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Introduction

Welcome to the USAID Office of Education’s Safer Learning Environments course. This course has been developed with support from the USAID Education in Crisis and Conflict Network (USAID ECCN).

USAID ECCN is a community of practice composed of USAID education staff, implementing partners, and others working to increase equitable access to, and improve the quality of, education in crisis- and conflict-affected environments. USAID ECCN was initiated to promote knowledge generation and sharing among practitioners, policy-makers, and researchers related to improved equitable access to education in crisis- and conflict-affected environments. This five-year initiative complements the substantial contributions of other networks, such as the Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE), while focusing on support to USAID staff and partners working on education in crisis- and conflict-affected environments.

Under the 2011 USAID Education Strategy Goal 3: increased equitable access to education in crisis and conflict environments, USAID specifically set out to provide safer learning opportunities for children in crisis and conflict-affected environments. This course was designed drawing on the best available evidence and aims to build the knowledge and skills of USAID staff and partners in order to deliver safer learning environments through USAID’s education programs.

USAID’s definition of a Safe Learning Environment:

A safe learning environment is defined as a place where structured learning happens that is free from environmental, internal and external threats to learners’ and education personnel safety and wellbeing, where infrastructure of a learning environment and also to the people within a learning environment is deemed safe. Environmental threats can include, but are not limited to, natural disasters and public health threats. Internal threats can include, but are not limited to, school-related gender-based violence (which includes rape, unwanted –including both physical and sexual –touching, unwanted sexual comments, abuse) corporal punishment, bullying, and verbal harassment), and gang activity/recruitment within a school. External threats can include, but are not limited to, attacks on the way to/from school, ideological attacks on learning environments, armed/violent attacks on learning environments, and occupation of learning environment infrastructure by armed groups.

Because the factors relevant to safe learning environments vary from context to context, the criteria used to define a safe learning environment should be determined in consultation with local stakeholders before school improvements are made.

USAID ECCN’s work on safety:

USAID ECCN has developed evidence gap maps around the field of safety in learning environments, available at eccnetwork.net/resources/evidence-gap-maps. These maps depict both the research evidence relating to safety but also our framework for categorizing the various threats. These four maps focus on Safer Learning Environments (SLE); specifically a) internal threats (including gang violence that emanates from within the school and SRGBV); b) external threats (including SRGBV on the way to/from school, gang violence, armed conflict and ideological attacks on education); c) environmental threats that are related to physical health and d) environmental threats that are related to various natural hazards.
Course Description

This course will provide a useful framework for understanding the intersections of safety and education, provide a more detailed discussion of promising practice in each safety domain, specifically school-related gender based violence, attacks on education, gang violence, psychological effects of witnessing or experiencing breaches to safety, mitigation and preparedness for natural disasters, and the effects of health crises on education. Participants will be introduced to USAID ECCN’s new SLE qualitative assessment tool, and will practice using the data that emerges from it for both program design and evaluation.

Course Goals

By the end of this course, participants will be able to:

1. Describe the characteristics of SLEs,
2. Integrate evidence-based strategies to promote safety in program design,
3. Interpret and use data from SLE formative and evaluative assessment, and
4. Use the SLE Qualitative Assessment Tool
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### Agenda Summary

