

Strengthening Education Management Information Systems (EMIS) and Data for Increased Resilience to Crisis

COUNTRY CASE STUDY: PALESTINE

Background document

The 'Strengthening Education Management and Information Systems (EMIS) and Data for Increased Resilience to Crises' initiative responds to the need for accurate and relevant education data and evidence in crisis contexts. UNESCO, in partnership with NORCAP and supported by Education Cannot Wait and SIDA, has conducted country case studies in Chad, Ethiopia, Uganda, Palestine, South Sudan and Syria to analyse recurring data challenges in crisis situations in the framework of the initiative.

This document was commissioned by UNESCO and is part of the collection of six country case studies carried out. The views and opinions expressed in this paper are those of the author and should not be attributed to UNESCO.

This document can be cited with the following reference: Francesca Pinna, 2021, Palestine Country Case Study. Document commissioned for the UNESCO Strengthening Education Management and Information Systems (EMIS) and Data for Increased Resilience to Crises' initiative.

© UNESCO and NORCAP 2021. This work is available under the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 3.0 IGO licence (CC BY-SA 3.0 IGO; <u>https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0/igo</u>).

For further information, please contact: <u>eie@unesco.org</u>

FRANCESCA PINNA

2021



Table of Contents

Acr	Acronyms 3							
Вас	Background 5							
Me	thodology	6						
Mai	in findings	7						
١.	Education and the protracted crisis in Palestine	10						
	A. The education system in Palestine	10						
	B. Impacts of the protracted crisis on education in Palestine	11						
	C. Vulnerability factors that limit access to safe, quality education for specific groups	13						
н.	Data environment to inform EiE	15						
	A. Data-driven culture within the MoE	15						
	B. Commitment of the MoE to strengthen the resilience of the education system	16						
	C. Main challenges	19						
III.	Gathering and processing data to inform effective EiE strategies and programmes	20						
	A. Capturing data on vulnerabilities to inform evidence based EiE plans	20						
	B. Humanitarian and development partners bridging information gaps	23						
	C. Main challenges	25						
IV.	Assessing vulnerabilities and priority needs to inform evidence-based EiE programn and strategies	nes 25						
	A. Fragmented vulnerability and needs assessments developed by the MoE	26						
	B. Development of vulnerability assessments by humanitarian and development partners	27						
	C. Main challenges	28						
v.	Collaborating towards strengthening the information systems of the Ministry of Education	29						
	A. Strengthening data collection and EMIS for stronger resilience to crises	29						
	B. Suggested remedial actions to address gaps and challenges	30						
	C. Proposed implementation strategy and next steps	33						
Bibl	liography	35						
Δnr	ney 1. Man of humanitarian vulnerability	37						
A	nex 1. Wrap of numaritation vulnerability	37 20						
Ann	iex 2. Suggested next steps towards the implementation of remedial actions	58						
Anr	nex 3. Descriptive tables of Information Management Systems assessed for the case study	39						
Ann	nex 4. EiE assessments carried out by members of the Education Cluster in 2018-2019	56						

Acronyms

AWRAD: Arab World for Research and Development DG: Technical Direction of the Ministry of Education ECW: Education Cannot Wait **EiE: Education in Emergencies** EMIS: Education Management Information System **ESCP: Education Sector Contingency Plan** ESS: Equivalent Student Suffering System ESSP: Education Sector Strategic Plan ESWG: Education Sector Working Group GCPEA: Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack **GIS:** Geographic Information System **GPE:** Global Partnership for Education ICT: Information and communications technology **IDP:** Internally Displaced Person IIEP: UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning IITE: UNESCO Institute for Information Technologies in Education INEE: Inter-agency Network for Education in Emergencies JEA: Jerusalem Education Administration JPAS: Joint Advocacy and Protection Strategy M&E: Monitoring and Evaluation MICS: Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey MoE: Ministry of Education MoEHE: Ministry of Education and Higher Education MOU: Memorandum of Understanding MS: Microsoft MYRP: Multi-Year Resilience Programme NER: Net Enrolment Rate NRC: Norwegian Refugee Council OCHA: United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs PCBS: Palestinian Bureau of Statistics

SDG: Sustainable Development Goals SIDA: Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency SMIS: School Management Information System TVET: Technical and Vocational Education and Training UNCT: United Nations Country Team UNDAC: United Nations Disaster Assessment and Coordination UNDP: United Nations Development Programme UNESCO: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization UNICEF: United Nations Children's Fund UNRWA: United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East

WASH: Water Sanitation and Hygiene

Background

Impact of emergencies on education

It is currently estimated that 75 million children around the world are in desperate need of educational support. Conflict and situations of emergencies, such as war, disasters and public health emergencies, affect one in six school-age children worldwide.¹

While education is a pivotal element for the well-being of all societies, in emergency settings it goes beyond providing intellectual and technical skills to learners. It establishes a protective environment that is beneficial for the emotional, cultural and social well-being of entire communities. This is crucial for the reconstruction of the social, economic and political fabric in a post-crisis scenario.

For this reason, in 2015 the international community committed to reaching Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG 4), 'Ensuring inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all', including those affected by emergencies and protracted crises.

Education in Emergencies (EiE) data for better planning, prevention and response

Education planning that takes into account the causes and triggers of conflict and disasters, and that reflects the impacts of emergencies as well as their possible evolution, can reduce – and sometimes prevent – the effects of crises and disasters on education. In addition, it can be cost-efficient, protecting investments in infrastructure, equipment and supplies (IIEP-UNESCO, 2017).

However, in most countries impacted by emergencies and protracted crises, governments and their partners face important and recurring challenges when planning for EiE. One of the most critical challenges faced is the lack of disaggregated, reliable and up-to-date data that can serve as a baseline for relevant preparedness, response, and recovery strategies, all the while monitoring the impact of the implemented actions (Anselme et al., 2019, p. 23).

Education Management Information Systems (EMIS) that are adapted to such purpose can strengthen accountability in EiE while ensuring systematic monitoring of the resilience of the education system to the recurring impacts of emergencies (Hamiys, 2017, p. xv).

Strengthening data and EMIS for increased resilience to crises

UNESCO – with the support of Education Cannot Wait, NORCAP and SIDA – is supporting Ministries of Education in countries affected by emergencies and protracted crises to strengthen and adapt their EMIS to inform EiE strategies and programmes. Six case studies have been carried out in different contexts (i.e. Chad, Ethiopia, Palestine, South Sudan, Syria and Uganda) to assess the capacities in place, the challenges and possible ways forward.

These studies have been undertaken in direct collaboration with national authorities and humanitarian and development partners working in EiE; and represent a valuable opportunity to strengthen accountability while generating more cohesive approaches by referring to common datasets for joint planning. Doing so is recognized as of crucial importance by the Ministry of Education of Palestine – as

¹ See Global Partnership for Education (GPE) 'Education cannot wait for conflict and crises to end. INFOGRAPHIC', <u>https://www.globalpartnership.org/news/infographic/education-cannot-wait-conflict-and-crises-end-infographic</u>

well as its partners – who have demonstrated consistent commitment to being data-driven and mainstreaming EiE throughout institutional policies, plans and practice.

Objective of the case study

The overall objective of this case study is to analyse the current EMIS and recurring challenges related to education data and its use to inform evidence-based EiE plans and strategies in Palestine. In particular, it aims to (i) highlight gaps between the information generated through the EMIS and data/information used by humanitarian/development actors; and (ii) outline potential remedial actions to address the identified gaps.

Methodology

The implemented methodology prioritized the need to reflect the reality of the context, while ensuring an inclusive and participative approach. UNESCO viewed this as a key element to ensure the accuracy and quality of the assessment, build ownership, capitalize on previous achievements and avoid duplication of efforts.

In addition to a thorough desk review of context-specific literature and an analysis of key information systems used by the Ministry of Education (MoE), a series of semi-structured consultations with education officials and partners were conducted throughout the process. In particular, the consultations concerned eight technical directions (DGs) of the MoE,² two District Offices of the MoE,³ as well as four international partners⁴ and the Education Cluster.

The findings were presented in a one-day workshop that gathered together all consulted parties, as well as high-level decision-makers of the MoE and additional partners (i.e. Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics (PCBS), UNDP and AWRAD), in order to develop joint recommendations and define the next steps.

Moreover, UNESCO ensured systematic coordination with its partners in the current Multi-Year Resilience Programme (MYRP) (i.e. UNICEF, UNDP, UNRWA and Save the Children). This allowed for strong alignment with the country priorities in terms of EiE, as well as the establishment of a strong consensus around future objectives that should be advocated.

This process laid the groundwork for future collaboration in the event of a second phase, in which everyone will contribute to the achievement of the set goals and objectives.

² These include the DG of Educational Planning (Division of Statistics and Division of Monitoring and Evaluation), DG of Field Follow-Up, DG of School Health, DG of School Building, DG of Counselling and Special Education, DG of Jerusalem Affairs, DG of ICT and DG of General Education.

³ Hebron and Jerusalem.

⁴ NRC, Save the Children, UNICEF and UNRWA.

Main findings

Strong data-driven culture within the MoE but fragmented information systems that affect the quality and relevance of data

The consultations highlighted the significant commitment of the MoE – at all levels – to collect data in view of informing evidence-based strategies and plans, including those related to emergencies. This 'data-driven culture' is at the heart of the work of all DGs within the MoE and is the basis for fostering a results-based management approach.

However, since the development of the first EMIS in 1995, a proliferation of information systems has occurred. Numerous DGs refer to different mechanisms that use parallel tools and processing methodologies that do not allow for the data generated to be integrated.

While this is linked to the absence of a unified data collection/management policy, and the emergence of new data needs, the multiple systems in place contribute to (i) dispersion of information and excessive clerical work, (ii) overlapping information and inconsistent indicators that cannot always be integrated and (iii) fragmented vulnerability data and needs assessments within the MoE.

Important commitment to building resilience but incomplete understanding of the vulnerabilities of the education system

The MoE has demonstrated great commitment towards protecting children's rights to educational continuity and participation in a safe learning environment. This is evident through its endorsement of international standards and protocols,⁵ as well as the Inclusive Education Policy, the School Environment Policy, the Joint Advocacy and Protection Strategy (JPAS), the Education Sector Contingency Plan and the Education Sector Strategic Plan 2017-2022 (ESSP).

While these formal commitments are commendable, the MoE has struggled to implement a coordinated and systematic approach to monitor comprehensive vulnerabilities of the education system and inform cohesive EiE strategies. This mostly results from the absence of an institutionalized, coordinated approach to EiE that includes the phases of emergency prevention, preparedness, response and recovery. Moreover, it leads to significant challenges in defining a common set of EiE data, informing a vulnerability/EiE baseline and developing joint strategies and programmes.

Strong collaboration with humanitarian and development partners, but challenges in informing EiE interventions

The MoE and the humanitarian and development partners consider their collaboration to be very strong and successful. The MoE is systematically included in all phases of EiE programme development and implementation. It is also a leading and active actor in relevant coordination mechanisms (i.e. the Education Cluster, Education Sector Working Group and EiE Thematic Group), and benefits from significant support aimed at strengthening its capacities.

However, the current challenges encountered by the MoE to gather and process relevant, reliable and cohesive data on the vulnerabilities of the education system to emergencies has led partners to

⁵ Including the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030, the Sustainable Development Goals, and the Safe Schools Declaration.

implement their own data collection and assessment mechanisms – mostly related to programme needs, specific education components and restricted catchment areas. In 2019, the Education Cluster collected about 28 assessments that were developed by 13 different members⁶ throughout the previous year.

While the information collected and assessed by partners can be a valuable and complementary resource that can highlight needs of specific vulnerable groups that would otherwise be neglected, partners agree on the relevance of strengthening EMIS to inform EiE strategies.

Suggested remedial actions

It is difficult to define how to adapt and strengthen EMIS for EiE without addressing the general gaps and challenges of EMIS. In fact, the recommendations that derived from the consultations pertained to the revision of the overall EMIS, as well as specific components related to EiE.

In particular, they address the challenges related to the quality and kinds of data generated, as well as their effective use by the MoE and its partners to inform evidence-based EiE programmes.

The main recommendations can be categorized as such:

Development of a unified computerized system

- Draft and validate a data collection/management policy
- Develop and implement an adapted computerized system (linked with systems of other ministries and organizations, such as UNRWA)
- Ensure the sustainability and ownership of the system within the MoE at all levels (financial, IT, human resources)

Development of a comprehensive EMIS framework – which includes specific EiE indicators

- Elaborate an EMIS Master Plan (i.e. identifying data gaps and needs and how the information system will concretely address them)
- Develop a Data Management Framework for Education Data (i.e. indicators, processes, roles and responsibilities) with all DGs
- Integrate specific EiE indicators that can inform emergency preparedness, response and recovery plans

Promote systematic and coordinated EiE monitoring and planning

- Formalize the EiE role of the DG of Field Follow-Up and of each DG
- Elaborate a comprehensive EiE strategy and develop systematic joint assessments
- Strengthen and systematize coordination on matters related to EiE among DGs and partners at all levels

UNESCO, along with the MoE and its partners, suggest tackling these components simultaneously as they all contribute to the successful implementation of one another. For example, the development of

⁶ See Annex 4.

a comprehensive EiE strategy for the MoE will likely inform the indicators that should be included in the EMIS Framework. In addition, the indicators and their standards will inform the development of the computerized system which will need to guarantee the reliability of the information gathered.

All these recommendations should be developed and implemented in a coordinated manner with the inclusion of all DGs, and with humanitarian and development actors. This will not only contribute to the quality of the outcomes of the process but will support the linkage of the EMIS to other existing information systems (e.g. UNRWA and PCBS), as well as the recognition of the generated data within the MoE and by other stakeholders. This is considered a key element for promoting its use as a common reference to inform strategies and plans – including those related to EiE.

I. Education and the protracted crisis in Palestine

The humanitarian situation in Palestine is among the world's most longstanding crises, largely resulting from continued military operations and the blockade of Gaza (OCHA, 2017a). The prolonged occupation, illegal settlement activity and demolitions of homes and livelihoods, relocation and geographical fragmentation have resulted in fragile living conditions for many communities across the West Bank – including East Jerusalem – and Gaza (OCHA, 2017a). The closure imposed on Gaza and the ongoing hostilities have eroded infrastructure, whereby only 10 per cent of the population has access to clean water, electricity availability is limited to a few hours per day, and an estimated one in two people suffers from food insecurity (OCHA, 2017a).

