the *percentage* of staff, the numerator is those satisfactorily completing the training, and the denominator is all administrators and officials identified as eligible within the project’s targeted central and decentralized ministry offices. |
| **Reporting Frequency:** | Quarterly |
| **Known Data Limitations:** | Challenge to verification of attendance throughout full hours of training; counting ineligible trainees or double counting trainees; possible irregularities in post-test completion. |
| **Actions Taken or Planned to Address the Data Limitation** | Trainees should be enrolled by invitation only. Attendance forms (ideally electronic) should be pre-populated with names and unique IDs (created by the project if needed). Post-training assessments should be carefully proctored. Where feasible, post-test assessments could be individually administered electronically. |
| **THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON October 3, 2019** | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | |
| **Category** | Activity Management |
| **Result Level** | Output |
| **Name of Indicator:** | **CSE-7. Conflict sensitivity checklist score of project’s quarterly implementation.** |
| **DESCRIPTION** | |
| **Standard or Custom Indicator:** | Custom |
| **Precise Definition(s):** | The indicator measures the conflict sensitivity of a project’s implementation by assessing the conflict-sensitivity of implemented *work plan activities* from the previous quarter using a customized conflict sensitive education checklist tool.  **Conflict sensitivity in education** includes:  • Understanding the conflict-relevant aspects of the context in which the system, organization, or program is operating, particularly inter-group relations;  • Understanding the interactions between interventions and the context/group relations; and  • Acting upon the understanding of these interactions in order to minimize negative impacts and maximize positive impacts of a program or other intervention.  A minimum requirement of being conflict sensitive is to “do no harm”—keeping in mind the impact of education assistance on conflict. However, a conflict sensitive education approach may go further by intentionally striving to promote inclusion and equitable access, and even work to actively transform tension and support peace by teaching respect for diversity, as well as local, national, and global citizenship.  To measure the conflict sensitivity of a project’s implementation a customized low inference **conflict-sensitive education checklist** is to be derived from existing guidance and checklists. ***Low-inference*** means that a scoring decision for each item requires little interpretive or inferential reasoning on the part of raters. Development of the customized CSE checklist tool must include a protocol with clear decision procedure and scoring rubric for its use. See especially:   * [*INEE Reflection Tool*](https://inee.org/system/files/resources/INEE_CSE_Reflection_Tool_EN.pdf); * [*USAID Checklist for Conflict Sensitivity in Education Programs*](https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1865/USAID_Checklist_Conflict_Sensitivity_14FEB27_cm.pdf); * [*Guidelines for Transitional Education Plan Preparation (GPE/IIEP)*](https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000244900) *(esp. annexes 1 and 2);* * [*How to Guide to Conflict Sensitivity (Conflict Sensitivity Consortium*).](https://actionaid.org/sites/default/files/conflict_sensitivity_how_to_guide_-_feb_2012.pdf)     The customized checklist should be structured and scored in a way that allows project implementers and USAID staff to understand the degree to which implementation has applied conflict-sensitive education principles, including a focus on equity.  The checklist is to be applied in a *retrospective* assessment of activities/program components implemented in the quarter. Depending on the scale and complexity of the project, an implementing partner may choose to use the highest, most general level for designating work plan activities/program components (typically listed in the leftmost column of a work plan spreadsheet). Alternatively, they may choose to apply the checklist to the work plan’s more specific tasks or sub-activities under the highest level activity headings.    Provided here are ***illustrative*** checklist domains and items (derived from the above-listed tools):  **Community Consultation and Participation:**   * Was information about the activity’s implementation communicated transparently to all communities and stakeholders? * Were consultations on activity implementation fully representative of various groups affected by the conflict? * Did implementation approaches and methods result in any community members being excluded from participating in program activities? * Did community members raise any grievances regarding the activity’s implementation? * Did implementation of the activity reinforce or contribute to community cohesion?   **Site Selection and Sequencing:**   * Did the *selection* of sites for implementation, and, in the case of a phased approach, did the *sequencing* of implementation sites incorporate considerations of equity and the perceptions of actors involved in, or affected by, conflict?   **Partners:**   * Were partner organizations involved in implementation of the activity perceived as *neutral* by actors affected by or involved in the conflict? * Had the staff of any partners involved in the implementation of the program component been trained in CSE?   **Staff, Sub-contractors, Consultants and Volunteers:**   * Did behaviors or discourse of individuals involved in activity implementation (including staff, sub-contractors, consultants and volunteers) create or exacerbate negative relations or dynamics with targeted beneficiary communities or other stakeholders? * Did known identity characteristics (e.g., religion, ethnicity, nationality) of individuals involved in activity implementation (including staff, sub-contractors, consultants and volunteers) create or exacerbate negative relations or dynamics with targeted beneficiary communities or other stakeholders?   **Security:**   * Did implementation of the education program component or activity directly trigger or become the target of armed attack? * Was implementation of the education program component or activity impacted in any way by armed attacks or other security threats? * Did implementation of the component/activity incorporate continuous security monitoring informed by prior assessment of threats?   **Equity of Access and of Opportunity to Learn**:   * Did the activity or program component’s implementation (unintentionally) create or exacerbate barriers to educational access for any sub-group of the intended beneficiaries? * Did the activity or program component’s implementation (unintentionally) create or exacerbate obstacles to learning for any sub-group of the intended beneficiaries (e.g., because of the language of materials, or specific teaching approaches)? |
| **Unit of Measure:** | Percentage score on checklist (numerator = number of points earned on the checklist; denominator = total number of possible points) |
| **Disaggregated by:** | Disaggregation not applicable |
| **Rationale or Justification for indicator *(optional)*:** | The indicator demonstrates the extent to which a project is applying conflict-sensitive education principles and guidance to its implementation. It may further provide opportunities for insight into and reflection upon the effects of applying these principles to implementation. |
| **PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION** | |
| **Data Source:** | Checklist applied at quarterly review of work plan implementation |
| **Method of data collection and construction:** | At the occasion of quarterly reporting, a committee of implementing partner staff (e.g., M&E director, COP, DCOP, technical specialists) applies checklist criteria to work plan activities implemented in the quarter. The final aggregate checklist score is a percentage. The denominator is the total possible number of points that can be earned on the checklist across the relevant activities. The denominator therefore will depend on the customized checklist, as well as on the way a project chooses to score the work plan, and on the content of the work plan for the given quarter. The numerator is the number of points earned across all reviewed activities, based on the review process described. The numerator divided by the denominator yields the percentage score. Note that the scoring system should be designed alongside the checklist: some checklist items may be reverse coded in terms of their score value; that is, for some items the desirable answer may be “yes” while for others it is “no”. |