**Day 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00 am – 9:30 am</td>
<td><strong>1.1 Welcome and Introductions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 am – 10:30 am</td>
<td><strong>1.2 USAID and Safer Learning Environments:</strong> Nina Weisenhorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 am – 10:45 am</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45 am – 12:45 pm</td>
<td><strong>1.3 Measuring Safety: ECCN’s SLE Qualitative Assessment Tool:</strong> Gwen Heaner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:45 pm – 1:45 pm</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:45 pm – 3:45 pm</td>
<td><strong>1.4 School Related Gender-based Violence (SRGBV):</strong> Julie Hanson Swanson and Kalene Reslar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:45 pm – 4:00 pm</td>
<td><strong>1.5 Reflections and Wrap-Up</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Day 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00 am – 9:15 am</td>
<td><strong>2.1 Opening Activity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:15 am – 12:00 pm</td>
<td><strong>2.2 Education Under Attack:</strong> Amy Kapit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 pm – 1:00 pm</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 pm – 3:00 pm</td>
<td><strong>2.3 Gang Violence:</strong> Sarah Danish and Megan Meinen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 pm – 3:15 pm</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15 pm – 4:00 pm</td>
<td><strong>2.4 Recap</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Day 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00 am – 9:15 am</td>
<td><strong>3.1 Opening Activity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:15 am – 11:15 am</td>
<td><strong>3.2 Wellbeing:</strong> Vania Alves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15 am – 11:30 pm</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30 pm – 12:45 pm</td>
<td><strong>3.3 Natural Disasters and Risk Reduction:</strong> Darren Hertz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:45 pm – 1:45 pm</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:45 pm – 2:45 pm</td>
<td><strong>3.4 Health Case Study: Ebola in Liberia:</strong> Lukas Olynyk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15 pm – 3:30 pm</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:45 pm – 3:30 pm</td>
<td><strong>3.5 Content Recap</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30 pm – 4:00 pm</td>
<td><strong>3.6 Course Evaluation</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Since the purpose of this training is largely to promote promising practices, the ECCN conceptual framework will be used repeatedly to bring participants back to a simple list of interventions that might be used when dealing with specific threats to safety.
Day 1 – Dec 4, 2017

1.1 Welcome and Introductions 9:00 – 9:30

Time: 30 minutes

Presenter: Radha Ganesan, Tracy Cordner and Nina Weisenhorn

Objective: Participants will be oriented to the course, USAID, ECCN, and their peers.
1.2 USAID and Safer Learning Environments 9:30 – 10:30

*Time:* 60 minutes

*Presenter:* Nina Weisenhorn

*Objective:* Participants will be able to articulate USAID’s definition of Safer Learning Environments (SLE) and situate the concept within USAID’s Education Strategy.
1.3 Measuring Safety: ECCN’s SLE Qualitative Assessment Tool 10:45 am– 12:45pm

**Time:** 120 minutes

**Presenter:** Gwen Heaner

**Objective:** Participants will learn how to complete the four phases that make up USAID ECCN's SLE Qualitative Assessment toolkit.

**Relationship to ECCN’s Conceptual Framework:**
- Tool is based on the framework
- Same categories, same considerations

12:45 – 1:45: Lunch
1.4 School Related Gender-based Violence (SRGBV) 1:45 – 3:45 pm

Time: 120 minutes

Presenter: Julie Hanson-Swanson and Kalene Reslar

Objective: Participants will understand specific challenges to safety in regions affected by SRGBV, various intervention strategies and the degree to which these have been successful in the field.

Common interventions:
- School codes of conduct
- Reporting and accountability mechanisms in school
- Student clubs and committees
- Community advocacy
- Whole school approach
- Psychosocial support / therapy in school
- Girls’ latrines / girls’ spaces
- Anti-SRGBV National Policies
- Teacher training / sensitization

Evidence-based promising practices:
- Whole school / multi-sector / holistic approach is effective
- Top-down introduction of codes of conduct alone are insufficient; participatory development of codes of conduct is more effective
- Gender transformative approaches are more effective than rights-based approach
- Confidentiality and reliable response to complaints are necessary for students to utilize reporting mechanisms
- Teaching positive discipline is necessary alongside policies against corporal punishment to reduce incidence

Relationship to ECCN Conceptual Framework:

Questions from the SLE Qualitative Assessment tool:
1. **Of the following types of SRGBV, which occur at the school(s) regularly?** Bullying between students? Student sexually abusing another student? Corporal punishment? Teachers abusing students or vice versa (emotional, physical, sexual?)

2. **If someone hears about a student victim of SRGBV, how is it (if at all) reported?** Is the reporting mechanism different depending on the type of abuse / who is involved? What is the response that is supposed to be taken? What is the response that is actually taken? What gaps might occur in communication that prevent resolution?

3. **What is the school doing to reduce the incidence of SRGBV (specific to type of SRGBV)?** Are these actions successful? What would it take for them to be more successful? How can others help? What gaps might occur in communication that prevent resolution?