In addition to the impacts of the protracted conflict, Palestine is exposed to natural hazards, including earthquakes, floods, droughts and landslides (UNDAC, 2014). All major urban centres of the West Bank are vulnerable to seismic risk and severe flooding. Landslides systematically affect communities throughout the country, especially in the Gaza Strip and in the Hebron governorate.

In this context, and in line with the international commitments of SDG4, educational service providers must identify and target the overall vulnerabilities of schools, educators and learners that may affect their safe access to school, as well as learning outcomes. This will help to build the resilience of the education system to the recurring threats resulting from the protracted crisis and natural hazards.

A. The education system in Palestine

Children under 18 represent about 43.5 per cent (2,115,317) of the population in Palestine. Of that total, there are approximately 1.3 million children in the school system (MoEHE, 2019). While enrolment in basic education is very high (95.4 per cent), the net enrolment rate (NER) in secondary education stands at 60.8 per cent (52.4 per cent boys and 69.5 per cent girls) (UNICEF, 2018),⁷ and only 53.6 per cent of children with disabilities are enrolled in school (PCBS, 2018).

Palestine's education sector reflects the broader administrative fragmentation that reflects also from the protracted conflict with Israel. Education services are provided by different supervising authorities (e.g. MoE, UNRWA, private schools), which makes it challenging to implement a cohesive education strategy throughout the territory. In total, it is estimated that 65 per cent of enrolled Palestinian students attend government schools, 25.5 per cent attend UNRWA schools and 9.5 per cent attend private schools (MoEHE, 2019).

At the national level, the MoE based in Ramallah is responsible for overseeing the education sector across Palestine. Through its 17 district offices in the West Bank (including East Jerusalem), the MoE supervises the provision of education within public and private schools. Due to the geographic and

⁷ One of the key findings of UNICEF study on out-of-school children (2018) is that the rate of exclusion almost doubles between ages 12 and 15, with about one out of fifty 12-year-old children excluded from education, compared to about one out of seven 15-year-old children. The rapid increase in the rate of exclusion is particularly extreme for boys: about one out of four 15-year-old boys are out of school. Many of these adolescent boys cite a lack of interest in education and low school achievement as the primary reasons for leaving school, which underscores the importance of improving the quality of education to keep them in school and engaged in learning.

political separation between the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, there is MoE representation in Gaza City that supervises public schools in the Gaza Strip through seven district offices.

In East Jerusalem,⁸ only 45.2 per cent of Palestinian students are supervised directly by the MoE (Waqf and private schools) while 53.4 per cent attend schools supervised by the Jerusalem Education Administration (JEA) and Israeli Municipality (MoEHE, 2017b, p. 124).⁹ The remaining learners attend UNRWA schools.

This fragmentation limits the possibility of comprehensively monitoring and addressing the needs of the education system; it also makes it difficult to implement unified quality learning standards among all education facilities (MoEHE, 2017a, p. 53).

UNRWA is among the main education providers in Palestine, with its programmes directly targeting Palestinian refugees. UNRWA runs 12 per cent of the Palestinian schools, which absorb 24.2 per cent of the Palestinian student population (MoEHE, 2017a, p. 29). In the West Bank, UNRWA provides basic education from grades 1 to 9, and grade 10 in two schools in East Jerusalem. In Gaza, UNRWA carries out its biggest education programme, serving 278,991 students from grades 1-9 with the support of 8,676 education personnel.¹⁰

	West Bank ¹¹	Jerusalem	Gaza
Total students	650,594	90,104 ¹²	561,111
МоЕ	83.11%	13.37%	47.3%
Private schools	10.51%	31.83%	3.05%
UNRWA	6.37%	1.4%	49.64%
JEA and Israeli Municipality	N/A	53.4%	N/A

Table 1. Percentage of Palestinian students by supervising authority

Source: Author (data sources : MoEHE, UNWRA)

B. Impacts of the protracted crisis on education in Palestine

The policies and military restrictions imposed by the Israeli Government result in a wide array of obstacles and risks that continuously affect schools, students, and teachers (MoEHE, 2018). Movement restrictions, conflict escalations, the presence of numerous checkpoints and unsafe school buildings systematically challenge the ability of educators and learners to access quality education opportunities in safe learning spaces (ECW, 2019) and influence general learning outcomes (MoEHE, 2018).

⁸ For a detailed explanation of the administration of basic education in East Jerusalem, please see UNICEF, 2018. *State of Palestine Country Report on Out-of-School Children*, pp. 91-92.

⁹ This percentage includes the schools defined as being 'Semi-JEA'.

¹⁰ See https://www.unrwa.org/what-we-do/education.

¹¹ Does not include figures from Jerusalem.

 $^{^{12}}$ See MoEHE 2017b n 125

¹² See MoEHE, 2017b, p. 125.

The impacts of the conflict on the education system are often exacerbated by natural hazards that provoke similar effects on the same vulnerable communities. In Gaza, for example, recurring rains during the winter season, coupled with weak infrastructure, put the population at risk of temporary displacement, property loss and deterioration of health. About 69,000 students and teachers in 65 UNRWA and public schools have been identified among those in the most at-risk areas (OCHA, 2017c).

The protracted crisis affects the education system in terms of both access and quality. Main impacts on *access and participation* include:

- **Physical and emotional distress:** Children and educators are regularly exposed to aggression and harassment at checkpoints on their way to/from schools. In addition, they are often affected by the use of tear gas and rubber bullets, incursion into school premises, as well as settler-related incidents that can threaten their physical and psychosocial well-being.
- House arrest and detainment of students: Children in East Jerusalem are those most impacted by such extreme measures; although in 2015, over 1,000 Palestinian children, including in the West Bank, were arrested by Israeli forces and prosecuted before military courts on security-related charges (UNCT, 2016, p. 14). Children detained are often denied their rights and some are subjected to administrative detention without charge (OCHA, 2020).
- Use of school infrastructure for military purposes: armed groups sometimes use schools as bases to store weaponry and for a variety of other purposes, such as temporary detention centres, surveillance stations and strategic points from which to protect settlers (GCPEA, 2018, p. 154).
- Economic insecurity: The protracted conflict, the Gaza blockade and the particular situation of East Jerusalem and Area C have had detrimental effects on the economic situation in Palestine. This has pushed an increasing number of families into poverty (MoEHE, 2017b, p. 111), therefore affecting access to education for children and youth in the most disadvantaged households.

Main impacts on *quality* include:

- Inappropriate and insufficient buildings and classrooms: Area C, East Jerusalem and Gaza persistently face shortages of adequate school infrastructure, which affects the quality and safety of the education environment. This is often due to limitations imposed by the Israeli Government, including building permit requirements or taxes (MoEHE, 2017b, p. 127), which put schools at risk of being evicted or demolished and therefore prevent the allocation of investments for school maintenance and restoration.
- Psychosocial distress and emotional well-being: In Area C, Hebron H2 and East Jerusalem, 44.4 per cent of students manifested psychological and behavioural problems including fear, aggressiveness, withdrawal behaviour, hyperactivity, and speech difficulties (MoEHE, 2017b, p. 111). In Gaza, reports of attempted suicide, depression, sleeplessness, and anxiety have been noted among school children (ECW, 2019). Among the driving reasons for school drop-out, students lament a lack of specialized support programmes for those suffering from learning difficulties (UNCT, 2016, p. 153).
- Educational waste: Measures taken by the military operations and settlers often disrupt daily time at school; collectively, these disruptions resulted in the loss of 9153.5 class hours in 2017 and affected about 79,343 students and 8,428 teachers (MoEHE, 2017b, p. 111). This significantly

impacts the progression of the curriculum, as well as the capacity of learners to dedicate time to study and do their homework or school activities.

- Insufficient numbers of qualified teachers and training opportunities for educators: Teaching staff face many of the same difficulties as students mostly due to restrictions of movement and exposure to various forms of recurring violence. The low remuneration of teachers, specifically in the most fragile areas, deters the pursuit of this profession. The scarcity of access to continuous training opportunities for educators also impairs the quality of education.
- Inadequate school material: In May 2017, the Israeli Government approved a five-year plan aimed at promoting the Israeli curriculum within East Jerusalem schools – specifically those under the Israeli municipality. Recent interventions by Israeli authorities in the teaching of the Palestinian curriculum and textbooks in East Jerusalem by censoring national, historical, and political elements from textbooks remain a major source of controversy (UNICEF, 2018, p.92).

C. Vulnerability factors that limit access to safe, quality education for specific groups

While all Palestinian children and youth bear the effects of this protracted conflict on their education, impacts can differ on the basis of geographical location, exposure to violence, economic access, and sociocultural factors of students and their households. Among the main vulnerable groups¹³ identified by the UNCT in 2016, education service providers need to accord specific attention to the following categories:

Children with disabilities	Among 6- to 9-year-old children, an estimated 32.5 per cent of those with a disability are out of school, compared to 0.9 per cent of their peers (UNICEF, 2018, p. 25).
Adolescent girls	While school dropout rates are higher for boys, adolescent girls are more affected in the event of security-related obstacles to accessing schools (OCHA, 2013). This often leads to an increased risk of being homebound, socially isolated and/or at risk of early marriage (OCHA, 2019).
Children of Bedouin and herder communities	Restrictions imposed on these communities impact their freedom of movement, housing, health, education and employment.
Refugees	Refugees in Palestine account for 41.2 per cent of the total population of which 31.2 per cent suffer from poverty (UNCT, 2016, p. 48). A large percentage of these refugees are food-insecure and are unable to afford health and education services.

Table 2. Main vulnerable groups in need of specific attention from education service providers

¹³ Defined as 'the condition whereby some individuals or groups are systematically deprived of the means of achieving or sustaining progress. Systematic denial of the services and protection of the state, systematic limits to the exercise of human rights or systematic discrimination could all result in structural disadvantage' (UNCT, 2016, p. 41).

Out-of-school children	This category includes children who have never been to school or children that dropped out of the education system. This can result from a number of factors such as detention, displacement, economic insecurity and social norms.
Children subject to violence	Children exposed to or under threat of violence are at increased risk of having lower academic achievement and/or dropping out of school.
Children in labour	Working children are highly vulnerable to loss of education, exposure to hazardous conditions and violation of their rights.
Food insecure households headed by women	Food-insecure households headed by women face serious economic constraints to cover their basic needs. Around 45 per cent of severely food-insecure households headed by women reduce expenditure on education/health/clothes compared to 22 per cent for the food-secure households headed by women (UNCT, 2016, p.48).

Source: Author

Although vulnerability factors that affect access to quality education are multiple, the geographic location of children and their households is a determining factor that can limit their access to basic services and opportunities. The MoE and its partners have identified the most fragile areas as follows:¹⁴

- Gaza Strip Nearly 2 million Palestinians living in the Gaza Strip are facing a longstanding humanitarian crisis. This is driven by a protracted closure, security concerns, an intensification of the internal Palestinian political divide, and three major escalations of hostilities in less than ten years. Combined, these factors have devastated public infrastructure, disrupted the delivery of basic services, and undermined already vulnerable living conditions (OCHA, 2013).
- Area C This area, under near exclusive control of the Israeli authorities (i.e. law enforcement, planning and construction), constitutes over 60 per cent of the West Bank. Most of Area C has been allocated for the benefit of settlements or the Israeli military, at the expense of Palestinian communities (OCHA, 2013).
- Hebron H2 Israel exercises direct control over the 20 per cent of Hebron City known as H2, which is home to some 33,000 Palestinians and a few hundred Israeli settlers. This area has witnessed multiple cycles of violence in the context of continuing settlement activities, which are in contravention of international law (OCHA, 2019).
- Jerusalem (inside the separation barrier) Around 320,000 Palestinians and 212,000 Israeli settlers currently reside in East Jerusalem. Many Palestinians in East Jerusalem are at risk of forcible displacement from demolitions, evictions and revocation of residency (OCHA, 2018a).
- Areas behind the barrier Most of the barrier's route runs inside the West Bank. Where the barrier
 is complete (currently 65 per cent of the route), Palestinian farmers must obtain special permits
 or 'prior coordination' to reach their land via a few authorized gates, while those residing in the
 closed area between the barrier and the 'Green Line' face reduced access to services (OCHA, 2013).

¹⁴ See also 'Map of Humanitarian Vulnerability' in Annex 1.

II. Data environment to inform EiE

The MoE generates a large amount of data that is used for decision-making. This trend seems to be institutionalized throughout all the DGs and is the guiding principle for the development of yearly monitoring and evaluation (M&E) reports and the Statistical Yearbook, as well as all the assessments developed by different DGs. The ESSP 2017-2022 underscores the need for and importance of focusing on M&E efforts to inform programmes and future actions (MoEHE, 2017a, p. 46).

This 'results-based management' approach has been a priority since 1995, when the first attempt to establish a functioning EMIS was made. With the support of UNICEF and the UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP), the MoE developed its first tools and processes to collect, store and retrieve educational data in a systematic manner to inform its education plans and policies (Sultana, 2003, p. 70).

With regards to EiE, the MoE has attempted to have the same approach by institutionalizing its commitment towards assessing emergency-related needs to inform its prevention, preparedness, response and recovery strategies. This is made clear in the ESSP 2017-2022, as well as in the Joint Advocacy and Protection Strategy (JPAS), the Education Sector Contingency Plan (2018), the Inclusive Education Policy and the School Health Policy. These strategic documents all provide an important framework to orient the demand for data and their use within the MoE.

These efforts, implemented in close collaboration with humanitarian and development partners, are valuable. But important gaps remain in terms of defining roles and responsibilities within the MoE, as well as common standards, procedures and goals for data collection, processing and use.

A. Data-driven culture within the MoE

As previously mentioned, the MoE generates a large amount of data at all levels, and their use for decision-making appears to be institutionalized throughout all DGs. While the MoE does not dispose of a specific policy or strategy that orients what data to gather, how and why, it has systematically been committed to collecting data to inform the overall management of the education system.

Through the years, specific divisions of the DG of Educational Planning were given the responsibility of gathering and processing data at different levels, as well as monitoring and evaluating the condition of the education system to orient future steps. In particular, the Division of Statistics and the Division of Monitoring and Evaluation are the two main entities of reference that deal with gathering data and developing statistics.