| **Reporting Frequency:** | Quarterly |
| **Known Data Limitations:** | Possible conflicting judgements on degree of conformance of activities to checklist criteria. |
| **Actions Taken or Planned to Address the Data Limitation** | Protocol and decision procedure for applying the checklist is reviewed and appropriated in advance among parties to this data collection (e.g., project M&E director, COP/DCOP, technical specialists, and possibly including a mission representative). The checklist should be designed to be low inference, meaning that a scoring decision for each item requires little interpretive or inferential reasoning on the part of raters. The checklist items could therefore be simple binary (yes/no), or at most have a third possible response level (such as “partially”). The illustrative questions above are intended to lend themselves to this approach, which favors reliability across raters and across applications of the checklist. A committee approach to applying the checklist is recommended, with the same committee reforming for subsequent checklist use on updated strategy documents. |
| **THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON October 3, 2019** | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | |
| **Category** | Activity Management |
| **Result Level** | Output |
| **Name of Indicator:** | **CSE-10. Absence of conflict insensitive content from teaching and learning materials** |
| **DESCRIPTION** | |
| **Standard or Custom Indicator:** | Custom |
| **Precise Definition(s):** | This indicatorreports whether teaching and learning materials are free from conflict *insensitive* content. A representative review panel will reach binary yes/no decisions based on agreed-upon criteria, disaggregated for the various types of teaching and learning material that are in use within targeted schools or learning centers and/or that are in development or revision by the project.  **Teaching and Learning materials** (TLM) are the aids used by the educator to help in teaching/instructing effectively and the aids used by the learner/student to help in learning more effectively. Examples of learning materials include, but are not limited to, the following: textbooks; reading materials; student workbooks; supplementary reading books; educational tapes and CDs; library books; reference material in paper or electronic formats; support material for educational radio and TV broadcasts; teacher manuals and guides; guides and manuals for coaches or teacher trainers, etc.  The custom list of relevant categories of "learning materials" for review under this indicator is to be precisely delimited for the project. The list should take into account the pre-existing materials in use in the targeted schools and centers and those that the project intends to develop or revise. For the purposes of this indicator, “**conflict insensitive**” refers to content within learning materials that can reasonably be interpreted to disparage or exclude an identity group, to imply the superiority of one group over another, or to promote continued enmity between groups.  The project-level actors should further specify the objective, locally relevant criteria for what constitutes “conflict insensitive content” and develop guidance for applying these criteria. (These criteria and guidance should be informed by existing tools and guidance such as [*INEE Reflection Tool*](https://inee.org/system/files/resources/INEE_CSE_Reflection_Tool_EN.pdf); [*USAID Checklist for Conflict Sensitivity in Education Programs*](https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1865/USAID_Checklist_Conflict_Sensitivity_14FEB27_cm.pdf)*.* In addition, while it does not focus specifically on conflict sensitivity,USAID’s[*A Guide for Strengthening Gender Equality and Inclusiveness in Teaching and Learning Materials*](https://eccnetwork.net/wp-content/uploads/8460-3_DERP_Gender_Guide_V3_102715_r9_FNL.pdf)also provides relevant principles and guidance for evaluating inclusive representation in TLMs).  A panel with representation from key identity groups and/or targeted users is convened for evaluating TLMs by screening for potential offending content. Evaluation of learning materials should consider such aspects as:   * pictorial representations of identity groups * narrative representations of identity groups * cultural traditions highlighted * representations of history   An “**identity group**” is a population in the area targeted by the project that shares an ethnic, linguistic, religious, political, livelihood, gender, displacement status, or other identity characteristic that was identified as a potential determinant of discrimination or marginalization during the analysis of the conflict dynamics and context.  A **targeted user** may be a teacher, faculty, trainer, student, or learner.  The materials that are assessed under this indicator may be counted under ES 1-10 if they meet its definition |
| **Unit of Measure:** | Yes/No decision (free of insensitive content / not free of insensitive content) |
| **Disaggregated by:** | Category of teaching and learning material |
| **Rationale or Justification for indicator *(optional)*:** | Using the indicator focuses project attention explicitly on the key conflict-sensitive education domain of learning materials, via reflection of experts and stakeholders, in order to ensure that content does not aggravate conflict dynamics. The indicator would be best used in a project that is developing, revising, replacing, or piloting learning materials. |
| **PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION** | |
| **Data Source:** | Criteria-based evaluation of learning materials |
| **Method of data collection and construction:** | A convened panel applies agreed-upon conflict sensitive evaluation criteria to apply to each category of learning materials. This may be done first for a baseline review of existing TLMs employed in project-supported schools or centers. It can subsequently be conducted for review of materials under revision or development by the project. By consensus or vote, each category of TLM is designated as having conflict insensitive content, or as being free of any such content. Projects may choose to convene two panels: one with key stakeholders within the Ministry of Education and any key advocacy groups, and a second with learners or parents, to understand how the end users view the materials. |
| **Reporting Frequency:** | As appropriate according to materials revisions, development or procurement schedule. |
| **Known Data Limitations:** | Possible conflicting judgements on instances of provocative or conflict insensitive content. There could be cases where a relatively minor example of conflict insensitive content is contained, by oversight, within an otherwise exemplary learning material item, leading to disagreements over whether to count the specific item towards this indicator. |
| **Actions Taken or Planned to Address the Data Limitation** | Evaluation criteria, guidance, and decision procedure (consensus or vote) are negotiated clearly in advance among parties to this data collection. Within the decision procedure, the panel may wish to incorporate a scoring rubric and threshold below which an item as a whole would not qualify as provocative or conflict insensitive. Alternately, the panel may wish to reach consensus through discussion. |
| **THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON October 3, 2019** | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | |
| **Category** | Community/Parents |
| **Result Level** | Outcome |
| **Name of Indicator:** | **CSE-17. Number and percentage of parents reporting that parent-school cooperation mechanisms are inclusive.** |
| **DESCRIPTION** | |
| **Standard or Custom Indicator:** | Custom |