4. **What sorts of risks of SRGBV are students and teachers faced with when trying to get to/from school or within the school itself?** Do risks differ between boys and girls / men and women? Is the risk generally when students are within the school or when they are going to/from the school? Are there different kinds of risks depending on where the students are?

5. **What do students and teachers normally do to stay safe from SRGBV on the way to/from school?** Are there better methods than what they currently use to ensure safe passage? What are some of the risks (if any) to their alternative method of reaching school or using an escort?

6. **Are there certain times of day / year that the risks are more significant or less significant?** What is the reason that risk of SRGBV might change from day to day? Is there any way that students and teachers can know about the risks in their area on a regular basis?

---

3:45 - 4:00: Reflections and Wrap-Up
Day 2

2.1 Opening Activity 9:00 – 9:15

Time: 15 minutes

Presenter: Radha Ganesan

Objective: Participants will be re-acquainted with the content and with each other
2.2 Education Under Attack  9:15 am – 12:00 pm

Time:  165 minutes

Presenter: Amy Kapit

Objective: Participants will be able to articulate key considerations around education under attack in the context of education programming and will be familiar with key steps for risk reduction.

Common interventions:
- Unarmed/armed physical protection of education
- Early warning systems
- Alternative delivery
- School based safety and security planning

Evidence-based interventions: This is an emerging field where additional work is needed to develop an evidence-base on the effectiveness of the above common interventions.

Relationship to ECCN’s SLE Conceptual Framework:

Questions from the SLE Qualitative Assessment tool:

1. **How does the conflict threaten students and teachers on the route to/from school?**  
   Do risks differ between boys and girls / men and women? Is the risk generally when students are within the school or when they are going to/from the school? Are there different kinds of risks depending on where the students are?

2. **What do students and teachers do to stay safe on the route to/from school from conflict-related risks?**  
   Are there better methods than what they currently use to ensure safe passage? What are some of the risks (if any) to their alternative method of reaching school or
using an escort? Are there certain times of day / year that the conflict-related risks are more significant or less significant?

3. **What is the reason that conflict-related risks might change from day to day?** Is there any way that students and teachers can know about the risks in their area on a regular basis?

12:00 – 1:00: **LUNCH**
2.3 Gang Violence 1:00 – 3:00 pm

**Time:** 120 minutes

**Presenters:** Sara Danish and Megan Meinen

**Objectives:** Participants will understand specific challenges to safety in regions affected by gang violence, various intervention strategies and the degree to which these have been successful in the field.

**Common interventions:**
- Policing / law enforcement activity protecting schools
- Negotiations between gangs re: use of schools
- Community / parent advocacy
- Extended school hours
- Early childhood education
- School-based life skills interventions
- Improved infrastructure / community layout for location of schools
- Alternative education programs for youth (outside formal schooling)
- Reintegration of ex-gang members into community and schools
- Positive discipline teaching strategies

**Evidence based promising practices:**
- Need to differentiate specific risk factors for youth – type 1, 2, 3
- Early Childhood Development Programs
- Effective Parenting
- School-based violence prevention programs are one of the most successful school-level interventions for reducing risky behavior – focus on protective factors such as increasing connectedness with school / with adult in school; imparting ‘life skills’
- Community-wide social marketing and communication campaigns; anti-violence in media
- Remedial and second-chance education before resorting to incarceration
- Comprehensive job training programs
- Youth-friendly spaces (with constructive activities supported by an adult, not just a place)
- Mentoring programs have reduced likelihood that young person engages in risky behavior; also increases educational attainment
- Youth Service – young people who volunteer are less likely to engage in delinquent behavior; abuse drugs and alcohol
- Safe neighborhood and community policing programs increase the public’s perception of safety and the image of the police.

**Relationship to ECCN’s SLE Framework:**
Questions from the SLE Qualitative Assessment tool:

1. **What sorts of risks from gangs do students and teachers face on the route to and from school?** Do risks differ between boys and girls / men and women? Is the risk generally when students are within the school or when they are going to/from the school? Are there different kinds of risks depending on where the students are?