However, as a result of multiple factors, such as the absence of a specific data collection policy and the emerging of additional data needs, most of the DGs have developed their own information management systems that are used in a parallel manner and that do not generate a unified and comprehensive snapshot of the education system.

In light of this challenge, the ongoing ESSP 2017-2022 clearly states in its Programme Goal 4.2. the commitment of the MoE towards 'Developing the Educational Information Systems and Enhancing

their Use at all Levels' (MoEHE, 2017a, p. 201). To achieve this goal, the strategic document highlights the need to promote the use of information and data for decision-making at all levels, as well as to ensure that reliable and up-to-date data are made available for this purpose.

B. Commitment of the MoE to strengthen the resilience of the education system

ENDORSEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS AND MAINSTREAMING OF EIE IN POLICIES AND PLANS

Due to the continuous impacts of the protracted crisis and hazards on education, the MoE has engaged in proactive approaches to strengthen the resilience of the education system. This dedication is evident in the endorsement of international commitments, as well as the inclusion of emergency preparedness and response elements in its strategic and operational documents.

Among the most relevant commitments to EiE, it is worth noting (i) the contextualization of the INEE Minimum Standards, (ii) the endorsement of the Safe Schools Declaration, (iii) the development of the JPAS, (iv) the mainstreaming of EiE within the ESSP 2017-2022 and (v) the elaboration of the Strategic Contingency Plan. In addition, the commitment to ensuring continuous and safe access to quality education for all is outlined in its Inclusive Education Policy (MoEHE, 2015, p. 20), as well as its the School Environment Policy (MoEHE, 2017c, p. 7).

DIFFERENT ENTITIES AND SYSTEMS TO MONITOR THE EDUCATION SYSTEM IN PALESTINE

All the commitments made by the MoE towards building the resilience of the education system orient its approach towards monitoring and evaluating the vulnerabilities of buildings, learners and educators, as well as coordinating with the main humanitarian and development partners.

However, distinct education data systems are being used by the different education supervising authorities (i.e. MoE, UNRWA and Israeli Municipality Schools) and throughout Palestine (West Bank, Jerusalem and Gaza), which is a main challenge for the MoE when assessing overall capacities, achievements and priority needs.

The following table outlines the different systems used by the DGs included in the JPAS and the Contingency Plan, the MoE in Gaza and UNRWA.

Due to the focus of this case study on EiE, as well as time limitations, only the information systems of the consulted DGs were assessed and compared in detail. However, other important information systems are currently being used by the MoE that contribute to the outlined capacities and challenges (e.g. HR Management System, GIS Software).

DG	RESPONSIBILITIES IN ASSESSING EMERGENCY VULNERABILITIES AND DEFINING PRIORITY NEEDS	MAIN DATA COLLECTION SYSTEM USED				
	The Division of Statistics is responsible for the gathering and processing of educational statistics (GE Data). The Statistical	GE database (Microsoft Access)				
Division of Statistics (DG of Planning)	Yearbook, published every year, is considered one of the main publications of reference for the MoE to inform decision-making and future strategies. The data gathered and processed cover schools from both the public and private sectors, as well as UNRWA.	School Management Information System (SMIS)				
Division of Monitoring and Evaluation (DG of Planning)	Since 2008, the Division of Monitoring and Evaluation has been in charge of monitoring and evaluating the achievements of the education system through the assessment of the goals defined by the Education Sector Plan. It publishes the annual M&E report, which includes specific sections related to schools in the most fragile areas and in Jerusalem.	M&E Data Collection System				
DG Field Follow-Up	The DG of Field Follow-Up is the entity recognized within the MoE as being responsible for all matters related to EiE. It leads all efforts of the education system to monitor and report attacks and is responsible for maintaining regular and consistent flow of information with the National Education Cluster and donors to agree on strategic priority needs and emergency interventions.	E-School Portal				
	The DG of School Health monitors the overall education environment, including (i) Physical factors (i.e. the school location and buildings, and what they may contain), (ii) Social	School Readiness Survey: Healthy and Safe School Environment				
DG of School Health	factors (i.e. factors that bond students with administration and teachers and the relationship they share, as well as their surrounding community), and (iii) Administrative factors (i.e. plans, policies, rules and regulations that facilitate student learning).	Surveys to assess and follow-up on the health of the school environment				
DG of School	The DG of School Building monitors the state of school facilities to promote the respect of safe building standards that can	School Readiness Survey: Healthy and Safe School Environment				
bunding	natural hazards.	Equivalent Student Suffering System (ESS)				
DG of Counselling and Special Education	The DG of Counselling and Special Education is responsible for inclusive education and psychosocial counselling for all learners and educators who may need it – including those affected by emergencies.	Specific surveys to assess special and inclusive education needs and programme outcomes				

Table 3.	Data c	ollection	systems	used by	the	MoE ar	nd UNRV	NA and	d their	link	with	EiE

DG of Jerusalem Affairs	The DG of Jerusalem Affairs monitors the priority needs of the Palestinian Education Community in Jerusalem to ensure continuous access to quality education for all children and youth. While it refers to an EMIS that is separate and specific to the schools in East Jerusalem (Waqf and private), it provides the GE data that are then published in the Statistical Yearbook of the MoE.	Al – Murshed System Surveys to assess specific needs and programme outcomes
MoE Gaza	The MoE in Gaza has its own EMIS. It covers the governmental schools in the Gaza Strip and is completely separate from all systems used by the MoE in Ramallah, except the GE data system. Unfortunately, it was not possible to assess the functioning, indicators and use of this EMIS for the purpose of the present case study.	MoE Gaza EMIS
UNRWA	The UNRWA EMIS captures information on all UNRWA schools across the five fields of operation (West Bank and Gaza, Syria, Lebanon, and Jordan). It has no linkages with the information systems of the MoE; however, it does provide the GE data that are then published in the Statistical Yearbook of the MoE.	UNRWA EMIS

Source: Author

STRONG COLLABORATION WITH HUMANITARIAN AND DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS

The MoE is currently an active member and leader in several coordination mechanisms (i.e. the Education Cluster, Education Sector Working Group, and EiE Thematic Group), and has taken important measures at all levels to promote information sharing to orient EiE plans and programmes. This strong collaboration is evident throughout the Palestinian territory, including Jerusalem and Gaza.

Partners have demonstrated a consistent recognition and support of the MoE as the primary responsible entity of the education system and have been instrumental in strengthening its capacities, including in matters of EiE. This collaboration has allowed for the elaboration of strategies and operational plans – such as the Contingency Plan and the JPAS – as well as the strengthening of institutional information management systems that support the generation of reliable data to inform decision-making. In particular, throughout the years, partners have supported the information management systems of the MoE as follows:

PARTNER	OBJECTIVE	INFORMATION SYSTEM
UNICEF and IIEP-UNESCO	Set up of initial EMIS	GE Database
UNRWA and private schools	Sharing of GE data on UNRWA schools	GE Database

Save the Children	Monitoring and reporting of violations and attacks	E-School Portal
UNICEF	Web-based system for GE data	School Management Information System (SMIS)

C. Main challenges

While the implemented efforts are commendable and valuable, and the strong collaboration with humanitarian and development partners is a significant asset, important challenges persist in terms of having a unified approach towards data collection, processing and analysis to inform effective EiE programmes.

LACK OF A COMPREHENSIVE EIE STRATEGY WITHIN THE MOE

The MoE does not dispose of a unified and comprehensive strategy in matters of EiE. Currently the JPAS and the Contingency Plan can be considered as the main EiE reference, but they present several limitations that should be addressed.

The main challenges seem to derive from the lack of official adoption of these documents by the MoE, as well as by the specific DGs that have a role in their implementation. Moreover, they are not accompanied by measurable indicators – aligned with the EMIS and institutional information systems – that can inform a 'vulnerability baseline' and support M&E activities. This would be an important basis upon which to monitor progress and achievements and inform and adapt future interventions.

DIFFICULTY IN COORDINATING EIE EFFORTS WITHIN THE MOE

Coupled with the lack of official endorsement of a unified EiE strategy, the roles and responsibilities of the different DGs in matters of EiE are not official, and therefore not binding. Although the DG of Field Follow-Up is internally recognized as the responsible entity for directing EiE interventions within the MoE, its responsibilities and practical functions are not institutionalized through a specific policy or job description.

These elements have been cited as the primary obstacle to information sharing and coordination, and for mainstreaming priorities and ways forward within each DG. In fact, most consulted DGs have lamented a 'silo approach' towards EiE that does not optimize the information collected and capacities devoted, and results in missed opportunities for strengthening resilience.

LACK OF A SYSTEMATIC AND UNIFIED APPROACH TO MONITOR AND ASSESS EIE-RELATED NEEDS

As will be discussed in the following chapter, the silo approach to EiE within the MoE is exacerbated by the use of different information systems. This hampers the ability to create a unified and reliable snapshot of the vulnerability components that must be addressed, significantly affecting the ability to orient EiE interventions. It is primarily for this reason, that DGs and partners are obliged to collect additional information and develop complementary assessments.

III. Gathering and processing data to inform effective EiE strategies and programmes

The commitment of the MoE to designing and implementing adapted emergency preparedness, response and recovery programmes is commendable; but the success of EiE programmes largely depends on the availability of relevant and accurate information that enables a cohesive understanding of the vulnerability factors that must be prioritized and addressed. High-quality data allow stakeholders to make informed decisions, monitor the impact of strategies and adapt their educational plans.

The MoE in Palestine is committed to being data-driven and data-informed (RTI, 2015, p. 2). However, it faces significant obstacles in integrating, harmonizing and utilizing the totality of existing information, including data that can be instrumental in orienting emergency prevention, preparedness and response.

In view of identifying concrete ways to strengthen the capacities of the MoE to generate quality EiE data, this case study analyses the different information management systems used by the DGs involved in the implementation of the JPAS,¹⁵ as well as the DG of School Planning (Division of Statistics and Monitoring & Evaluation). In particular, the following sections highlight (i) the different processes and systems used, (ii) the monitored indicators – and their link to EiE, as well as (iii) their use to inform adapted strategies to strengthen the resilience of the education system.

A. Capturing data on vulnerabilities to inform evidence based EiE plans

MULTIPLE RESPONSIBLE ENTITIES

As mentioned in the previous chapter, the MoE has witnessed the proliferation a wide range of information systems used simultaneously by different DGs and partners. Numerous DGs – often without knowing – generate data that can be instrumental in developing effective EiE programmes; however, they tend to use parallel data gathering tools and processing methodologies that adhere to different standards and do not contribute to common assessments.

As detailed in the descriptive tables in Annex 3, all have different overall objectives, follow different data flows, have different coverage (in terms of location and kinds of schools), include different indicators, and have their data accessed and used by distinct actors and for separate purposes.

DIFFERENT DATA COLLECTION PROCESSES

Most of the data are collected through specific questionnaires developed by each DG. The questionnaires are distributed at school level and responses are compiled on Microsoft (MS) Excel or MS Access by the directorates before sending the data to the MoE. This requires a significant amount of clerical work at all levels.

¹⁵ DG of Field Follow-Up, DG of School Building, DG of School Health, DG of Counselling and Special Education, DG of Jerusalem Affairs.

In order to ensure that the data gathered are accurate, considerable efforts are made by all districts and DGs to compute and verify them. This becomes a heavy workload that can lead to long processes and inefficient use of limited resources. Moreover, lengthy processing sometimes renders the data unreliable and irrelevant by the time it arrives at the MoE or is published.

With the intent to improve data collection and processing, the MoE has developed different computerized systems (E-School, SMIS, Al-Murshed as well as the EMIS of Gaza). However, these are not comprehensive or fully operational, and therefore are not unanimously considered to be the primary sources of education data.

E-School System – A web-based information sharing portal that covers about 1,850 public schools in the West Bank. It aims to connect parents, school leaders, teachers and the MoE to share information on the schools, their achievements and priority needs. While it was not originally intended to communicate formal Ministry data and information, some DGs – including Field Follow-Up – base their evaluations primarily on this portal (e.g. violations and attacks, transportation).

School Management Information System (SMIS) – Developed to serve as one unified, centralized, and integrated web-based system to be used at all levels (school, district and ministry) for all school-based GE data. It includes a wide array of data modules (17) that were defined in collaboration with numerous DGs. However, at the moment the system is only functioning partially in 86 schools and therefore the generated data are not being utilized.

Al-Murshed System – A computerized portal used by schools in East Jerusalem for all school-based GE data, including Waqf and Private Schools. It is the main source of information for the schools in this area; however, it does not monitor the Palestinian schools under the authority of the Israeli Municipality. Unfortunately, this system could not be accessed for the case study.

Gaza EMIS – The MoE in Gaza has its own computerized EMIS that covers governmental schools in the Gaza Strip and is completely separate from all systems used by the MoE in Ramallah, except the GE data system. Unfortunately, it was not possible to assess the system during the elaboration of this case study.

OVERLAPPING INFORMATION AND INCONSISTENT EIE INDICATORS THAT CANNOT BE INTEGRATED

As can be seen in the descriptive tables of each assessed information system (Annex 3), the MoE collects a large amount of data that can be beneficial to all educational planning efforts, including those aimed at strengthening the resilience of the education system.¹⁶

With regards to EiE, beyond the traditional census and educational statistics, the assessed systems can provide useful knowledge around capacities and needs on matters related to infrastructure; inclusive education and psychosocial support; water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH); emergency preparedness; and violations and attacks. However, the indicators used follow different definitions, processes and standards that make it difficult to capitalize on the information generated and integrate it in a comprehensive analysis.

¹⁶ While they may not be exhaustive, the different systems measure indicators that can effectively inform programmes linked to all areas and objectives of the JPAS and the Contingency Plan.

Different processes/data flow

The processes used to calculate the indicators determine to a great extent the accuracy and complementarity of the generated data – and therefore its possibility of being harmonized with other sources. For example, the crisis in Palestine can affect the possibility of building or rehabilitating school infrastructure, which results in lower WASH standards within schools in the most fragile areas. At least five different systems in the MoE collect data on WASH: GE Data, E-School Portal, Health School Environment Assessment, M&E Report and ESS. While all information is helpful, it is dispersed and may not be integrated, as it is gathered by different authorities at different times, in different locations and in different ways. The perception of 'adequacy' or 'good condition of sanitation facilities' may differ considerably between a school principal, a contracted firm and a Health Field Worker. Therefore, while the information may seem to overlap or be complementary, there could be significant inconsistencies that should not be ignored.