| **Precise Definition(s):** | The indicator measures the proportion (percentage) and number of parents of learners in schools or learning centers supported by the project who report that mechanisms for parent/community cooperation, engagement and oversight are inclusive.  **“Parents”** includes both biological parents and legal guardians of learners.  “**Inclusive**” refers to practices that provide the opportunity to all parents or guardians to participate fully and effectively, especially those who, for different reasons, are excluded or at risk of being marginalized.  A sample-based survey will be deployed to investigate these perceptions and experiences through a series of locally formulated, contextualized questions to gauge parents' perception of the degree to which school governance invites and provides opportunities for all parental input. Only parents whose children go to schools (formal or non-formal) served by the project are eligible for inclusion. The survey sample should be drawn from this full school population, not only those who already participate.  Illustrative survey items:   * “The school and/or its governance structures keep me well informed of meetings and other opportunities to provide input.” * “Parents from my community are made to feel welcome at meetings concerning school affairs.” * “Decisions about school management take into account the views of my community.”   (Note that these conflict sensitive education survey items are intended as ***illustrative*** and have not been piloted.)  (Possible formats of response option scales could be: *Strongly Agree* to *Strongly Disagree;* or *Always to Never*.  An “**identity group**” is a population in the area targeted by the project that shares an ethnic, linguistic, religious, political, livelihood, gender, displacement status, or other identity characteristic that was identified as a potential determinant of discrimination or marginalization during the analysis of the conflict dynamics and context. |
| **Unit of Measure:** | Percentage of parents |
| **Disaggregated by:** | number of males, number of females, key identity group |
| **Rationale or Justification for indicator *(optional)*:** | The indicator provides a measure of a project’s progress in increasing inclusivity and participation of parents (of all identity groups) in school governance. The indicator would be most relevant in a project operating in a conflict- or crisis-affected area or serving people affected by crisis or conflict with an intentional school governance component. |
| **PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION** | |
| **Data Source:** | Sample based survey |
| **Method of data collection and construction:** | From the sample frame of all schools or learning centers supported by the project, a random sample is drawn, with appropriate stratification to allow adequate representation of all key identity groups in the context. Schools should be given advance notice of the data collection visits. (The sample schools should, however, not be asked in advance to make parents available for the survey, as this will increase the chance of handpicking of non-representative parents.) Once data collectors are at the sampled schools, parents should be sampled by randomly selecting pupil names from class registers and seeking out a parent, fathers of girls and mothers of boys, or some such formula to achieve gender balance. Parent sampling at school level may also require intentional quotas of key identity groups (beyond gender), where this is feasible and can be done in a conflict sensitive manner. Surveys are administered one on one to parents. Response frequencies are analyzed. Appropriate scale or index derived from individual questions for indicator calculation. Representative portions of identity groups may be best ensured through regional or community-level stratification.  To calculate the percentage, the numerator is the number of parents surveyed whose responses meet an established threshold score indicating a perception that parent-school cooperation mechanisms are inclusive. The denominator is the full number of parents surveyed.  The survey results may be extrapolated to the full relevant project population of to calculate the *number* of parents. To do so, the percentage obtained above should be multiplied by the estimate for the full population of parents whose children go to schools (formal or non-formal) served by the project. |
| **Reporting Frequency:** | Annual or Bi-annual (at end of semesters) |
| **Known Data Limitations:** | Potential issues of validity and reliability of survey instrument.  Potential challenges to achieving representative samples of all key identity groups, and of selecting representative parents in general, as opposed to those most engaged in school affairs. |
| **Actions Taken or Planned to Address the Data Limitation** | Survey developed with input of specialists from all identity groups; survey translated and back translated into all relevant languages; survey piloted and cognitively tested in all languages. Survey administrations triangulated with qualitative data collection among parents. Parents selected at random by rigorous method, as described in “Method of data collection and construction” above. |
| **THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON October 4, 2019** | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | |
| **Category** | Community/Parents |
| **Result Level** | Outcome |
| **Name of Indicator:** | **CSE-23. Number and percentage of parents who perceive their child’s schooling as inclusive** |
| **DESCRIPTION** | |
| **Standard or Custom Indicator:** | Custom |
| **Precise Definition(s):** | The indicator measures the proportion (percentage) and number of parents of learners in schools or learning centers supported by the project who report that their children’s schooling as a whole (the available school *system* and/or its alternatives) is *inclusive*.  **“Parents”** includes both biological parents and legal guardians of learners.  “**Inclusive schooling**” refers to having one system of education for all students, at all levels (early childhood, primary, secondary, and post-secondary), with the provision of supports to meet the individual needs of students. Inclusive education focuses on the full and effective participation, accessibility, attendance, and achievement of all students, especially those who, for different reasons, are excluded or at risk of being marginalized.  Inclusive education cannot be “**exclusionary”** or “**discriminatory”**. “Exclusionary” and “discriminatory” refer to practices (including policies, procedures, rules, structures, etc.) at any level of the education system, or within an education program, that intentionally or unintentionally exclude or disadvantage certain population subgroups in terms of educational access, retention, completion, or learning outcomes. “Discriminatory” also refers to representation of groups, in text and/or in images, in ways that perpetuate or intensify negative generalizations, promote hostility, or suggest the superiority of one group over another. The exclusion or omission of any representation of a group also qualifies as “discriminatory”.  A sample-based survey will be deployed to investigate these perceptions through a series of locally formulated questions/items. A locally contextualized sample-based survey instrument will be deployed to investigate these perceptions. The survey items should be formulated for maximal local relevance, validity and reliability and for conflict sensitivity. Items must avoid *suggesting* the presence of discrimination via leading questions, and should rather seek only to detect pre-existing perceptions of discrimination and unfairness. Eligible parents are only those whose child or children attend a school or learning center served by the project.  Illustrative survey items:   * “Schools in my community are in the same physical condition as schools in other communities.” * “Schools in my community receive the same level of resources as schools in other communities.” * “Schools in my community are no more crowded than schools in other communities.” * “My children’s teachers provide them the same academic attention as any other child in the class.” * “The languages used for teaching in my children’s class allow my child an equal chance to succeed as all other children.” * “The facts and ideas that my children learn are always respectful of our community and its history.”   (Note that these CSE survey items are intended as ***illustrative*** and have not been piloted.)  Such items could have a response scale from *Strongly agree* to *strongly disagree.* |
| **Unit of Measure:** | Percentage of parents |
| **Disaggregated by:** | number of men, number of women, key identity group |
| **Rationale or Justification for indicator *(optional)*:** | The indicator provides a measure of a project’s progress in increasing or improving the provision of education that is inclusive according to the perception of parents. The indicator would be most relevant in a project with an intentional conflict-sensitive education component striving to improve inclusiveness, eliminate exclusionary and discriminatory practices and resource distributions, and to improve school-parental relations. |