2. Are there certain times of day / year that the gang-related risks are more significant or less significant? **What is the reason that safety risks might change from day to day?** Is there any way that students and teachers can know about the risks in their area on a regular basis?

3. **What do students and teachers do to stay safe from gang-related problems on the route to/from school?** Are there better methods than what they currently use to ensure safe passage? What are some of the risks (if any) to their alternative method of reaching school or using an escort?

4. **Is alcohol easily accessible in the school community?** Where? Who goes there? Have you observed more violent behavior by people around that area or after frequenting that area?

### 2.4 Re-Cap 3:15 – 4:00 pm

**Time:** 45 minutes

**Presenter:** Tracy and Radha

**Objective:** Participants are aware of various resources for finding evidence relating to safer learning environments
3.1 Opening Activity

_Time:_ 15 minutes

_Presenter:_ Radha

,Objective:_ Participants will be re-acquainted with the content and with each other
3.2 Wellbeing 9:15 – 11:15 am

Time: 120 minutes

Presenter: Vania Alves

Objective: Participants will understand the definitions of trauma and wellbeing and the different ways to reach/measure that state, and how it relates to safer learning environments.

Common Interventions:

- Implicit and explicit Social and Emotional Learning in formal and non-formal education;
- Training of educators in Psychosocial Support, Positive Discipline, Social and Emotional Learning, and Child Protection - educators can provide psychosocial support to learners both by adapting the way they interact with learners, creating a safe and supportive environment in which learners may express their emotions and experiences, identifying children in need of support and by including specific structured psychosocial activities in the teaching/learning process;
- Providing educators with continuous learning opportunities, relevant training and professional support (e.g. through teacher professional development programs);
- Direct provision and/or activation of available psychosocial support for educators to assist them in dealing with crisis situations;
- Identification of key protection threats external to the educational system (e.g. armed conflict) and those that are internal (e.g. bullying, violent punishment, gender-based violence);
- Provision of education that helps to restore a sense of structure, predictability and normality for children; creates opportunities for expression, choice, social interaction and support; and builds children’s competencies and life skills.
- Utilising participatory methods that involve learners in learning activities (e.g., adolescent and youth participation in conducting activities for younger children; peer-to-peer approaches).
- Including opportunities in child- and youth-friendly spaces for children and young people to learn life skills and to participate, for example, in supplementary education, vocational training, artistic, cultural activities and/or sports.
- Support non-formal learning such as vocational training to provide learners with skills that are relevant for the current and future economic environments and that are linked to employment opportunities.
- Providing catch-up courses and accelerated learning for older children (e.g. those formerly associated with fighting forces or armed groups) who have missed out on education; conducting back-to-school campaigns in which communities, educational authorities and humanitarian workers promote access for all children and youth to education.

Evidence-based Promising Practices:

- Including Social and Emotional Learning in formal and non-formal education (e.g. Creative Associates International and International Rescue Committee, Nigeria - https://www.creativeassociatesinternational.com/special-reports/nigeria-path-healing-students-displaced-boko-haram/; International Rescue Committee & Global TIES NYU, Lebanon and Niger);
- The integration of Psychosocial Support Programs into the Public Education Sector (e.g., World Learning, Lebanon - http://luminosfund.org/media/32513/20160131-speed-schools-education-for-syrian-refugees-v2.pdf); Combination of pedagogical and psychosocial components that are oriented towards the development of the child (e.g., “Essence of Learning”: Caritas Switzerland, Gaza, Palestine -
- Strengthening teacher professional development in crisis settings and other contexts of instability, including the provision of support to teachers to promote their well-being and build their own social and emotional competencies (e.g., “Teachers for Teachers”: Teachers College, Columbia University, Kakuma refugee camp, Kenya - http://www.tc.columbia.edu/refugeeeducation; War Child Holland, Colombia)
- Fostering the psycho-affective development of children through emotional education programs (e.g., Universidad del Norte in Barranquilla, and the Colombian Institute of Family Welfare; Colombia, Pistoñ - https://www.uninorte.edu.co/documents/739230/Pisot%C3%B3n+Cartilla+Saber+Hacer+Colombia/27f8303c-c1d8-4407-9251-c4262d370944)
- Using mindfulness practice in learning spaces in order to foster social and emotional learning and promote teacher and student wellbeing (e.g., “BREATHE in Education (RESPIRA en Educación”, Convivencia Productiva and Save the Children, Colombia - http://en.respira.co/respira_en_educacion)
- Play-based Learning Approach (e.g., Right To Play International);
- Applying a whole-school approach, focusing on positive mental health, including all children in the school, through multi-year programs (Barry, Clarke, Jenkins, & Patel, 2013; Durlak et al., 2011; Jané-Llopis et al., 2011; O’Mara & Lind, 2013; Weare & Nind, 2011).