Different/limited target population

The target population of each system is also something that differs. The GE Data is the only one that covers all Palestinian schools (public, private and UNRWA). In the West Bank – including Jerusalem – and Gaza. Most of the other systems either cover only governmental schools in the West Bank or consider a specific sample of schools in the West Bank.

For example, the M&E Report monitors only twenty schools in the fragile areas that are chosen on the basis of reported violations/attacks the previous year. Due to its limited sample, the reliability of the information can be questioned and therefore it may not be considered complementary to what is collected by other systems.

Different/limited disaggregation of data

All information management systems present disaggregated data related to gender, but only the Al-Murshed System and the GE Data include information about refugee students¹⁷ by referencing data shared by UNRWA. However, due to the fact that UNRWA schools mostly run from grades 1-9, there is no mention of refugee students when or if they cross over to government schools.¹⁸ No mention is made of other vulnerable communities such as Bedouins and internally displaced learners.

With regards to location, only the data gathered by the E-School System and the Equivalent Student Suffering System (ESS) specify the location of the school by type of area (Area C or H2). However, the DG of Educational Planning affirmed that the disaggregation of information by area can be achieved upon request at directorate level.

Insufficient student-level data

Most of the data gathered by the information systems of the MoE are limited to school-level data. While this is very important, it creates knowledge gaps about vulnerabilities that can exacerbate the risk of school drop-out, as well as specific categories of students for whom there should be close follow-

¹⁷ The yearly questionnaires used to gather GE data clearly ask how many students are refugees. However, in the Statistical Yearbook, no mention of this is made, except of the data related to UNRWA. Considering that UNRWA schools mostly run education activities from 1-9, and the secondary education in Palestine proceeds until grade 12, there is no mention of educational data for refugees for the last three years of their secondary education. ¹⁸ This information is collected but not published and can be consulted upon specific request.

up, such as learners affected by trauma and/or house arrest/detention, or who had to be hospitalized. Without knowing their specific needs, and the possibility of their effective reintegration within the school system, it is challenging to adapt strategies that can promote the continuation of their education.

For example, the number of children affected by detention and house arrest and their specific needs are difficult to assess due to incomplete data around this category and the lack of a national referral system/database in East Jerusalem. Moreover, the reintegration of these students in the education system is not currently monitored (ECW, 2019). Adapted alternative and catch-up education opportunities are lacking in most schools, resulting in high drop-out rates among this category of learner (ECW, 2019).

B. Humanitarian and development partners bridging information gaps

NEED TO GATHER ADDITIONAL DATA TO DETERMINE VULNERABILITIES AND PRIORITY NEEDS

Although the collaboration between the MoE and partners is systematic and considered successful, partners often find themselves needing to gather and process additional data to inform their programmes and strategies. With the exception of the Monitoring and Reporting Mechanism of Violations and Attacks by the Education Cluster – which is systematic and computerized – the other assessments are often programme-based, ad hoc and specifically targeted to components of the education system in catchment areas.

As detailed in the following sections and in the table in Annex 4, this is the case of the assessment on out-of-school children by UNICEF (2018), the assessments carried out on inclusive and remedial education, impacts of emergencies on learning outcomes and psychosocial well-being, and those related to the hard-to-reach areas like Gaza and Jerusalem.

The separate data collection and assessment mechanisms of partners are often a direct effect of the (i) lack of knowledge or access to existing data, (ii) perception of inaccuracy, irrelevancy or insufficiency of data available, and (iii) need for data in hard-to-reach areas.

Lack of knowledge or access to existing data

Due to the significant coordination challenges among DGs of the MoE, partners sometimes find it difficult to know about the large quantity of data available and to whom they should refer. Some of the data collected by the different information systems of the MoE do not feed into common reports or assessments, and external stakeholders can only consult it upon specific request to the competent DG or district. This is due to a general tendency to not publish or disseminate the data and reports (with the exception of the Statistical Yearbook and M&E Report), as well as the need to prioritize data on the basis of specific needs of each DG.

For example, in the yearly questionnaire of the Division of Statistics, information is gathered about the number of refugee students. However, this information is not published in the Statistical Tables. If external partners wished to refer to the quantitative data of the MoE to assess how many refugee learners were currently in government structures, they would have to know that this information is in

the questionnaire, and would have to request it directly from the Division of Statistics within the DG of Educational Planning.

Perceived inaccuracy, irrelevance or insufficiency of data available

The multiple information systems within the MoE – which depend largely on periodic surveys or partially functioning computerized platforms, with unclear definition of indicators and that need a long time to be compiled and processed – can discredit the information provided.

Perceptions around the accuracy and relevance of the information provided by the MoE are also closely linked to doubts and inconsistencies related to data processing methods, geographic coverage, target populations and the disaggregation of data. As a result, partners tend to perceive the Ministry data as incomplete, and therefore they are not used to inform programmes and strategies tailored to the needs of the most vulnerable populations.

For example, although the MoE has made important advances in monitoring and reporting violations and attacks on the education community, the humanitarian partners think that an independent Monitoring and Evaluation system can be perceived to be more reliable. For this reason, the Education Cluster has developed a Cluster-led monitoring and reporting mechanism. It uses both MoE and other cluster partners' reports for independent verification process. This date can be viewed online by all stakeholders through the online dashboard produced by the cluster.

Another illustration is the development of an assessment on out-of-school children in Palestine by UNICEF (2018), which relied on multiple sources of information. For the section dedicated to schools in East Jerusalem, the study mentions that limited information sharing between the JEA and the MoE presented a major barrier to identifying out-of-school children and monitoring their return to school. In addition, the data on the school-age population or enrolment seemed to present significant inaccuracies that made them unreliable (UNICEF, 2018, p. 92). For this reason, the collected data were complemented with UNICEF's Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys (MICS).

Need for data on the education system in hard-to reach areas

Due to the fragmentation of the education system, which has resulted in multiple supervising authorities, it is often difficult for the MoE in Ramallah to access the information on all Palestinian schools. In fact, apart from the GE Data, it has great difficulties accessing information on schools in Gaza, UNRWA schools, as well as schools in Jerusalem – specifically those under the Israeli Municipality. This, of course, is a main challenge when needing a complete snapshot of the vulnerabilities and needs of schools, learners and educators.

Among the assessments collected by the Education Cluster in 2018-2019,¹⁹ for example, nine highlighted the education needs of communities in Gaza. This area of Palestine, for geographic and political reasons, is difficult to access for the MoE in Ramallah; and most of the information systems they use are unable to capture data about numerous components of the education system in Gaza.

¹⁹ See Annex 4.

C. Main challenges

In light of the elements outlined above, the main challenges that should be addressed to improve the production of reliable, accurate and relevant EIE data within the MoE are the following:

MULTIPLE PARALLEL AND FRAGMENTED INFORMATION SYSTEMS

The data-driven culture of the MoE is valuable, and the consistent approach by all DGs to gather information is a true asset. However, the MoE lacks a unified approach that refers to a common system, established on the basis of pre-defined standards and processes. This has resulted in the development of numerous systems, used by different entities; these systems are often not integrated and are not fully functional or comprehensive.

INCOMPLETE EIE INDICATORS

Along with the traditional statistical education data, the assessed information systems provide very interesting knowledge that can be useful for EiE. They include details on capacities and needs related to infrastructure, inclusive education and psychosocial support, WASH, emergency preparedness, and violations and attacks.

However, they cover different geographic locations and make insufficient reference to specific vulnerable groups (e.g. refugees, IDPs, Bedouins, marginalized communities, hospitalized, detained, out of school). More indicators related to EiE (e.g. EiE capacities, inclusive education/remedial education, educators) are necessary, and there is no mechanism that can allow student-level follow-up to track the needs of specific vulnerable individuals. Moreover, the indicators are not cohesive as they are monitored through different processes and target different populations.

PERCEIVED INACCURACY, UNRELIABILITY AND INSUFFICIENCY OF DATA

In view of gathering evidence to build their programmes and target specific vulnerable groups, partners often find themselves needing to collect and process additional data – which results in the development of parallel information systems and assessments that are mostly programme-based and target specific components of the education system. This tendency is often a direct effect of (i) the lack of knowledge about or access to existing data, (ii) the perceived inaccuracy, irrelevance or insufficiency of available data, and (iii) the need for data from hard-to-reach areas.

IV. Assessing vulnerabilities and priority needs to inform evidencebased EiE programmes and strategies

Most of the consulted DGs, while they refer to different information systems, are committed to processing the data and developing assessments to inform their plans and strategies. Although these may sometimes be programme-based, they reflect an institution-wide approach to utilize the collected information.

However, with the exception of the Statistical Yearbook and the M&E Report, there is no systematic approach in place to develop joint assessments and share them within the MoE, as well as among other

line ministries and partners. In fact, they often remain parallel, are not published, and provide only a partial understanding of the current capacities and priority needs of the education system.

In addition to the violations and attacks report, there are useful assessments of relevance to EiE that are developed by different DGs and can be consulted upon request. These assessments provide interesting information on specific vulnerabilities and needs. However, they are also undertaken in parallel and do not feed into a comprehensive analysis that can consistently orient EiE approaches.

A. Fragmented vulnerability and needs assessments developed by the MoE

With regards to EiE, different annual assessments are carried out, specifically by the DG of Field Follow-Up, DG of School Health and the DG of Counselling and Special Education. While they present very interesting data, they are not linked to one another, nor are they tied to a specific EiE strategy. Moreover, they are often done through specific and ad hoc data collection processes, and therefore do not capitalize on the information that is already being gathered by the different DGs. Along with contributing to the fragmentation of data and understanding of the current state of the education system, these parallel assessments do not enable the establishment of a vulnerability baseline on which to build approaches and monitor progress.

Relevant assessments and reports include:

Violation Report: Report developed by the DG of Field Follow-Up on a monthly, biannual or yearly basis that presents the attacks and violations reported by school directors. This is used as a basis to identify the most fragile schools and develop advocacy and protection strategies.

Needs Assessment of Schools in Area C: Report developed by the DG of Field Follow-Up with information specifically gathered at directorate level to assess the needs for specific categories such as safe shelter, first aid kits, safety glass windows, wire-secured windows, and others. However, the categories monitored are not systematic and do not refer to data already being collected by the different systems in use and by other DGs.

Transportation Needs Assessment: Report developed by the DG of Field Follow-Up on the basis of the transport-related needs expressed by schools and directorates on the E-School Portal.

Annual Report of the General Directorate of School Health: Report developed by the DG of School Health on the basis of the yearly achievements and assessments carried out by the Field Health Workers. This report covers the reality of 550 schools in the West Bank in matters related to health education and promotion, health services, school environment, school feeding, psychosocial health, strengthening the role of the community, and effective management.

Annual Report on Special Education: Report on the achievements and needs of special and inclusive education. This assessment includes the statistical data on learners with disabilities that are integrated in the yearly GE Statistics along with additional data from a specific questionnaire compiled by the inclusive education teacher twice a year. It provides a detailed overview of the capacities in place at school level to implement adapted special and inclusive education activities.

M&E Report of Schools in Fragile Areas: In consultation with the DG of Field Follow-Up and the DG of Jerusalem Affairs, the M&E Division monitors the variation of impacts of violations and attacks on

schools in fragile areas. It gathers data from different DGs, as well as specific studies carried out in the catchment schools. However, the data collection methodology presents some elements that lead to questions about the reliability of the information provided.²⁰

Assessing the Readiness of Schools: This effort is aimed to assess the capacities and needs of schools to provide a healthy, secure and student-friendly school environment by ensuring all the general safety requirements. A specific questionnaire was developed by the DGs of Field Follow-Up, School Health and School Building and was distributed for the first time in 2019. For this reason, no assessment had been elaborated at the time of writing. While this is an important joint effort towards assessing a wide range of needs and informing remedial actions that are in line with EiE, the DG of Field Follow-Up was unaware of this process due to the turnover of personnel.

B. Development of vulnerability assessments by humanitarian and development partners

As the MoE produces separate assessments that struggle to provide a cohesive snapshot of main vulnerabilities and priority needs of the education system, partners are often required to carry out their own assessments to inform their strategies and programmes. For example, in 2018-2019, the Education Cluster collected about 28 assessments that were developed by 13 different members.²¹ The studies developed by the partners assessed different elements of the education system throughout all the territory.

At times, the development of these assessments by partners contributes to the dispersion of data and resources, in addition to limiting the ability of the MoE to assert itself when defining priorities and strategies. However, they can also be an important complementary source of information. They can highlight vulnerabilities that may be disregarded by institutional EMIS and assess the needs of communities and groups that cannot be easily reached by national institutions.

For example, in March 2019, the Educational Forum Association developed an assessment that focused on the education-related impacts of economic distress in Gaza resulting from Israeli policies. This study enables insight into the complex dynamics that affect the risk of drop-out of youth from disadvantaged households – specifically in an area where the MoE in Ramallah has difficulty accessing information.

In addition, in contexts like the Palestinian one, where institutional, technical, financial and human capacity are limited, partners can provide valuable opportunities to create context-specific guidance to strengthen the capacities of all stakeholders – including the institutional ones – to assess and monitor the vulnerabilities of the education system. For example, in 2019, the NRC launched an assessment that aims to identify educational vulnerability factors in Palestine in order to support the targeting of beneficiaries and improve their long-term education access, learning and well-being (NRC, 2019).

While the importance and added value of assessments developed by partners in Palestine is evident, studies have shown that humanitarian assessments tend to be rapid in nature, focused on education

²⁰ See description of data flow and analysis process in the descriptive table in Annex 3.

²¹ See Annex 4.

access and protection issues, and are particularly suited for sudden-onset emergencies or the initial phases of protracted crises (Nicolai et al., 2016, p. 16). It is for this reason that humanitarian and development partners in Palestine agree on the importance of strengthening the capacities of the MoE to collect EiE data and develop comprehensive assessments that can orient their agenda. This is specifically relevant in a context of protracted conflict and emergency where the stakeholders must collaborate to generate strong evidence to support effective policies, programmes and practices that cannot be short-sighted and must aim to build long-term resilience.