| **PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION** | |
| **Data Source:** | Sample based survey |
| **Method of data collection and construction:** | From the sample frame of all schools or learning centers supported by the project, a random sample is drawn, with appropriate stratification to allow adequate representation of all key identity groups in the context. Schools should be given advance notice of the data collection visits. (The sample schools should, however, not be asked in advance to make parents available for the survey, as this will increase the chance of handpicking of non-representative parents.) Once data collectors are at the sampled schools, parents should be sampled by randomly selecting pupil names from class registers and seeking out a parent, fathers of girls and mothers of boys, or some such formula to achieve gender balance. Parent sampling at school level may also require intentional quotas of key identity groups (beyond gender), where this is feasible and can be done in a conflict sensitive manner. Surveys are administered one on one to parents. Response frequencies are analyzed. Appropriate scale or index derived from individual questions for indicator calculation. Representative portions of identity groups may be best ensured through regional or community-level stratification.  To calculate the percentage, the numerator is the number of parents surveyed whose responses meet an established threshold score indicating a perception that their child’s schooling is inclusive. The denominator is the full number of parents surveyed.  To calculate the *number* of parents, the survey results may be extrapolated to the full relevant project population. To do so, the percentage obtained above should be multiplied by the estimate for the full population of parents whose children go to schools (formal or non-formal) served by the project. |
| **Reporting Frequency:** | Annual or Bi-annual at end of semester |
| **Known Data Limitations:** | Potential issues of validity and reliability of survey instrument.  Potential challenges to achieving representative samples of all key identity groups. |
| **Actions Taken or Planned to Address the Data Limitation** | Survey developed with input of specialists from all identity groups; survey translated and back translated into all relevant languages; survey piloted and cognitively tested in all languages. Survey administrations triangulated with qualitative data collection among parents. Parents selected at random by rigorous method, as described in “Method of data collection and construction” above. |
| **THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON October 4, 2019** | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | |
| **Category** | Community/Parents |
| **Result Level** | Output |
| **Name of Indicator:** | **CSE-25. Number of attendees at project-supported events promoting conflict reduction/avoidance** |
| **DESCRIPTION** | |
| **Standard or Custom Indicator:** | Custom |
| **Precise Definition(s):** | The indicator counts the number of individuals, both adult and child (beginning at first grade in primary school) in attendance at project-supported events that promote conflict reduction and/or conflict avoidance. In the case of an event whose messages are specifically geared towards adults only, child attendees should not be counted. Staff of prime or sub-implementing partners should not be counted as attendees. A “project-supported event” may be organized fully or primarily by project staff, or by collaborating organizations who receive either financial or in-kind project support. An event “promoting conflict reduction and/or conflict avoidance” is one that is conceived and planned specifically with this mandate and objective, and which could involve a variety of formats and animation techniques. |
| **Unit of Measure:** | Number of individuals |
| **Disaggregated by:** | Number of males, number of females (required). Number of participants age 10-14, number of participants age 15-19, number of participants age 20-24, number of participants age 25-29 (if applicable and possible). If possible, key identity group. |
| **Rationale or Justification for indicator *(optional)*:** | The indicator measures a project’s community outreach efforts to promote conflict reduction and avoidance, particularly in the interest of stabilizing and securing education institutions. The indicator would be most relevant on projects that use initial conflict analysis (of drivers, mitigations, etc.) to develop event-based community sensitization campaigns designed to help ensure regular functioning of education interventions with reduced threats. |
| **PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION** | |
| **Data Source:** | Attendance counts and estimates (various forms according to event type) |
| **Method of data collection and construction:** | Prior to each event, the best feasible method for obtaining an accurate head count of attendees will be selected and a protocol designed. For indoor events, this can involve counting individuals as they enter, or, if possible, employing sign-in sheets. At outdoor events, both live head counts by designated M&E staff, and, where permissible, photography should be used to increase accuracy. Alternative estimation methodologies, involving exit polls with a sample of attendees, may be practical and applicable. Individuals attending multiple events may be counted once for each event. Sex of participants may be identified by observation. |
| **Reporting Frequency:** | Quarterly |
| **Known Data Limitations:** | Most events seeking a large community audience will not be conducive to the use of sign-in sheets or collecting information as specific as age or identity group, especially when held outdoors with no single entrance to the event. Headcounts will thus not be perfectly accurate. In events open to general audiences, disaggregation by anything other than gender may not be possible. |
| **Actions Taken or Planned to Address the Data Limitation** | Planning for each event will carefully consider both the venue and the nature of the event in order to design an attendance-taking methodology that can provide the most accuracy. Where there is wide acceptance of crowd photos at such public events (which might be conventionally used for further publicity), photography may also serve as an aid to accurate attendance estimates. Some events may be organized for sub-audiences (women, adolescents, certain identity groups based on location), which will permit disaggregation of at least a portion of the total count. |
| **THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON September 17, 2019** | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | |
| **Category** | Teachers |
| **Result Level** | Outcome |
| **Name of Indicator:** | **CSE-26. Number and percentage of teachers whose instruction and classroom management sufficiently meets conflict sensitive practice standards** |
| **DESCRIPTION** | |
| **Standard or Custom Indicator:** | Custom |
| **Precise Definition(s):** | The indicator measures the percentage and number of teachers (trainers, faculty, or learning facilitators) in schools or learning centers supported by the project who demonstrate instructional practice and classroom management that meets standards of conflict sensitivity.  “**Sufficiently meets conflict sensitive practice standards**” means attaining a defined threshold score on an observation rubric. The rubric should be developed in alignment with the project’s most relevant criteria for conflict sensitive pedagogy. The observation rubric for conflict sensitivity may be applied as a portion of a broader observation exercise that also assesses teacher’s full range of pedagogical skills. Teachers should only be observed and scored in specific practice domains on which teachers have been trained by the project.  **Teachers** can be certified professionals or volunteer. They can be a trainer, a faculty member, or a learning facilitator. Teachers refers to anyone who is providing sequenced, focused, active, explicit instruction in a particular topic. Teachers eligible to be observed are those who have been trained, coached, or otherwise supported by the project to change their instructional practice and classroom management.  **Instruction and classroom management** refers to the specific practices and processes that a teacher uses to guide interaction in the classroom.  **Conflict sensitive practice standards** refers tostandards of instruction and classroom management specifically defined by the project as essential to classroom practice that is inclusive and that realizes the *Do no Harm* principle. These standards should be informed by Teaching and Learning Standard 3: Instruction and Learning Processes, from [*INEE Minimum Standards for Education: Preparedness Response, Recovery*](https://inee.org/system/files/resources/INEE_Minimum_Standards_Handbook_2010%28HSP%29_EN.pdf)*.*  This resource emphases:   * Teaching methods appropriate to the age, developmental level,   language, culture, capacities and needs of learners;  • Instruction and learning processes that address the needs of all learners,  by promoting inclusiveness and reducing barriers to learning.  The technical note, [*Conflict Sensitivity and Peacebuilding in UNICEF*](http://www.unicefinemergencies.com/downloads/eresource/docs/KRR/UNICEF%20Technical%20Note%20on%20Conflict%20Sensitivity%20and%20Peacebuilding.pdf)  building self-esteem, creativity and decision making, communicating with children and active listening, handling children in the classroom safe and comfortable learning atmosphere. |
| **Unit of Measure:** | Percentage of individuals |
| **Disaggregated by:** | Number of males, number of females (required). Number of teachers at grade levels relevant for the project, number of teachers new to the teaching profession (2 years or less as a teacher), number of teachers per geographic area of the project, number of teachers who are displaced. |
| **Rationale or Justification for indicator *(optional)*:** | The indicator measures the degree to which teachers are observed to teach and manage their classrooms in a conflict sensitive manner, specifically on practices on which they have been trained. This indicator can be used as one measure of fidelity of implementation. The data from this indicator can also be used for in-service coaching or mentorship. The indicator is most relevant on projects that include conflict sensitivity components in teacher training. |
| **PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION** | |
| **Data Source:** | Sample based classroom observation rubric |
| **Method of data collection and construction:** | In a randomly selected, representative sample of project-supported schools and/or learning centers, randomly selected teachers are observed using a rubric tied to specific conflict-sensitive education domains and concrete teaching and classroom management practices on which they have been trained. A threshold score is established on the rubric that teachers must reach to qualify as meeting conflict sensitive practice standards. Applicable technical guidance and discussion of best practices in measurement via classroom observation can be found in the following linked documents (which do not focus specifically on CSE):   * [Measures of quality through classroom observation for the Sustainable Development Goals: Lessons from low-and-middle-income countries.](https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000245841) * [The World Bank’s TEACH Tool](http://saber.worldbank.org/index.cfm?indx=5&sub=7)   Development of the observation form should be informed by initial open-ended classroom observation. The observation form should attend to both the presence of positive, inclusive practices and to negative, conflict *insensitive* practices. Qualified observers should be trained using both videos of actual lessons and classroom-based practice with the observation form. Inter-rater reliability tests must be conducted and any raters failing to meet a minimum standard should receive additional training or be excluded from data collection if necessary. If the indicator is used as an outcome measure in a rigorous evaluation, the data collection method will vary. For example, multiple raters observing the same teacher multiple times may be needed. For the purposes of monitoring, the observation may be more aligned with the supervision cycle (e.g. one person observing a teacher at one time).  To calculate the *percentage*, the numerator is the number of teachers attaining the defined threshold score on the observation rubric. The denominator is the total number of teachers observed.  To calculate the *number* of teachers, the survey results may be extrapolated to the full relevant project population. To do so, the percentage obtained above should be multiplied by the full number of teachers targeted by the project. |
| **Reporting Frequency:** | Following school supervision cycle as feasible. |
| **Known Data Limitations:** | Inter-rater reliability in administering the classroom observation rubric; possible limited range of practices observable in a single (or even across a few) lessons; Hawthorne effect (behavior change as the result of being observed). |
| **Actions Taken or Planned to Address the Data Limitation** | Observation forms must be designed to strike a balance between being low-inference (thus favoring inter-rater reliability) and being sufficiently informative to meaningfully report on the indicator. The specific actions taken to address data limitations will depend on the use of the indicator. Using this indicator as an outcome measure in an impact evaluation has different implications than using this indicator for monitoring.  The effect on teacher behavior of an observer’s presence is a perennial issue. Multiple observations of the same teacher, along with triangulation through interviews with learners, and with teachers themselves, can help to mitigate. |
| **THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON October 4, 2019** | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | |
| **Category** | Teachers |
| **Result Level** | Output |
| **Name of Indicator:** | **CSE-27. Number of educators completing appropriate contextualized training in conflict sensitive pedagogy and classroom management** |
| **DESCRIPTION** | |
| **Standard or Custom Indicator:** | Custom |
| **Precise Definition(s):** | This indicator counts the number of educators in project-supported schools who complete a defined training course in conflict-sensitive education (e.g., based on elements of INEE course), or a dedicated conflict-sensitive education module of a broader course.  **Educators** are individuals whose professional activity involves the transmitting of knowledge, attitudes, and skills that are stipulated in curriculum directly to students participating in a formal or non-formal educational opportunity. Educators may work in formal or non-formal settings and institutions. They may be employed by public organizations (e.g. school) or private organization (e.g. school, NGO). Examples include, but are not limited to, the following: teachers, teaching assistants, instructors, etc.  **Completion** must be defined for the context in terms of minimum hours of verified attendance at a structured training and/or by a passing score on an assessment administered post-training. A certificate may or may not be issued at the end of a professional development activity.  **Conflict sensitivity in education** involves:  • Understanding the conflict-relevant aspects of the context in which the system, organization, or program is operating, particularly inter-group relations;  • Understanding the interactions between interventions and the context/group relations; and  • Acting upon the understanding of these interactions in order to minimize negative impacts and maximize positive impacts of a policy, strategy, program, or other intervention.  \* Relationship to ES.1-12. Data from this indicator can be used in part to report against ES.1-12. ES.1-12 counts head teachers (among other types of officials and administrators). ES.1-12 does not count teachers. The disaggregates are partially aligned.  \* Relationship to ES.1-6. Data from this indicator can be used in full to report against ES.1-6, if the educators are primary or secondary school (or equivalent) only. If educators are post-secondary, this indicator cannot be used to report against ES.1-6. This indicator captures a more specific type of training, and may be more appropriate for a project that spends a large share of time or budget on training educators in conflict-sensitive pedagogy or classroom management. |
| **Unit of Measure:** | Number of educators |