Relationship to ECCN’s SLE Framework:

Questions from the SLE Qualitative Assessment tool:

1. **Generally speaking, how do students/teachers/staff feel about the school?** Are they happy to be here? If so, what in particular makes them happy? If not, what in particular makes them unhappy? What would they change?

2. **What type of teacher discipline is considered to be the most effective?** How do teachers normally discipline students? Have there been any changes to code of conduct or other regulations that restrict the use of certain forms of punishment? What kinds of punishments do boys get? Girls? Do they affect attendance? Retention? Does it work?

3. **What kinds of resources and materials are available at the school, and are they sufficient** (e.g. chairs, roof, walls, tables, chalkboards for students; access to toilets; water source).

4. **What type of trauma are students experiencing?** What is the source of trauma? Is it related to influences inside the school or outside—including the home? Is this trauma experienced by most students, some students, or only a few students, and do girls or boys experience it differently? How do gender norms contribute to the source of trauma? Are there different expectations for boys and girls?

5. **What is the school doing to help students deal with trauma?** Are students receptive to it / willing to talk about these issues? Is it effective? If so, what in particular works well and what
is the impact you observe. If not, what more needs to be done? Are there different approaches depending on if it is a girl student or a boy student?

6. **How does trauma impact students’ well-being and learning within the school setting?** Does it impact their attention in class? Their behavior? Their ability to acquire knowledge? Their ability to form relationships with other students? Anything else? Are there any clear differences between the impact on girls versus boys?

7. **Are trauma/emotional problems experienced by most students, some students, or only a few students?** What is the main source? Is any of it related to what is happening within the school itself, or is it something to do with things going on at home / in the community?

8. **What, if anything, is being done to try to help students dealing with trauma as a result of these risks?** Are students receptive to it / willing to talk about these issues? Is it effective? If so, what in particular works well and what is the impact you observe. If not, what more needs to be done?

9. **How does trauma impact student’s well-being and learning within the school setting?** Does it impact their attention in class? Their behavior? Their ability to acquire knowledge? Their ability to form relationships with other students? Anything else?

**11:15 - 11:30: BREAK**
3.3 Natural Disasters & Risk Reduction 11:30 am – 12:45 pm

*Time:* 75 minutes

*Presenter:* Darren Hertz

*Objectives:* Participants will articulate key considerations around natural disasters in the context of education programming and will be familiar with key steps for risk reduction.

*Common interventions:*
- **National level:**
  - National high level hazard, vulnerability and risk assessments designed appropriately and used to reduce disaster risk
  - Advocate for, develop and enforce school building codes for all new schools first and retrofitting plans for existing schools
  - Advocate for development of education sector disaster preparedness / response plans that address facility safety and continuity of education service provision with service level agreements.
  - Integrate appropriate Disaster Risk Management content into national curriculum
- **School / school community level:**
  - School facility structural and site assessments for all hazards
  - Local builders trained to construct and maintain hazard resistant school facilities
  - All new or existing school construction monitored to assure it meets hazard resistant building codes.
  - Retrofitting of structurally dangerous components of existing schools prioritized.
  - Local capacity and vulnerability assessments for all hazards
  - Community and/or child led vulnerability and capacity assessments
  - School disaster management committees developing, implementing and monitoring disaster risk reduction plans

*Evidence-based promising practices:*
- Specific to natural hazard and context.