C. Main challenges

Similar to the challenges described in previous chapters, the main factors that constrain the development of comprehensive, joint EiE assessments are linked to the following:

LACK OF EFFECTIVE EIE COORDINATION WITHIN THE MOE

Although the JPAS and the Contingency Plan – together with the set-up of the EiE Thematic Group – provide a useful base for building a coordinated approach towards EiE within the MoE, these are not currently functional. This is mainly linked to the lack of institutionalization of the EiE role of the DG of Field Follow-Up, which therefore does not have formally recognized responsibilities to mobilize DGs in sharing information and elaborating joint assessments.

LIMITED UNDERSTANDING OF THE COMPREHENSIVE COMPONENTS OF EIE

When consulting the various DGs about the collection and processing of emergency-related data, their attention is often directed towards 'attacks and violations'. This narrows significantly the suggested interventions to 'emergency response'; and limits the assessment of more complex vulnerabilities that arise in crisis settings and that have an important and lasting impact on access to education, as well as learning outcomes (e.g. economic insecurity, social inequities, displacement, counselling capacities in schools, remedial education capacities available).

INSUFFICIENT QUALIFIED HUMAN RESOURCES AT ALL LEVELS FOR EIE MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT

The small team of the DG of Field Follow-Up (six people) received EiE training in 2015. The training was a valuable opportunity to understand the components of EiE, the INEE Minimum Standards, and the role and responsibilities of the MoE in strengthening the resilience of the education system. This is essential when needing to develop assessments that can effectively orient EiE efforts in the country.

However, additional capacity is necessary at all levels to ensure a thorough understanding of emergency risks, as well as the necessary measures needed to limit their impacts on the education system. This includes all matters related to data collection and evaluation, planning and coordination.

V. Collaborating towards strengthening the information systems of the Ministry of Education

If crisis elements are well integrated within the EMIS, data can be systematically monitored to understand the capacities in place and how the emergency has impacted education trends, and to inform decision-making and planning for resource allocation (MEERS et al., 2019). Moreover, they can provide a valuable baseline upon which to monitor the variation of resilience trends over time.

In Palestine, the importance of strengthening EMIS and adapting it to reflect the complex dynamics of the crisis is evident within the MoE, as well as among humanitarian and development partners who have demonstrated great commitment in supporting such efforts.

A. Strengthening data collection and EMIS for stronger resilience to crises

While this report specifically focuses on EMIS to inform EiE policies and plans, the challenges identified refer to the EMIS in a more general manner. In fact, it is impossible to consider remedial actions without aiming to strengthen the overall functioning, coverage and use of the information management systems of the MoE.

For this reason, the suggested next steps relate to the overall EMIS restructuring and functioning, while including actions that are specifically related to EiE monitoring and planning. In particular, the main suggested remedial actions are the following:

• Development of a unified computerized system

- Draft and validate a Data Collection/Management Policy
- Develop and implement an adapted computerized system (linked with systems of other ministries and organizations, such as UNRWA)
- Ensure the sustainability and ownership of the system within the MoE at all levels (i.e. financial, IT and human resources)
- Development of a comprehensive EMIS framework that includes specific EiE indicators
 - Elaborate an EMIS Master Plan (data mapping including gaps and needs and how the information system will concretely address them)
 - Develop a Data Management Framework for Education Data (i.e. indicators, processes, roles, and responsibilities) with all DGs
 - Integrate specific EiE indicators that can inform emergency preparedness, response, and recovery plans
- Promote systematic and coordinated EiE monitoring and planning
 - Formalize the EiE role of the DG of Field Follow-Up and of each DG
 - Elaborate a comprehensive EiE strategy and develop systematic joint assessments
 - Strengthen and systemize coordination on matters related to EiE among DGs and partners at all levels

B. Suggested remedial actions to address gaps and challenges

DEVELOPMENT OF A UNIFIED COMPUTERIZED SYSTEM

As previously mentioned, educational data within the MoE is fragmented among different departments, which results in 'data islands' that are often overlapping and that do not meet the same standards. This is made even more complicated by the different systems used by other education supervising authorities that are not linked to one another.

A unified computerized system would be an effective solution towards generating up-to-date data, that can be easily accessed, monitored, and processed, and that can be used for decision-making at different levels. However, in order to ensure its sustainability and optimization, it must be adapted to the specificities of the local context and must overcome the challenges encountered by the E-School Portal and the SMIS.

In addition, it would be ideal to include partners and other line ministries (i.e. UNRWA, the Education Cluster and PCBS) throughout the conceptualization and development process to ensure linkages among the different systems used. This would allow stakeholders to optimize capacities and determine common data standards and collection/processing mechanisms.

In order to fulfil this scope and be sustainable over time, the following actions are recommended:

Draft and validate a Data Collection/Management Policy

The EMIS must be supported by a formal political commitment that can ensure allocation of financial and technical resources, and determine the conditions of its supervision, functioning and use. This includes the definition of data protection policies, access permission systems, data sharing agreements and MOUs.

The EMIS should aim to be comprehensive, therefore possibly including the ones used in Gaza and East Jerusalem. If possible, it would be useful to link it to other existing systems, as well as other line ministries (i.e. social protection, health, labour, PCBS).

Assess the local infrastructure capacity for internet based EMIS and develop an adapted system

EMIS should be cost effective and easy to operate. The past experiences of the MoE in developing computerized information systems encountered (i) insufficient internet and ICT infrastructure; (ii) excessive reliance on the private service provider; and (iii) insufficient technical capacities of EMIS staff to ensure systematic maintenance and effective use of the system.

For this reason, before engaging resources and efforts in the development of a new EMIS, it is important to undertake the following:

- Assess the current infrastructure and ensure that the hardware and software are compatible with the current capacities.
- Consider the possibility of adapting/upgrading the existing systems to overcome the encountered challenges. If not, possibly refer to an option that allows manual data collection and then subsequent transmission or uploading in areas with better internet connectivity (e.g. Open EMIS).

• Ensure that the source codes of the system reside within the MoE in order to avoid future bottlenecks related to the ownership of the system, and possible challenges for the customization and upgrading of the software.

Ensure the sustainability and ownership of the computerized system within the MoE

The MoE should ensure the presence of local capacity not only with regards to the information technology (IT) infrastructure (e.g. internet, computers), but also in terms of human and financial resources. This will help to reduce the reliance of the information system on private service providers, as well as partners.

The following actions should be considered:

- Engage in systematic development of IT capacities of the EMIS staff.
- Implement continuous training of personnel at all levels to better produce and consume data.
- Dedicate a specific budget line for the development and maintenance of EMIS.

DEVELOPMENT OF A COMPREHENSIVE EMIS FRAMEWORK

The EMIS is a valuable tool that should respond to the strategic and operational needs of the entire education system. For this reason, it is important that it is designed in a way that can effectively supply complete, timely, and accurate education data upon which education actors can base decisions.

Elaboration of an EMIS master plan

Through the elaboration of an EMIS master plan, the MoE will produce a detailed analysis of (i) the present systems and their recurrent operational requirements, (ii) the characteristics of the 'desired' system and (iii) activities to support its effective implementation.

The master plan should build on previous achievements and be elaborated in a participative manner in view of establishing an EMIS that responds to the needs of the education system as a whole.

To ensure its feasibility, the plan should be costed, therefore highlighting the existing financial resources and gaps.

Develop a Data Management Framework for Education Data (i.e. indicators, processes, roles, and responsibilities) – with all DGs

For the elaboration of a Data Management Framework, the MoE must have a clear view of the data gaps and needs and how the 'target information system' will concretely address them. This will inform a document that will include (i) indicators to be monitored and assessed, (ii) calculation processes, (iii) definitions, (iv) justification, (v) baseline and targets, and (vi) roles and responsibilities.

It should be aligned with the ESSP and elaborated in a participative manner with partners and other line ministries in view of creating synergies with other existing information systems (e.g. UNRWA, the Education Cluster, PCBS). This will enable the establishment of common data standards and collection/processing mechanisms.

Integrate specific EiE indicators that can inform emergency preparedness, response, and recovery plans

The development of the EMIS Data Management Framework will provide a valuable opportunity to highlight data gaps and needs in matters of EiE. For this reason, it will be important that all DGs involved in EiE, along with the support of their partners, define the specific vulnerability indicators and standards that are linked to an institutional EIE Strategy and that will be integrated in the system. The indicators will enable assessment of aspects related to access and protection, as well as well-being and learning outcomes – while providing a base for monitoring achievements of the EiE Strategy.

For this component, specific thematic task forces should be set up – composed of relevant DGs and humanitarian/development partners – that will contribute to describing the indicators and defining their purpose, calculation methodologies and general roles and responsibilities.

Indicators could include elements related to the following categories:

- **Existing capacities** (e.g. WASH, emergency preparedness, availability of remedial/inclusive education, state of school infrastructure, existence of shelters, telecommunications/internet availability, psychosocial support, transportation services, recreational activities, TVET)
- **Specific vulnerable groups** (e.g. refugees, IDPs, out-of-school children, children with disabilities, detained or hospitalized, victims of violence and attacks)
- Vulnerability factors of learners, educators, and infrastructure (e.g. location of school and of household, food and economic insecurity, ownership or rental of school infrastructure, school shifts)
- Raw data that can allow for specific follow-up (e.g. reintegration in the education system, risk of drop-out, reason for drop-out, referral system activated)
- Quality and learning outcomes (e.g. survival rate, perception of students and parents)

PROMOTE SYSTEMATIC AND COORDINATED EIE MONITORING AND PLANNING

In view of promoting the coordination of different DGs towards analysing and using EiE data in a cohesive manner, the following elements are suggested:

Formalize the EiE role of the DG of Field Follow-Up and of each DG

The current role of the DG of Field Follow-Up in EiE is outlined in the JPAS and the Contingency Plan and includes representing the MoE in the EiE Thematic Group and the Education Cluster. However, the lack of official recognition of this role remains a challenge when needing to encourage information sharing among DGs, mainstream EiE at all levels and develop joint EiE strategies. In addition, the role of other DGs in EiE must be clear to promote their participation in the development and implementation of cohesive strategies. This will have to be done in a formal and institutionalized manner to ensure accountability, as well as the continuation of commitments in EiE throughout possible turnover of staff.

Elaborate a comprehensive EiE strategy and develop systematic joint assessments

In order to develop cohesive and systematic assessments that can inform evidence based EiE approaches, a comprehensive EiE strategy will have to be developed and validated. This strategy –

which should be aligned with the ESSP and other national strategic commitments – must be accompanied by measurable indicators that will be included in the EMIS Data Management Framework, and that will inform the achievement of goals and remaining needs.

To do so, the DG of Field Follow-Up – along with the relevant DGs – must have the technical capacities to elaborate joint cross-sectional and longitudinal assessments. This will enable analysis of the relationship between different sets of data while detecting developments or changes over time.

Strengthen and systemize information sharing and coordination on matters related to EiE among DGs and partners

While the MoE has made important strides towards coordinating all DGs and partners to define common goals and develop shared approaches, additional steps could be useful. Through existing coordination mechanisms (e.g. EiE Thematic Group) or ad hoc groups, the DG of Field Follow-Up could set up periodic meetings with all relevant DGs and discuss the monitored vulnerability/EiE indicators, common issues, advancements and challenges around the implementation of the EiE strategy.

Although collaboration with partners is already considered to be very successful, through the collection and use of reliable, up-to-date and relevant EiE data and assessments, the MoE will be able to provide a more solid and assertive direction for EiE interventions targeting specific needs, areas and populations.

C. Proposed implementation strategy and next steps

TIME-FRAME AND PRIORITY ACTIONS

UNESCO, along with the MoE and its partners, suggest tackling the remedial actions simultaneously as they all contribute to the successful implementation of one another. For example, the development of a comprehensive EiE strategy for the MoE will likely inform the indicators that should be included in the EMIS Framework. In addition, the indicators and their standards will inform the development of the computerized system which will need to guarantee the reliability of the information gathered.

However, there are some suggested components that go beyond the specific EiE focus and need additional technical assessments to qualify the nature and quantify the cost and timeframe for the implementation of adapted interventions. This is specifically the case for the development of a unified computerized system, as well as the overall EMIS Master Plan and Framework. These elements could benefit strongly from the support of specific expert partners, such as the Institute for Information Technologies in Education (UNESCO-IITE), and the International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP-UNESCO).

ENSURING A COORDINATED IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

In view of ensuring the quality and ownership of the process, as well as its context specificity, all remedial actions should be developed and implemented in a coordinated manner with the inclusion of all DGs, and with humanitarian and development actors. This participative approach will support the engagement and recognition of the acquired results within the MoE and by other stakeholders. In addition, it will ensure the optimization of current capacities, as well as the linkage with existing EiE information systems used by partners (e.g. UNRWA and the Education Cluster).

It is also aligned with the shared commitment among national institutions and humanitarian and development partners to generating coordinated data and evidence in an environment characterized by a multitude of actors, issues, processes and funding sources (Montjouridès & Liu, 2019, p. 18). The length and intensity of current crises have made it impossible to neglect the need for stronger humanitarian and development collaboration to assess and address the needs of affected populations, reduce vulnerabilities to future risk, and build local capacities (OCHA, 2017b).

The overall remedial actions could be led by the MoE and UNESCO, with the direct support and inclusion of partners that can enrich the process with their specific expertise. In particular, the EiE components could benefit greatly from the convening of a tailored EMIS/EiE Working Group – linked with the existing EiE Thematic Group. This group would include all the relevant DGs and partners in order to make sure that outcomes clearly reflect the needs of the education system and the EiE community.

Ministry of Education	Institutional partners	International partners
Lead: DG of Field Follow-Up	PCBS	Lead: UNESCO
DG of Educational Planning	Ministry of Social Protection	UNRWA
DG of School Health	Ministry of Health	UNICEF
DG of School Building	Ministry of Higher Education	Save the Children
DG of Counselling and Special Education		NRC
DG of ICT		UNDP
DG of General Education		
DG of Jerusalem Affairs		

In particular, the EMIS/EiE Working Group could be composed as such:

The terms of reference of this EMIS/EiE Working Group, as well as its final composition will be discussed during the initial phases of implementation of the remedial actions. Moreover, the members will be chosen in direct consultation with the MoE and the Education Cluster in order to ensure active ownership of the process.

Bibliography

Anselme, M., Ghosn, Y. & van de Brug, I. 2019. 'Data and Evidence Gaps in Addressing the Educational Needs of Vulnerable Adolescents and Youth in Situations of Crisis'. M. Mendenhall (ed.), *Data Collection and Evidence Building to Support Education in Emergencies*. Geneva, NORRAG, pp. 22–24.