| **Disaggregated by:** | Number of males, number of females (required). Number of educators at grade levels relevant for the project, number of educators per geographic area of the project, number of educators who are displaced. |
| **Rationale or Justification for indicator *(optional)*:** | The indicator provides an indication, on the output level, of the scale of project efforts to improve school level understanding and competency in conflict-sensitive education. |
| **PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION** | |
| **Data Source:** | Verified attendance forms; training post-tests |
| **Method of data collection and construction:** | * Attendance at training sessions should be verified at least twice daily to ensure minimum hours attended. Where possible, eligible educator names and unique IDs should be pre-populated in attendance forms, ideally tablet- or laptop-based. * Valid, proctored training post-test of relevant knowledge. |
| **Reporting Frequency:** | Quarterly |
| **Known Data Limitations:** | Challenge to verification of attendance throughout full hours of training; avoiding ineligible trainees and double counts; possible irregularities in post-test completion. |
| **Actions Taken or Planned to Address the Data Limitation** | Trainees should be enrolled by invitation only, with attendance forms (ideally electronic) being pre-populated with names and unique IDs. If the targeted educators do not already have unique IDs, they should be created by the project. If post-training assessments are administered on paper), they should be carefully proctored. Alternatively, where feasible, post-test assessments could be individually administered electronically. |
| **THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON September 17, 2019** | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | |
| **Category** | Students/School |
| **Result Level** | Outcome |
| **Name of Indicator:** | **CSE-32. Number and percentage of learners who perceive their school as inclusive** |
| **DESCRIPTION** | |
| **Standard or Custom Indicator:** | Custom |
| **Precise Definition(s):** | The indicator measures the proportion (percentage) and number of learners in schools or learning centers supported by the project who report their perception that their school is *inclusive*.  **Inclusive schools** refers to having one system of education for all students, at all levels (early childhood, primary, secondary, and post-secondary), with the provision of supports to meet the individual needs of students. Inclusive education focuses on the full and effective participation, accessibility, attendance, and achievement of all students, especially those who, for different reasons, are excluded or at risk of being marginalized.  A school may be formal or non-formal, state or non-state. Learners can be at any level of the education system.  “Inclusive schools” cannot be “**exclusionary”** or “**discriminatory”**. “Exclusionary” and “discriminatory” refer to practices (including policies, procedures, rules, structures, etc.) at any level of the education system, or within an education program, that intentionally or unintentionally exclude or disadvantage certain population subgroups in terms of educational access, retention, completion, or learning outcomes. Note that a schools system’s segregation of male and female students may still be considered “inclusive” where access and quality for both sexes are equal.  “Discriminatory” also refers to representation of groups, in text and/or in images, in ways that perpetuate or intensify negative generalizations, promote hostility, or suggest the superiority of one group over another. The exclusion or omission of any representation of a group also qualifies as “discriminatory”.  A locally contextualized sample-based survey instrument will be deployed to investigate learner perceptions. The survey items should be formulated for maximal local relevance, validity and reliability *specifically with the targeted age range*, and for conflict sensitivity. Items must avoid *suggesting* the presence of discrimination via leading questions, and should rather seek only to detect pre-existing perceptions of discrimination and unfairness.  Learners’ perceptions of how *inclusive* their school is may be influenced by various aspects of their school experience. The following are *illustrative* survey items.  “My teacher(s) treats all children with equal care and respect.”  “My teacher(s) wants all children to learn well.”  “The language that my teacher uses when teaching allows me and all the children to learn well.”  “How long does it take you to get to school? How long does it take most other children to get to school?”  “Children that are different from me treat me badly, so I do not want to come to school.”  (Note that these survey items are intended as *illustrative* and have not been piloted. Any items should be customized for the project context.) |
| **Unit of Measure:** | Percentage of learners |
| **Disaggregated by:** | Number of males, number of females (required), key identity group if possible, grade level, number of learners age 10-14, number of learners age 15-19, number of learners age 20-24, number of learners age 25-29 |
| **Rationale or Justification for indicator *(optional)*:** | The indicator provides a measure of a project’s progress in increasing learners’ perceptions of their school as inclusive. This indicator could be used in conjunction with the indicator that captures parents’ perception of their children’s schooling as inclusive, for the purposes of triangulation. |
| **PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION** | |
| **Data Source:** | Sample based survey |
| **Method of data collection and construction:** | Eligible learners are those that attend a school served by the project. From the sample frame of all schools or learning centers supported by the project, a sample is drawn, with appropriate stratification to allow adequate representation of all key identity groups in the context. Random learner sampling at school level may also require intentional quotas of key identity groups (beyond gender), where this is feasible and can be done in a conflict sensitive manner. Surveys are administered one on one to learners. Response frequencies are analyzed. An appropriate scale or index is derived from individual items and a threshold score is established for indicator calculation.  To calculate the *percentage* of learners, the numerator is the number of learners surveyed whose responses meet a threshold score indicating a perception that their school is inclusive. The denominator is the full number of learners surveyed.  To calculate the *number* of learners, the survey results may be extrapolated to the relevant project population of learners. To do so, the percentage obtained above should be multiplied by the full number of learners targeted by the project. |
| **Reporting Frequency:** | Annually at the end of the school year |
| **Known Data Limitations:** | Potential issues of validity and reliability of survey instrument, especially when targeting early grade learners.  Potential challenges to achieving representative samples of all key identity groups. Interpretation of data trends may be challenging in a scenario where progress is indeed made, but because of simultaneous awareness raising on prejudice, stereotyping, etc., via peace education interventions, perceptions of schools as inclusive do not improve. |
| **Actions Taken or Planned to Address the Data Limitation** | Survey should be developed with input of specialists from all identity groups; the survey should be translated and back translated into all relevant languages; the survey should be piloted and cognitively tested in all languages and with relevant age groups. Instruments should be context and age-appropriate and conflict-sensitive. The use of child-centered survey methods is encouraged in an effort to improve upon conventional agreement scale items. Survey administrations can be triangulated with qualitative data collection among learners. |
| **THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON October 4, 2019** | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | |
| **Category** | Students/School |
| **Result Level** | Outcome |
| **Name of Indicator:** | **CSE-35. Number and percentage of learners reporting positive perceptions of students from other identity groups** |
| **DESCRIPTION** | |
| **Standard or Custom Indicator:** | Custom |