*Relationship to ECCN’s SLE Framework:*
Questions from the SLE Qualitative Assessment tool:

1. **Has the school been affected by [specific hazard(s)] in the past?** What happened? What was the school’s response? Was the response that the school successful in keeping students, teachers and staff safe? What would it take for them to be more successful? What help would you need?
2. **What is the school doing to keep students and staff safe and continue schooling in the event of [specific hazard(s)]?** Does the school carry out regular preparedness and evacuation drills? Is there a preparedness plan?

3. **Is the school building constructed according to [specific hazard(s)]-resilient standards?** What standards are used? If they are not up to standard, are any steps being taken to address this?

12:45 – 1:45 pm: **LUNCH**
3.4 Health Case Study: Ebola in Liberia 1:45 – 2:45 pm:

**Time:** 60 minutes

**Presenter:** Radha Ganesan and Lukas Olynyk

**Objective:** Participants will articulate key considerations around health in the context of education programming.

**Common interventions:**
- STI Prevention education
- WASH education for students and teachers
- Improved water source
- Deworming
- Infectious disease screening and control/ mobile reporting
- Malaria prevention or treatment
- Teacher first aid / health training
- Physical education and exercise programs
- Nutrition / school feeding
- Micronutrient supplementation
- Clinic/ first aid kits / basic health resources in school
- Planned school closures (temporary) during outbreak
- Distance education / learning / alternative sites

**Evidence based promising practices:**
- Increases in attendance and learning are correlated with a number of health-related interventions, most clearly:
  - Improved hygiene facilities and resources in school and community (toilets, wash basins, menstruation materials)
  - Improved water sources in school and community
  - Deworming students in school and community
  - Vaccination programs
  - Malaria prevention or treatment in community (bed nets, spraying, treatment)
  - Improved nutrition (in communities) and school feeding programs
  - Micronutrient supplementation
- WASH interventions within schools / for students has been shown to reduce incidence of both infectious and non-infectious disease
- School closures do not necessarily reduce transmission
- Community care centers and first aid resources in schools can reduce transmission of both infectious and non-infectious disease
- Distance / virtual education when schools are closed during health emergencies can prevent decreased attendance and decreased learning
- School-level disaster risk and response education / risk assessment and planning are applicable to potential health emergencies – being aware of potential infectious diseases and establishing protocol (e.g. process for early identification, decisions on when to use isolation/quarantines, locations for treatment, available vaccinations, etc.).

Relationship to ECCN’s SLE Framework:
Questions from the SLE Qualitative Assessment tool:

1. **Was the school affected by a health emergency / epidemic in the past?** Please tell me about the most recent outbreak / issue that occurred in this community / area (even if it didn’t reach the school itself)? How many people were affected? Did the health emergency/epidemic affect student or teacher attendance / the opening of the school itself?

2. **Does the school have any safeguards for protecting against / identifying the risk of epidemics before they occur?** Please give an example. Have these safeguards ever been used? Did they work? How did you come up with the idea / plans for the safeguards in place? What could be done to improve them?

3. **What kind of preparedness plan or protocol does the school have for responding to the risk of a health epidemic?** Have the school ever implemented this protocol? Was it successful? What more would need to be done to make it more effective?

4. **Has the school community been affected by food insecurity, malnutrition or famine?** What happened to the school and students/ teachers? How did they respond? What was learned?

5. **How is the school protecting staff and students against malnutrition and food insecurity?** Have you ever used these safeguards? What was the result? What more would you need for them to be better?

6. **What kind of preparedness plan or protocol does the school have to reduce the risk of malnutrition or food insecurity and respond in a crisis?** How is this linked to the broader preparedness plan for other risks (as natural disasters and conflict increase the risk of malnutrition and food insecurity.)
3.5 Content Re-cap 2:45 – 3:30 pm

Time: 15 minutes

Presenters: Radha and Tracy

Objective: Participants will be able to articulate the main messages from all sessions

3.6 Course Evaluation 3:30 – 4:00 pm

Time: 30 minutes

Presenters: Radha and Tracy

Objective: Participants will articulate their experience of the course and provide suggestions for improving the training.