ECW. 2019. *ECW Multi-Year Resilience Program for Palestine, 2019-2021*. <u>https://www.educationcannotwait.org/download/ecw-facilitated-myrp-palestine-2018-2020/</u>

Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack (GCPEA). 2018. *Education under Attack 2018*. New York, GCPEA.

Hamiys, H.A. 2017. *Data for Learning, Building a Smart Education Data System*. Washington DC, World Bank Group.

MEERS, Social impact, FHI 360 & USAID. 2019. 'Overview of the EiE data landscape'. https://www.eccnetwork.net/events/overview-education-emergencies-eie-data-landscape

Ministry of Education and Higher Education (MoEHE). 2015. *Inclusive Education Policy*. Ramallah, MoEHE.

MoEHE, 2017a. *Education Sector Strategic Plan 2017-2022*. Ramallah, MoEHE. <u>https://planipolis.iiep.unesco.org/sites/planipolis/files/ressources/palestine_education_sector_strategic_plan_2017-2022.pdf</u>

MoEHE. 2017b. *M&E Report*.

MoEHE. 2017c. School Environment Policy.

MoEHE. 2018. Education Sector Contingency Plan.

MoEHE. 2019. Education Statistical Yearbook for the Academic Year 2018/2019.

Montjouridès, P. & Liu, J. 2019. 'Data and Evidence on Education in Emergencies: Linking Global Concerns with Local Issues'. M. Mendenhall (ed.), *Data Collection and Evidence Building to Support Education in Emergencies*. Geneva, NORRAG, pp. 16–18.

Nicolai, S., et. al., 2016. A common platform for education in emergencies and protracted crises: *Evidence paper*. London, ODI.

NRC. 2019. Learning on the margins: External threats on schools and its impact on learning outcomes in the West Bank and Gaza. Concept note.

OCHA. 2013. 'Vulnerability Profile of Palestinian Communities in Area C'. <u>http://data.ochaopt.org/vpp.aspx</u>

OCHA. 2017a. 2018-2020 Humanitarian Response Strategy – January-December 2018 Humanitarian Response Plan: Occupied Palestinian Territory. <u>https://www.ochaopt.org/content/2018-2020-humanitarian-response-plan-hrp</u>

OCHA. 2017b. *New Way of Working*. https://www.unocha.org/sites/unocha/files/NWOW%20Booklet%20low%20res.002_0.pdf OCHA. 2017c. 'Poor infrastructure and lack of funding put over 560,000 people at risk of flooding in the Gaza Strip', Monthly Humanitarian Bulletin, November 2017.

OCHA. 2018a. *Areas with Highest Humanitarian Vulnerability, December 2018.* <u>https://www.ochaopt.org/content/areas-highest-humanitarian-vulnerability-december-2018</u>

OCHA. 2018b. *Humanitarian Needs Overview 2019*. <u>https://www.ochaopt.org/content/humanitarian-needs-overview-2019</u>

OCHA. 2019. In the Spotlight: The Humanitarian Situation in the H2 Area of the Hebron City – Findings of Needs Assessment. April 2019. <u>https://www.ochaopt.org/content/humanitarian-situation-h2-area-hebron-city-findings-needs-assessment-april-2019</u>

OCHA. 2020. Occupied Palestinian Territory: UN officials call for release of children in detention in light of COVID-19. May 2020. <u>https://www.unocha.org/story/occupied-palestinian-territory-un-officials-call-release-children-detention-light-covid-19</u>

Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics. 2018. Population, Housing and Establishments Census, 2017.

RTI. 2015. Information for Education Policy, Planning, Management, and Accountability in West Bank and Gaza: Final Report of Findings of the Data Gap Analysis of the Palestinian Ministry of Education and Higher Education. Washington DC, USAID. <u>https://ierc-</u> publicfiles.s3.amazonaws.com/public/resources/Data%20Gap%20Analysis_FINAL%20REPORT.pdf

Sultana, R.G. 2003. An EMIS for Palestine-the education management and information system in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. *Mediterranean Journal of Educational Studies*, Vol.7, p. 70.

UN Country Team (UNCT) Occupied Palestinian Territory. 2016. *Common Country Analysis, 2016 – Leave No One Behind: A Perspective on Vulnerability and Structural Disadvantage in Palestine*. <u>https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/CCA_Report_En.pdf</u>

UNDAC. 2014. *Disaster Response Preparedness Mission to the State of Palestine, 22 March to 05 April, 2014.* Draft, 26 June.

IIEP-UNESCO. 2017. *Conflict-sensitive and Risk-informed Planning in Education: Lessons Learned*. IIEP Policy Brief. Paris, IIEP-UNESCO. <u>http://www.iiep.unesco.org/en/publication/conflict-sensitive-and-risk-informed-planning-education-lessons-learned</u>

UNICEF. 2018. *State of Palestine: Country Report on Out-of-School Children*. <u>https://www.unicef.org/sop/sites/unicef.org.sop/files/2018-08/OOSC_SoP_Full%20Report_EN_0.pdf</u>

Annex 1. Map of humanitarian vulnerability

OPt AREAS WITH HIGHEST HUMANITRIAN VULNERABILITY

AREA C

Area C is the over 60 per cent of the West Bank where Israel retains near exclusive control, including over law enforcement, access and movement, and planning and construction. The restrictive planning regime applied by Israel in Area C makes it virtually impossible for Palestinians to obtain building permits, impeding the development of adequate housing, infrastructure and livelihoods.

EAST JERUSALEM

Around 320,000 Palestinians and 212,000 Israeli settlers currently reside in East Jerusalem, which was annexed to Israel in contravention of international law. Many Palestinians in East Jerusalem are at risk of forcible displacement from demolitions, settler evictions and revocation of residency. Israeli measures, including the Barrier and the permit regime, have increasingly cut off East Jerusalem from the rest of the oP1.

AREAS BEHIND THE BARRIER

Most of the Barrier's route runs inside the West Bank. Where the Barrier is complete, currently 65 per cent of the route, Palestinian farmers must obtain special permits or 'prior coordination' to reach their land via a few authorized gates, while those residing in the closed area between the Barrier and the 'Green Line' face reduced access to services. The construction of the Barrier followed a wave of Palestinian attacks inside Israel and has the stated aim of preventing such attacks.

H2

'H2' is the 20 per cent of Hebron city that remains under direct Israeli control. It is home to approximately 33,000 Palestinians and a few hundred Israeli settlers. Policies and practices implemented by the Israeli authorities, citing security concerns, have reduced a once thriving area to a 'ghost town'. The living conditions of many Palestinians who remain in some parts of H2 have been gradually undermined, including with regard to basic services and sources of livelihood.

GAZA STRIP

Nearly 2 million Palestinians living in the Gaza Strip are facing a longstanding humanitarian crisis. This is driven by a protracted Israeli blockade, imposed citing security concerns, an intensification of the internal Palestinian political divide, and three major escalations of hostilities in less than ten years. Combined, these factors have devastated public infrastructure, disrupted the delivery of basic services and undermined already vulnerable living conditions. Access to areas within 200-300 meters from the perimeter fence surrounding Gaza and to sea areas beyond 6 nautical miles from the coast are largely prohibited.





Oslo Area C

No Man's Land

Source : OCHA/ReliefWeb

(https://www.ochaopt.org/sites/default/files/areas with highest humanitarian vulnerability december 2018.pdf)

Annex 2. Suggested next steps towards the implementation of remedial actions

	YEAR 1			YEAR 2				YEAR 3				
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Compose a country-level EMIS/EiE Task Force and define ToRs												
Development of a unified computerized system												
Assess the local infrastructure capacity for internet-based EMIS and develop a proposal for an adapted												
system – including the development and operational strategy												
Draft and validate a Data Collection/Management Policy												
Implement the unified computerized system												
Promote the sustainability and ownership of the computerized system within the MoE (trainings, human												
resources, financial budget)												
Development of a comprehensive EMIS Framework												
Elaborate an EMIS Masterplan (i.e. data gaps and needs and how the information system will concretely												
address them)												
Develop a Data Management Framework for Education Data (i.e. indicators, processes, roles and												
responsibilities) – with all DGs												
Integrate specific EiE indicators that can inform emergency preparedness, response and recovery plans												
Promote systematic and coordinated EiE monitoring and Planning												
Formalize the EiE role of the DG of Field Follow-Up and of each DG												
Elaborate a comprehensive EiE strategy												
Support the development of systematic joint EiE assessments (e.g. training, coordination, elaboration,												
sharing and update)												
Strengthen and systematize coordination on matters related to EiE among DGs and partners – at all levels												

Annex 3. Descriptive tables of Information Management Systems assessed for the case study

The GE Database

Responsible entity	DG of Educational Planning (Division of Statistics)
Overall objective	This database houses the school census data on a Microsoft [MS] Access platform. The data collected inform the Education Statistical Yearbook and aim to provide a holistic picture of the educational system in order to inform decision-makers about achievements and priority needs on the basis of Ministry targets.
Coverage	<u>Types of schools:</u> Public, Private, UNRWA <u>Geographic coverage:</u> West Bank (incl. Jerusalem) and Gaza <u>Level of education:</u> pre-primary, basic, secondary, non-formal education (NFE)
Data collection process	School principals in all of Palestine (over 2,000 schools) receive yearly paper questionnaires at the beginning of each school year. If they prefer, they can also enter the data directly in an MS Excel spreadsheet. The questionnaires are gathered by the Division of Statistics at the directorate level (from 17 directorates) where the data are compiled in MS Access, cleaned and assessed. Once this process is finalized, the data are sent to the Division of Statistics of the MoE. The data are reviewed and inconsistencies with the previous years are verified. For Jerusalem and Gaza, the questionnaire is integrated within their specific computerized systems.
Links with EiE	Indicators: While the administrative statistics do not include emergency-specific data, there are some traditional indicators that can provide a relevant outlook on the vulnerability of specific components of the education system to emergencies, specifically in those governorates that are located in the most fragile areas. These indicators (e.g. school enrolment – disaggregated by gender; quantity and quality of school infrastructure, student/counsellor ratio, drop-out rates, number of students with disabilities and nature of their disability), while they are not exhaustive, can provide valuable guidance for emergency preparedness, response and recovery actions. The data are disaggregated by governorate, including Jerusalem and Gaza, providing a useful snapshot of the situation throughout Palestine and in the most recovery actions.
Sharing and use of data	The data are published every year in the Education Statistical Yearbook, which is accessible online via the MoE website. Not all information gathered by the questionnaire is included in the Statistical Tables (e.g. Number of refugee students, number of canteens, firefighting equipment, special learning material for learners with disabilities, qualifications of teachers); however, this information can be shared upon request. All DGs are aware of the complete information gathered by the Division of Statistics. Although the raw data are not directly accessible to the public, they can be requested through the Divisions of Statistics by all stakeholders who may be interested.
Main strengths	Geographic coverage: This database is the only one used by the MoE that includes Gaza and UNRWA schools, as well as private schools, giving the opportunity to compare the education system throughout all the territory. In addition, as the same indicators are monitored systematically, resilience trends can be monitored over time.

	Main reference for educational statistics: The GE Database is the main national and international reference for educational statistics for Palestine. The MoE uses these data to build its Education Sector Plan, and both the Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics (PCBS) and UIS/UNESCO reference this database to create their statistics. The accuracy and quality of the data have been acknowledged by UIS.
	Traditional indicators : While some of the quantitative data provided can be very useful to assess capacities and vulnerabilities in the most fragile areas, additional information is necessary to inform emergency preparedness and response plans. For example, this database does not provide information on matters related to: (i) Safety and protection (e.g. violence, proximity to military checkpoints and bases, length of commute, average number of checkpoints to cross, access to safe transportation), (ii) Infrastructure rehabilitation/maintenance needs and materials, (iii) Teachers (i.e. qualifications), (iv) Availability of alternative education opportunities (e.g. catch-up classes, TVET), (v) Social protection (e.g. canteen, cash for school, socio-economic status), (vi) Referral mechanisms and kind of support provided (e.g. psychosocial support, health support)
Main challenges	 Follow-up on variations of specific indicators: The Division of Statistics expressed that the way the data are currently archived in the system impedes the follow-up of the variations recorded from one year to the next, specifically with regards to private and UNRWA schools because there is no control of the data. Excessive clerical work: As the information is collected through questionnaires that are compiled by over 2,000 schools and entered into an MS Access platform, the amount of clerical work is very heavy. This results in a very long process that engages a large number of people who are responsible for integrating the data, assessing them and ensuring follow-up for every identified inconsistency. The Division of Statistics mentioned that the amount of human resources that are dedicated to this process at all levels is insufficient.

The E-School Portal

Responsible entity	DG of Educational Planning and the DG of ICT
Overall objective	The E-School Portal is a web-based information sharing portal developed in 2014 by the same company that developed SMIS. It aims to connect parents, school leaders and teachers to share information on academic programmes and engage parents and communities in school events and activities. While it was not originally intended to communicate formal Ministry data and information, some DGs, such as the DG of Field Follow-Up, have added specific categories that are relevant to their domain of expertise and data collection needs.
Coverage	<u>Types of schools:</u> Public <u>Geographic coverage:</u> West Bank (about 1,835 schools) <u>Level of education:</u> pre-primary, basic, secondary
Data collection process	The data on the E-School Portal are compiled directly by school principals, teachers and district-level education officials. As the portal includes multiple modules, used by different audiences, the method of compilation and extrapolation of data differs.
Links with EiE	 Indicators: Within the E-School Portal, the modules that have a direct link to EiE are those that assess the: Type of access to school Transportation capacities and needs <u>Violations and attacks</u> - Nature of attack and violations (e.g. physical violations, detention and confinement, delays at checkpoints), Directorate of school, number of students and education staff affected, effect on the provision of education activities (e.g. barriers to access, school infrastructure, educational waste, notifications of eviction) State of health facilities First aid capacities Water and electricity infrastructure State of school facilities The schools, when inserting their information, can define the location they are in, therefore giving the opportunity to understand whether they are in the most fragile areas (C, H2 and Jerusalem). In addition, they are given the possibility to express whether they are inside the wall, near a settlement, inside Jerusalem, near an army checkpoint, or within Jerusalem outside the wall.
Sharing and use of data	The data are easily accessible to the wider education community, including parents, teachers, school staff and education authorities. They provide the opportunity to have a general understanding of the state of several components of each school.