| **Precise Definition(s):** | The indicator measures the proportion (percentage) and number of learners in schools or learning centers supported by the project who indicate positive perceptions of learners from other identity groups.  **“Positive perceptions**” refers to perceptions and attitudes including:   * beliefs that others have qualities and characteristics worthy of acceptance, trust, respect, and/or care; * willingness to work, conduct business, or play with others; * absence of fear, bias, and discriminatory attitudes towards the others   An “**identity group**” is a population in the area targeted by the project that shares an ethnic, linguistic, religious, political, livelihood, gender, displacement status, or other identity characteristic that was identified as a potential determinant of discrimination or marginalization during the analysis of the conflict dynamics and context.  A sample-based instrument will be deployed to investigate these perceptions through a series of locally formulated items that are appropriate to the targeted age range and are conflict sensitive. Especially for younger learners, instruments could employ items that elicit reactions to image-based vignettes. Existing assessments on Universal Orientation and Attitude towards Outgroup, such as the [Allophilia Scale](https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/23e6/fe493177479cb64d4660f8783c4bb5621c4e.pdf), [Generalized Group Attitude Scale](http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.887.9237&rep=rep1&type=pdf), and [Cognitive Social Capital Assessment Tool](https://www.dmeforpeace.org/resource/monitoring-evaluation-and-learning-for-fragile-states-and-peacebuilding-programs-practical-tools-for-improving-program-performance-and-results/) should inform development of the instrument, as should initial conflict analysis. |
| **Unit of Measure:** | Number and Percentage of learners |
| **Disaggregated by:** | Number of males, number of females (required); key identity group, grade levels |
| **Rationale or Justification for indicator *(optional)*:** | The indicator provides a measure of a project’s progress at the outcome level in improving perceptions among learners of different key identity groups that are known to be implicated in conflict dynamics (as revealed by initial conflict analysis). The indicator would be relevant in any project with an intentional component of CSE and/or peace building pedagogy, revised learning materials, and/or community sensitization seeking to reduce mutual distrust and prejudice among groups that have historically been parties to conflict. |
| **PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION** | |
| **Data Source:** | Sample based survey instrument |
| **Method of data collection and construction:** | Eligible learners are those that attend a school served by the project. From the sample frame of all schools or learning centers supported by the project, a sample is drawn, with appropriate stratification to allow adequate representation of all key identity groups in the context. Learner sampling at school level may also require intentional quotas of key identity groups (beyond gender), where this is feasible and can be done in a conflict sensitive manner. Surveys administered one on one to learners, ideally via electronically. Response frequencies are analyzed. An appropriate scale or index is derived from individual questions for indicator calculation. Where the available enrollment and population data do not yield reliable estimates for initial, planned stratification by identity group, flexibility in data collection may be required in order to reach replacement or additional clusters (or schools).  To calculate the *percentage* of learners, the numerator is the number of learners surveyed whose responses indicate positive perceptions of learners from other identity groups. The denominator is the full number of learners surveyed.  To calculate the *number* of learners, the survey results may be extrapolated to the relevant population of learners. To do so, the percentage obtained above should be multiplied by the full number of learners targeted by the project. |
| **Reporting Frequency:** | Annual or Bi-annual at end of school year or semester. |
| **Known Data Limitations:** | Potential issues of validity and reliability of survey instrument.  Potential challenges to achieving representative samples of all key identity groups. |
| **Actions Taken or Planned to Address the Data Limitation** | Survey instrument developed with input of specialists from all identity groups and with specialist in social psychology; instrument translated and back translated into all relevant languages; survey piloted and cognitively tested in all languages. Depending on the use of the data (e.g. as an outcome measure in an impact evaluations vs monitoring), the survey could be triangulated with child adapted qualitative data collection among learners, as well as direct observation. |
| **THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON September 20, 2019** | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | |
| **Category** | Students/School |
| **Result Level** | Output |
| **Name of Indicator:** | **CSE-40. Number and percentage of students that learn in a familiar language** |
| **DESCRIPTION** | |
| **Standard or Custom Indicator:** | Custom |
| **Precise Definition(s):** | The indicator measures the number and proportion (percentage) of learners in schools or learning centers supported by the project for whom the predominant language of instruction is a language that is familiar from their own homes or communities.  A “**familiar language**” is one that the learner at least hears and speaks regularly at home or in the community and has opportunities to practice comprehension and speaking in real life situations. This could be the learner’s “mother tongue” or another language that they use and understand.  “**Learn**” means that the teaching is *actually conducted* in the familiar language in a school accessible to the child, and that teaching and learning materials are available in that language.  **A student** is someone enrolled in school, whether formal or non-formal, state or non-state, at any level of the education system.  The numerator is the number of learners enrolled in schools or centers whose actual language of instruction is a language familiar to them. The denominator is the total number for learners enrolled in project-supported schools or centers. |
| **Unit of Measure:** | Number and Percentage of learners |
| **Disaggregated by:** | number of males, number of females, number of learners per grade level that learn in a familiar language |
| **Rationale or Justification for indicator *(optional)*:** | The indicator constitutes an import metric of the equity of available schooling. Inequity of opportunity, created by language barriers and other obstacles to educational promotion, attainment, and achievement, is a source of grievance and conflict. The indicator is most relevant to activities that provide teacher training and learning materials in minority languages in order to reduce language barriers for learners. |
| **PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION** | |
| **Data Source:** | EMIS data (as available, and only if it covers the schools and students supported by the project); project enrollment data; sample-based learner and teacher surveys; household survey data; classroom observation monitoring data. |
| **Method of data collection and construction:** | The data source and methods of collection will vary according to:   * the type of educational institution supported by the project, * the availability, quality, and completeness of EMIS data (in the case of formal schooling), * the availability of household survey data or other population estimates by language spoken, * possibly other factors.   The method should be customized to the project. In projects that conduct their own enrollments (e.g., for accelerated education centers), it will be possible to collect data on familiar language(s) for all learners and compare to the languages of instruction used in classrooms. For projects supporting large numbers of formal schools where EMIS does not include data for project-supported schools or learners, or include data on learners’ languages, or is otherwise unreliable, sample-based school-level or household surveys may be required to provide estimates. Any large-scale learning assessment can be used as a concurrent opportunity to collect sample-based estimates of learner familiar language percentages and to confirm the regular use of languages in the schools. School supervision and monitoring regimes should also incorporate regular verification of the languages of instruction actually being used in classrooms.  To calculate the *percentage* of students, the numerator is the number of students targeted by the project who learn in a familiar language. The denominator is the number of full number of students targeted by the project.  For guidance on deriving population estimates for identity groups, including in conflict and crisis environments, see [*Education Equity Indicators for Access: Guidance for Practitioners in Crisis and Conflict-Affected Contexts*](https://eccnetwork.net/wp-content/uploads/FINAL-Equity-of-Access-Indicator-Guidance-11.13.18.pdf)*.* |