	The DG of Field Follow-Up uses this portal as its main reference for developing its Violation Reports and Needs Assessments to define priority actions. This has been
	the case specifically for orienting advocacy measures to protect schools from attack, as well as addressing the transportation needs of schools in the most fragile areas.
	Coverage: At the moment, the E-School Portal is operational within 1,835 public schools in the West Bank, therefore providing important information about a significant part of the education system.
Main strengths Main challenges	Computerized online system: The computerized software – developed free of charge by ULTIMIT – offers an important opportunity to reduce the amount of clerical work and to have a more direct overview of the different components that need to be assessed. The nature of the software allows it also to be easily modified, by including, changing or eliminating specific modules or indicators in order to reflect the evolving needs of the education community in relation to gathering and processing data.
	Easy access of information: This portal is extensively used by parents, students, teachers and education authorities to compile and consult different kinds of data. The direct and easy access to this information allows for increased transparency and promotes more direct management and supervision of the different components of the education system by all stakeholders involved. The DG of ICT has implemented numerous trainings at school level to support the correct use of the software.
	Limited use of the portal by DGs: Although the system has wide coverage throughout the West Bank, not all DGs use this portal as a source of information. For example, the Division of Statistics, the DG of School Health, the DG of Counselling and Special Education, and the DG of School Building do not refer to this system.
	Incomplete EiE coverage: While it provides important information that can inform EiE strategies and programmes, it makes no reference to other important aspects such as infrastructure rehabilitation/maintenance needs and material; teachers (e.g. qualifications, mobility); availability of alternative education opportunities (e.g. catch-up classes, TVET), or referral mechanisms and support provided (e.g. psychosocial support, health support).
	Fluid categories for the reporting of Violations and Attacks: Among the main challenges encountered is the fluidity of the categories used to report violations. In fact, the reporting tools used by the MoE leave ample space to the discretion of the school principal to define what constitutes a violation. This elicits the need to re-assess the report and can sometimes discredit the information provided.
	Insufficient internet access and strength: A main challenge for the use and efficiency of the E-School Portal is the quality and strength of internet coverage throughout the country. Unfortunately, the use of the system has encountered severe challenges and the Internet Service Provider has expressed the need to host it elsewhere as it is too heavy.

The School Management I	Information System	(SMIS)
-------------------------	--------------------	--------

Responsible entity	Initially DG of Educational Planning, but currently it is the DG of ICT
Overall objective	The SMIS was developed to serve as one unified, centralized and integrated web-based system to be used at all levels (i.e. school, district and ministry) for all school-based GE data. It includes a wide array of data modules that were defined in collaboration with numerous DGs (i.e. Finance, General Education, School Health, Counselling and Special Education, HR, Supplies, and School Building) under the supervision of DG of Educational Planning.
Coverage	<u>Types of schools:</u> Public <u>Geographic coverage:</u> West Bank (about 86 schools) <u>Level of education:</u> Basic and secondary
Data collection process	The data in the SMIS are compiled directly by school principals, teachers and education officials at district and central level. For the modules related to students' health and psychosocial well-being, the data are compiled by the School Counsellors.
Links with EiE	 The SMIS includes 17 modules that range from the assessment of school infrastructure to the school's financial status. With regards to specific EiE components, all the modules include elements that can be very useful. In particular, the following components can provide a clear view of capacities in place and priority needs to ensure the safety and quality of the school system in the most at-risk areas: School: general settings (i.e. location, single/double shift, main water source, electricity main resource, wastewater disposal, number of ramps), school building, school room, school gardens, school arena and playground, toilet units Staff Students: student profile, absence, student upgrade, student transfer Student suite student accident, student death, canteen, health activities, evacuation capacities, fire extinguishers, health trainings Student perpetrator, victim, educational involvement, description of violence Special education: school requirements, training courses, disability, rooms, modifications and maintenance, special education staff, institutional care, special education report
Sharing and use of data	The system is designed to allow all relevant education stakeholders to access the data easily on the SMIS portal. While a wide range of users can compile and consult the data, some categories – such as student health and psychological well-being – will only be accessible to specific categories of user to protect the privacy of the students. Each module allows for the development of reports that can facilitate the consultation and analysis of the gathered data.
Main strengths	Comprehensive data: The large number of modules, defined in collaboration with a wide array of DGs, allows this system to be comprehensive and to systematically capture a larger quantity of data that can effectively inform education plans. With regards to EiE, the information collected can be a very valuable base for assessing capacities and priority needs to strengthen resilience.

	Computerized-internet portal: If correctly used, the portal allows for the collection of data to be rapid, therefore significantly limiting the amount of clerical work needed to compile and assess educational data. Moreover, all relevant DGs can base their analysis on the same portal, without having to rely on parallel systems that contribute to the fragmentation of data. This can be very beneficial for the development of joint assessments and planning processes. In addition, throughout time, the modules and indicators can be easily removed, added or changed to reflect the needs of the MoE, districts and school principals.
Main challenges	Limited coverage: Although this system offers the best opportunity to meet many of the Ministry's data needs, at the moment the system is functioning partially in about 86 schools (compiling information only on students, staff and schools). For this reason, it is currently not used as a reference for any of the consulted DGs. Lack of involvement of the DG of Field Follow-Up: While this system can provide very informative data for EiE, the DG of Field Follow-Up did not collaborate in the creation of the different modules. For this reason, the system currently does not include indicators about transportation capacities, and very marginally covers military violations and attacks.
	Insufficient internet access and strength: The internet connection throughout the country is not strong enough to support the system. This creates significant problems at school level when entering the data and at district and MoE level to gather and assess the findings. This is a major obstacle for the efficiency of the system, and for the accuracy of the information.

Responsible entity	DG of Educational Planning (Division of Monitoring and Evaluation)
Overall objective	The Division of Monitoring and Evaluation aims to monitor the achievement of the education system by systematically measuring key performance indicators linked to the Education Sector Strategic Plan.
Coverage	<u>Types of schools:</u> Public <u>Geographic coverage:</u> West Bank and Jerusalem <u>Level of education:</u> pre-primary, basic, secondary, TVET, NFE
Data collection process	 In order to monitor and evaluate specific indicators, the M&E Division selects a sample of about 160 schools (depending on the indicator) every year within the West Bank. The sample of schools changes every year; however, among them are about six schools which are defined as 'anchor schools' and therefore are monitored consistently. In addition to these schools, about 20 are monitored in fragile areas²² in the West Bank on the basis of the attacks reported and monitored. A separate analysis is dedicated to the Waqf schools in East Jerusalem. The indicators are aligned with the ESSP, but some small amendments are made every year on the basis of specific emerging needs of the MoE. They are monitored in different ways according to the indicator: All the access indicators come from the Division of Statistics; For some quality indicators, relevant data are gathered by a specific DG (e.g. DG of Examination, DG of Counselling and Special Education, DG of School Building, DG of Field Follow-Up and DG of Jerusalem Affairs) using an ad hoc data collection tool For other quality indicators, the M&E Division develops specific monitoring tools in collaboration with the relevant DG and contracts an external research firm to use it at school level. The use of an external firm is seen as an element that supports the transparency and accuracy of the process.
	Monitoring of schools in fragile areas: In consultation with the DG of Field Follow-Up and the DG of Jerusalem Affairs, the M&E Division monitors the variation of exposure to conflict risks for schools that are located in fragile areas. In particular, they are sees aspects related to:
Links with EiE	 Fragile area indicators: Number of schools exposed to infrastructure attacks Number of students and teachers exposed to physical violations Rate of lost class hours as a result of violations Degree of psychological and behavioural problems among students in schools exposed to violations

The data collection for the annual M&E Report

²² Fragile areas are defined with the DG of Field Follow-Up (there are about 195 schools in total) and 20 of the most vulnerable schools are identified on the basis of the number of attacks and in coordination with the DG of Field Follow-Up and DCO.

	Enrolment indicators:
	Drop-out rate
	 Execution rate for construction, furnishing and equipping new classrooms
	based on needs in Area C
	 Number of Resilience and Challenge schools
	 Number of students with disabilities enrolled in schools most exposed to violations
	Qualitative indicators
	 % of students with moral values and positive attitudes
	 % of students in possession of various thinking patterns
	 % of students with life and citizenship skills
	 % to which school health environment standards that enhance learning are realized
	 % of technology classes employing specialized tools
	 % of students participating in extracurricular activities
	 % participation of the local community in school activities and events
	 % of students exposed to violence inside the schools
	 % to which questions posed by the teacher inside the classroom are diversified according to thinking skills level,
	 % of science classes that employ educational tools
	These elements are compared to the baseline of the previous year and, in some cases, are also compared with the schools located in the rest of the West Bank.
	Specific attention dedicated to Jerusalem: For the section dedicated to East Jerusalem, because of the difficulty in accessing all schools and gathering data that could reflect the challenges faced by educators and learners, the M&E Division – in coordination with the DG of Jerusalem Affairs – decided to develop a more
	narrative snapshot. It provides an overall understanding of the complexity of the school system in Jerusalem with regards to the different education authorities, difficulties to access school facilities, nature of violent attacks, impact of the conflict on school retention, interference in the school curriculum, shortage of
	qualified teachers, access to and success rate on the General Secondary Matriculation Exam, and qualitative indicators on the acquisition of thinking patterns and life skills. ²³
	Once the processing of the data has been finalized, and the yearly M&E Report is developed, the different DGs are gathered for a presentation of the findings. This is viewed as an important opportunity to define concrete actions for progress towards pre-established targets – and to update the annual plan of DGs in an informed manner. The report is published and shared with accelering as well as technical and financial partners. In order to raise superness of the findings at experience and
Sharing and use of data	district level, a training is conducted to the benefit of district officials and school principals.
	The raw data of the report are hosted by the M&E Division and cannot be shared. Upon request, stakeholders can consult the questionnaires that were used to collect data, but they cannot be taken outside of the MoE.

²³ See the ones listed for fragile areas

Main strengths	Strong reference for evidence-based planning: The M&E report has become a strong reference for the Ministry and its partners to assess achievements and inform next steps. It has strengthened the data-driven culture within the MoE, and all DGs have made it a priority to contribute to the report and to take into account its findings.
	Specific sections dedicated to the most fragile areas: The inclusion of specific sections dedicated to schools located in the fragile areas of the West Bank and in Jerusalem offers a great opportunity to highlight the importance and the urgency of addressing the challenges faced by educators and learners. Moreover, the M&E Division has made a commendable effort to assess and monitor qualitative indicators that – although, at times, may seem vague – can focus on the impact of the education services provided to learners that are systematically confronted with violence and trauma.
Main challenges	Lack of clarity on the data gathering and evaluation process: While the M&E Report clearly states the objective of the data gathering and processing mechanism, the data collection methodology is unclear. This leaves significant room to question the accuracy and credibility of the findings. No mention is made about the source(s) of data, tools used, and sample choice and criteria.
	Sampling and choice of schools: The change of sample every year may considerably affect the accuracy of the monitored trends. In fact, by monitoring different schools every year, the baseline used – which reflects the findings of the previous year – could be invalid.
	With regards to the choice of schools in fragile areas, the M&E Report does not provide a clear understanding of which schools have taken part in the M&E process (e.g. Are they the ones who have been victims of violations throughout the year? If so, then the number would change every year. To which level of education do they belong?). This is crucial to be able to assess the vulnerability criteria, and possibly compare the findings to other schools in different areas.
	Indicators for schools in fragile areas: The indicators chosen to monitor schools in fragile areas do not include some of the indicators used to assess the basic education schools in the rest of the West Bank. ²⁴ For those that are specific to EiE, they are not exhaustive when considering vulnerability factors of schools towards emergencies. ²⁵ In addition, the indicators chosen to monitor quality and learning outcomes seem to be vague and difficult to assess, therefore putting into question the accuracy, or overall relevance, of the information gathered.
	Use of parallel data gathering systems: While the study refers to some of the data already generated by some DGs (e.g. GE Data and Field Follow-Up) most of the indicators are assessed through specific questionnaires that are used by the DGs or by a contracted firm. This contributes to the generation of parallel data, without capitalizing on the wide array of information already available. Moreover, it increases considerably the work burden on the MoE, districts and schools to assess achievements and priority needs.

²⁴ There is no reference to Sub-performance indicators for the Enrolment Rates (2.2, 2.3, 2.4., 2.6, 2.8, 2.10), to indicators related to the Qualified Teachers, and on the Palestinian Curricula.

²⁵ For example, no mention of indicators related to the safety of school buildings and premises, transportation, emergency preparedness and response capacities, PSS and health services available, qualified teachers, etc.

Assessing the School Health Environment

Responsible entity	DG of School Health
Overall objective	In view of promoting student health and a safe education environment, the DG of School Health uses surveys that look into different aspects – including the state of the school building and premises, sanitation and hygiene, as well as safety measures – to identify priority needs and inform school health plans.
Coverage	<u>Types of schools:</u> Public <u>Geographic coverage:</u> West Bank and Jerusalem <u>Level of education:</u> KG, basic, secondary
Data collection process	To carry out these bi-annual surveys, the data collection process is supported by Field Health Workers, Directorates, and finally the DG. Each field health officer is expected to fill the tool in all schools under his supervision during the first semester of the academic year and then again at the end of the second half of the academic year. The data from the surveys are gathered at directorate level, compiled in Excel, and then transmitted the DG of School Health.
	The survey developed by the DG of School Health and compiled by the Field Health Workers looks into the state of the school building and premises, sanitation and hygiene, as well as safety measures. It also looks at the capacity within schools, and acquisition of positive behavioural practices that contribute to the safety of the overall school environment.
	The indicators that are monitored and evaluated by Field Health Workers ²⁶ are categorized by seven basic axes, which include (i) Effective leadership and management of School Health Committees, (ii) Health education, (iii) Public safety (e.g. safety, water safety and road safety), (iv) Community engagement and participation, (v) Physical environment (quality of education environment, WASH, infrastructure), (vi) Health, nutrition and physical activity, and (vii) Health services.
	The categories have been defined in alignment with the School Environment Policy and include indicators related to:
	 The presence and functioning of School Health Committees, as well as Evacuation and Firefighting Committees;
	 Presence of sufficient first aid supplies and trained capacities on site (i.e. students and teachers)
	 Coordination with local authorities and communities to support emergency preparedness and response
	This information is fundamental in assessing the capacities in place, as well as the priority needs to inform adapted emergency preparedness and prevention plans.
	The data are gathered by the Field Health Officers at Directorate level to inform their specific School Health Plan. This allows them to develop adapted operational
Sharing and use of data	achievements of the implemented plans, and report on the remaining needs that should be considered.
	These data are reflected in the annual report developed by the DG of School Health. This report, which defines the main achievements and priority needs, is shared among partners and other DGs on the occasion of specific thematic groups or upon request.

²⁶ See Annex 3 "Assessing the Readiness of Schools: Healthy and Safe School Environment"

Main strengths	Comprehensive vulnerability factors: The aspects monitored by the DG of School Health correspond to an important range of vulnerability factors that, if addressed, can significantly limit the impacts of the emergencies on the access and quality of the education provided. It is the only DG – among those consulted – that looks at a more holistic composition of the education environment that is essential and must be protected in the face of emergencies. The data gathered and the reports developed could be a very valuable starting point to assess priority needs and define strategies to strengthen the resilience of the education system to emergencies (e.g. WASH, infrastructure, preparedness and response capacities, health, positive behaviour). Data used to inform specific School Health Plans: The data gathered by the DG of School Health and their use clearly reflect the overall tendency of the MoE towards a results-based management approach. The information gathered by the field health workers is immediately utilized to develop adapted plans, and it is used as a concrete baseline to monitor achievements through systematic visits (at least three times a month) and a final evaluation. This allows for the data collection mechanism to be effective and serve its purpose, while avoiding dispersion of efforts to generate information that is not optimized.
	Coverage of survey: At the moment the MoE is able to cover the costs of only 110 field workers – each covering 5 schools. This means that the information gathered, and the report developed by the DG of School Health, cover only 550 schools within the West Bank and Jerusalem.
Main challenges	Specificity of data and needs of schools in fragile areas: The data gathered, as well as the developed reports, do not reflect the specificities of schools in fragile areas (Area C or H2) and their exposure to the risk of violations and attacks. This was due to a specific intention of focusing on a needs-based approach and assuming that the School Environment Standards should be the same everywhere. However, at the moment, the DG of School Health is considering giving special attention to schools in Area C because of their specific risks and fragilities.
	Use of parallel data gathering systems: The School Health Department gathers and manages the information separately from the other DGs. This contributes to the fragmentation of information within the MoE while resulting in excessive clerical work at school, district and MoE level.

Responsible entity	DG of School Building, DG of School Health and DG of Field Follow-Up
Overall objective	Provide a checklist to schools in view of assessing their capacity to provide a healthy, secure and student-friendly school environment by ensuring all the general safety requirements
Coverage	<u>Types of schools:</u> Public <u>Geographic coverage:</u> West Bank and Jerusalem <u>Level of education:</u> pre-primary, basic, secondary
Data collection process	The questionnaire is compiled by school directors and is sent to the directorates, where the data are compiled in an Excel spreadsheet and analysed by a committee composed of different divisions (School Health, Buildings, Planning, and Field Follow-Up). These divisions will provide support to the schools to overcome any shortages in the preparedness of their schools. The data are then sent to the different DGs at the MoE.
Links with EiE	 The questionnaire includes a great number of indicators that are linked to the overall infrastructure safety standards. This can provide important information that is relevant to assessing the vulnerability of schools to emergency risks. In particular, the survey assesses the following elements: Environment of the school building Safety of water and health facilities School canteen General safety requirements
Sharing and use of data	The data are gathered at directorate level and are used to understand the priority needs of the school in a specific area. Schools are expected to indicate if and how they will overcome the gaps, and the directorates will provide any support if necessary. This questionnaire was used for the first time in July 2019, therefore there is not enough experience to highlight the success of this data collection measure.
Main strengths	Wide array of school-safety indicators: The questionnaire includes a large number of questions that can help assess the overall safety and quality of the school environment. It enables a good understanding of the different components – from the school building, to hygiene and sanitation, to emergency preparedness measures – that must be ensured within all schools. This becomes particularly relevant in areas that are most exposed to emergency risks. Collaboration with different DGs: The collaboration between the DG of School Health, the DG of School Building and the DG of Field Follow-Up clearly reflects the will of the MoE to engage in collecting and assessing data in a harmonized manner – which can be a strong basis for developing cohesive approaches to address the vulnerabilities of schools. However due to the turnover of personnel, at the time of this case study, the team of the DG of Field Follow-Up had no knowledge of this process.
Main challenges	Very recent experience: This questionnaire was developed and used for the first time in July 2019, therefore there is not enough experience to assess the data collection process and its success.

Assessing the Readiness of Schools: Healthy and Safe School Environment

Specificity of data and needs of schools in fragile areas: The data gathered do not reflect the specificities of schools in fragile areas (Area C or H2) and their exposure to the risk of violations and attacks. This reflects the intention of wanting to ensure common standards throughout all the territory, without focusing primarily on the schools that are considered most fragile. However, including specific elements related to the risk of violations and attacks (e.g. contingency plans, emergency committee, safety shelter, transportation needs) in this questionnaire could be useful in order to avoid the creation of additional surveys.

Use of parallel data gathering systems: While this questionnaire can be a valuable source of information, it adds an additional questionnaire to the already heavy workload of school principals. This information could be ideally assessed through the E-School Portal, or the SMIS in order to avoid additional clerical work at all levels.

Assessing Infrastructure Needs in Catchment Areas

Responsible entity	DG of School Building
Overall objective	The DG of School Building maintains an Excel-based data system to calculate school needs and priorities based on a composite school suffering index. This tool prioritizes a school's needs against other schools within a specific catchment area.
Coverage	<u>Types of schools:</u> Public <u>Geographic coverage:</u> West Bank and Jerusalem <u>Level of education:</u> pre-primary, basic, secondary
Data collection process	The tool is compiled at district level and transmitted to the DG of School Building by emailing the MS Excel file.
Links with EiE	 The Equivalent Student Suffering (ESS) System assesses the infrastructure vulnerabilities of schools and their impact on the overall education environment. Through the calculation of a specific 'student suffering index', the DG of School Building is able to identify priority schools and actions to support. In particular, this tool identifies the following elements: General information – Area of school (A,B,C, H2, Jerusalem), number of students and teachers by gender, average distance from residence to school Classrooms – Number of double shifts or rented rooms, number and quality unsuitable (of lighting, ventilation, acoustics, structure, plastering, painting, floors), overcrowding of classrooms Area per student – Area m² classroom/student, Area m² paved playground/student Specialized and administrative rooms – Number and quality of specialized and administrative rooms (e.g. library, computer lab, science lab, covered courtyard, teachers' room, headmaster room, administration and secretariat, social worker room, canteen, latrines for teachers, latrines for students, storage) Safety – % of students exposed to dangerous situations in/around school Inclusion – % of students affected by the lack of access for learners with disabilities
Sharing and use of data	This system is used upon request in case a specific project needs to be developed and implemented. It is a way to prioritize actions and location.
Main strengths	 Centred on the impact on students: The 'student suffering index' enables consideration of the impacts of the physical education environment on the learner in a student-centred manner. By calculating the relative suffering in the school/area, the DG of School Building aims to have a concrete index that can orient the choice of school to be supported, and to implement a specific intervention that has a higher effect on the well-being of learners and educators. Takes into account aspects of safety and inclusion: Among the criteria measured through this tool, the DG of School Building includes the risk of leaners and staff to be exposed to violent events within or around a particular school. This allows the DG to define appropriate prevention measures that can limit exposure to violent threats or mitigate their impact. Geolocalization by fragile area: This tool helps to identify the location of the schools by fragile areas (C, H2, Jerusalem), therefore considering the chronic difficulties faced by the education community in these areas.

Main challenges	Coverage of survey: This data collection system is used only upon request in the case an opportunity to implement a project arises. It could be interesting, however,
	to use this methodically, and to revise it to include other indicators and all schools in Palestine.
	Use of parallel data gathering systems: The ESS is not linked to any other existing system used by the MoE. Therefore, this contributes to the fragmentation of
	information

Assessing Special	Education N	eeds and Capacities
-------------------	--------------------	---------------------

Responsible entity	DG of Counselling and Special Education
Overall objective	Monitor the achievements and needs of Special and Inclusive Education. This tool complements the statistical data on learners with disabilities that are integrated in the yearly GE Statistics and provides a more detailed overview of the capacities in place at school level to implement adapted special and inclusive education activities.
Coverage	<u>Types of schools:</u> Public <u>Geographic coverage:</u> West Bank and Jerusalem <u>Level of education:</u> pre-primary, basic, secondary
Data collection process	The tool is compiled at school level by the inclusive education teacher at the end of the first semester and at the end of the school year. The information is then gathered and processed on Excel by the District Division of Counselling and Special Education. A report is then sent to the MoE. Once the reports from the 17 districts are received, a semi-annual and annual report are developed.
Links with EiE	 With regards to EiE, special and inclusive education is of primary relevance, as conflict and natural hazards could severely affect the physical and mental well-being of children and youth, both temporarily and permanently. Moreover, children with disabilities can face additional challenges when having to prepare for or react in the event of a hazard – making them more vulnerable to the impacts of emergencies. For this reason, it is important to ensure that the education system is adequately prepared to ensure continuous access to quality and safe education to learners who have disabilities or who face other impediments – such as hospitalization and detention. In particular, this form assesses the following components that can be useful in assessing vulnerabilities and defining priority needs: Number of students with disabilities: for the academic year (categorized by directorate and type of disability) Number of integrated students (categorized by directorate and type of disability) Number of transferred Students (categorized by directorate and type of disability) Number of workers with disabilities (categorized by directorate and type of disability) Number of modified schools (categorized by directorate and type of disability) Number of hardware and tools provided (categorized by directorate and supervising authority) Number of hardware and tools provided (categorized by directorate and kind) Number of students with disabilities in special education institutions (categorized by directorate and type of disability)
Sharing and use of data	The data are processed at district level and can be shared upon request by the DG of Counselling and Special Education

Main strengths	Coverage of the assessment: The report covers all levels of education throughout the government schools in the West Bank. Although it does not include data from private schools and Gaza, it allows to have an interesting snapshot of the capacities in place, and additional needs in matters of special and inclusive education Data used to inform specific School Special and Inclusive Education Plans: As in the case for the DG of School Health, the data collection and processing mechanism for Special Education clearly reflects the results-based management approach of the MoE. The information gathered is utilized to develop adapted plans and is
	considered as a concrete baseline to monitor achievements over time. This allows for the data gathering and collection mechanism to be effective and serve its purpose, while avoiding dispersion of efforts to generate information that is not optimized. Link to the GE Statistical Data: The annual report of the DG of Counselling and Special Education incudes data that is collected through the yearly statistic questionnaire of the Division of Statistics. This allows to avoid duplicating the data that has already been collected.
Main challenges	 Specificity of data and needs of schools in fragile areas: The data gathered, and the reports developed, do not reflect the specificities of schools and students in fragile areas (Area C or H2) (i.e. exposure to risks and impacts of emergencies). Use of parallel data gathering systems: Although a part of the data is gathered through the GE Statistic Data System, the information is collected through an additional form – increasing the clerical workload of schools and districts and contributing to the dispersion of data.

Annex 4. EiE assessments carried out by members of the Education Cluster in 2018-2019

	SOURCE OF INFORMATION (AGENCY)	NAME OF DOCUMENT	REGION	DATE OF ASSESSMENT
1	NRC	Evictions in the Gaza Strip – Needs Assessment Report	Gaza Strip	01/10/2018
2	NRC	Education in Emergencies Rapid Assessment 'Emerging alarming educational trends in Gaza'	Gaza Strip	01/10/2018
3	NRC	Great March of Return – Needs Assessment Report	Gaza Strip	01/10/2018
4	NRC	Helping students in Gaza – Evaluation of Better Learning Program 2: Group Sessions	Gaza Strip	01/10/2018
5	Islamic Relief- IRPAL	Kindergartens Needs Assessment Report	Gaza Strip	01/07/2019
6	Educational Forum Association	The Impact of Occupation Policies on Enhancing the Drop-out in Palestine	Gaza Strip	01/03/2019
7	Culture and Free Thought Association- CFTA	Evaluation report for Education Project	Gaza Strip	20/08/2018
8	Educaid	Education Needs Assessments (EiE)- Inclusive Education	Gaza Strip	01/10/2018
9	Educaid	Reality of KGs south Gaza – summary report	Gaza Strip	01/02/2018
10	AVSI	AVSI Data and information_ed cluster	West Bank	15/07/2019
11	Consortium	190416 GVC Education Infographic	West Bank	16/04/2019
12	Social and Economic Policies Monitor (المرصد) & Teacher Creativity Center- TCC	Equity and Quality in Education م	West Bank	01/01/2018
13	The Civic Coalition for Palestinian Rights in Jerusalem- CCPRJ	De-Palestinization of Education in Occupied East Jerusalem - Call for International Protection	West Bank	13/3/2017

14	Save the Children	Tuqu_Secondary School Profile	West Bank	05/07/2019
15	Save the Children	Schools Zones of Peace Eval Report FINAL DRAFT	West Bank	17/1/2018
16	Save the Children	"Schools as Zones of Peace Project", Evaluating the School Disaster Management Committees	West Bank	17/1/2018
17	Save the Children	Protecting Education briefing 2018 - Full Year-Updated - 13.3.19	West Bank	13/3/2019
18	NRC	NRC Update - Developments Education in East Jerusalem	West Bank	05/01/2017
19	Addameer	Factsheet Addameer	West Bank	06/09/2018
20	Save the Children	EiE Case Study - As Sawiya al Luban school, Nablus District 11.5.18	West Bank	05/11/2018
21	Save the Children	ED SCI Report- June 4 2018	West Bank	06/04/2018
22	FinnChurch	Al Fajer School Assessment Report	West Bank	09/01/2018
23	FinnChurch	Improved inclusive quality and well-being of the most marginalized Palestinian children, narrative report 2019	West Bank	03/01/2019
24	Christian peacemaker team	Hebron School Report	West Bank	01/01/2019
25	FinnChurch	Hawwari Abu Madian School Assessment Report	West Bank	01/01/2018
26	Save the Children	As Sawiya al Luban school Nablus District	West Bank	03/12/2019
27	Save the Children	Al Khader School Report	West Bank	03/12/2019
28	UNICEF	State of Palestine – Country Report on Out of School Children	Entire Affected Area	07/01/2018