| **Reporting Frequency:** | Annual |
| **Known Data Limitations:** | Absence of EMIS data on learners’ languages spoken; limitations in EMIS data quality and timeliness; absence of population estimates by language. |
| **Actions Taken or Planned to Address the Data Limitation** | See recommendations above in section on “Method of data collection and construction”. |
| **THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON October 4, 2019** | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | |
| **Category** | Students/School |
| **Result Level** | Output |
| **Name of Indicator:** | **CSE-41. Number and percentage of students active in extracurricular clubs with a peacebuilding/tolerance focus** |
| **DESCRIPTION** | |
| **Standard or Custom Indicator:** | Custom |
| **Precise Definition(s):** | The indicator measures the number and proportion (percentage) of learners in schools or learning centers supported by the project who actively participate in student clubs that have a focus on peacebuilding and/or tolerance.  The numerator is the number of learners enrolled in schools or centers active in extracurricular clubs with a peacebuilding/tolerance focus. The denominator is the total number of learners enrolled in project-supported schools or centers.  **An extracurricular club** is a student group that meets regularly to conduct activities and realize objectives that fall outside of the defined academic curriculum of their school. Such activities are generally voluntary, but may in some cases be mandatory. Depending on the level of education, such clubs may be organized and led entirely by students, or they may be supervised by teachers or other adults. An extracurricular club may meet during or outside school hours and may be officially or semi-officially approved and connected with the school or center.  **A peacebuilding/tolerance focus** means that the club promotes mutual understanding, reduction of prejudice, and resolution and/or avoidance of conflict among identity groups, particularly those with traditional rivalries that have led to conflict. A “focus” on such work means that the club has such work as its primary mission, and its primary activities are thematically related to it. A club must meet regularly for students to be active in its work. The schedule of regular meetings is set by the club itself.  For learners, “**active**” is defined in terms of a threshold attendance rate at club meetings and events to be established by stakeholders as appropriate for the clubs and educational institutions in question. |
| **Unit of Measure:** | Number and Percentage of learners |
| **Disaggregated by:** | number of males, number of females (required), key identity group if feasible, number of students age 10-14, number of students age 15-19, number of students age 20-24, number of students age 25-29 |
| **Rationale or Justification for indicator *(optional)*:** | The indicator is relevant to projects that design, implement, or support implementation of existing club-based activities geared toward mitigating conflict drivers. |
| **PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION** | |
| **Data Source:** | EMIS data (as available and if it covers the schools and learners served by the project); project enrollment data; club attendance data |
| **Method of data collection and construction:** | The numerator comes from club attendance data. Club facilitators will be trained on attendance protocols and documentation of club activities. The denominator can come from EMIS data (if feasible and relevant) or from project data. To calculate the percentage, the numerator (all students qualifying as active club members in projects schools or centers) is divided by the denominator (all students reached by the project). |
| **Reporting Frequency:** | Quarterly |
| **Known Data Limitations:** | Absence of, or limitations in EMIS data quality and timeliness; potential limitations in accuracy and integrity of club data on attendance and activity implementation. |
| **Actions Taken or Planned to Address the Data Limitation** | For formal schools, where projects rely on EMIS, school-level enrollment data should be validated on a sample basis. Where projects are setting up and/or managing learning centers, their enrollments can be conducted and documented directly. Clubs should receive regular monitoring visits, and refresher training on attendance protocols and data validation. Club facilitators’ compensation should be linked to quality data delivery. |
| **THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON September 23, 2019** | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | |
| **Category** | Infrastructure/Resources |
| **Result Level** | Output |
| **Name of Indicator:** | **CSE-43. Number of functioning schools per capita** |
| **DESCRIPTION** | |
| **Standard or Custom Indicator:** | Custom |
| **Precise Definition(s):** | The indicator counts the number of functioning schools per capita (to be disaggregated by jurisdictional divisions of interest).  **“Schools**” refers to:   * *public* schools, as well as other schools that offer a substantially similar curriculum to public schools and that are similarly financially accessible (potentially including community schools and low-cost private schools).   **“Functioning”** may be defined and measured in a variety of ways based on what is feasible and reasonable in the context. Ministries may have clear specifications that may include thresholds for real contact hours in which teachers are actually teaching in classrooms.  “**Per capita**” refers specifically to the population of the relevant school age. |
| **Unit of Measure:** | Number |
| **Disaggregated by:** | Geographical divisions relevant to equity and conflict analyses. Private vs public. Formal vs non-formal. |
| **Rationale or Justification for indicator *(optional)*:** | The purpose of the indicator is to facilitate analysis of the equity of the state’s distribution of educational resources, specifically in terms of schools available per relevant school age child by sub-national divisions that are associated with key (conflict-prone) identity groups. |
| **PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION** | |
| **Data Source:** | EMIS data, if it reflects the project areas of operation and covers all groups who require access to school; household survey or other population data. |
| **Method of data collection and construction:** | EMIS data on number of schools is validated through purposively selected site visits to confirm school status as functioning. For equity analysis based on disaggregation, relevant geographic divisions are selected in collaboration with stakeholders. Relevant regional population data for school age children is consulted, if available, or potentially interpolated from local school EMIS and national gross attendance ratio. If necessary, household survey data may be collected.  For guidance on deriving population estimates for identity groups in specific regions, including in conflict and crisis environments, see [*Education Equity Indicators for Access: Guidance for Practitioners in Crisis and Conflict-Affected Contexts*](https://eccnetwork.net/wp-content/uploads/FINAL-Equity-of-Access-Indicator-Guidance-11.13.18.pdf)    Number of schools per capita is calculated by dividing the number of functioning schools by the regional population estimate obtained of the relevant school age. |
| **Reporting Frequency:** | Annual |
| **Known Data Limitations:** | Limitations in EMIS availability, quality, and timeliness; Absence or limited quality and timeliness of population estimates of school-age children. |
| **Actions Taken or Planned to Address the Data Limitation** | Purposively selected site visits to confirm school status as functioning. Potentially conduct household survey. |
| **THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON October 4, 2019** | |