



**SECTION 2. GUIDANCE ON COLLECTING,
ANALYZING, AND REPORTING DATA ON ATTACKS
ON EDUCATION**

Toolkit for Collecting
and Analyzing Data
on Attacks on Education

January 2023

Toolkit for Collecting and Analyzing Data on Attacks on Education

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section 2. Guidance on Collecting, Analyzing, and Reporting Data on Attacks on Education	1
Suggested Steps for Collecting, Analyzing, and Reporting Data on Attacks on Education	1
Step 1. Map relevant actors	1
Step 2. Assess the security, political, and legal landscape.....	2
Step 3. Develop or update relevant tools.....	3
Step 4. Training, awareness raising, and relationship building with local partners	6
Step 5. Collecting data	7
Step 6. Analyzing data	9
Step 7. Sharing reports of attacks on education	14

SECTION 2. GUIDANCE ON COLLECTING, ANALYZING, AND REPORTING DATA ON ATTACKS ON EDUCATION

High-quality analysis and reporting of attacks on education relies on the collection of reliable, comprehensive data. GCPEA intends for organizations or governments to use this *Toolkit* as a menu of possible indicators for data collection and analysis.

Efforts to collect data have expanded and improved over time. For example, the UN’s Monitoring and Reporting Mechanism, established in 2005, has contributed to better reporting of verified attacks and has raised awareness of the need for child protection and human rights specialists deployed within peacekeeping missions. In addition, as attacks on education have been more widely integrated into humanitarian response planning and taken on by education and protection clusters, national efforts to monitor and report on attacks on education have also improved in conflict-affected countries around the world.

Toolkit users can assess their level of capacity for collection and analysis and availability of other education data,¹ then select the appropriate indicators for their needs from the Indicators on Attacks on Education section. Depending on the dynamics of conflict, prominent types of attacks on education, and other relevant trends, certain indicators and tools in this *Toolkit* may be more applicable than others for certain contexts and organizations. For example, the MRM does not typically collect data on attacks on higher education, while those organizations focused on higher education will not require indicators on attacks on schools or school students.

While no one model of data collection will meet the particularities of each country, we encourage actors in the field to consider the following steps to collect, analyze, and report on attacks on education.

Suggested Steps for Collecting, Analyzing, and Reporting Data on Attacks on Education

Step 1. Map relevant actors

Organizations in the field should coordinate to assess existing data collection efforts. Often, the Education or Child Protection Clusters take the lead on monitoring attacks on schools. Where a peacekeeping or special political mission is active, Clusters may work closely with these bodies to report incidents which the UN may then verify as part of the Country Taskforce for Monitoring and Reporting on grave violations against children.

NGOs, together with Clusters, may also produce sectoral needs assessments. Additionally, the Ministry of Education may capture some relevant information. In some cases, local media may also play an active role in reporting attacks or a civil society organization may be releasing regular reports on a specific type of attack on education.

Mapping these different actors allows for improved harmonization between them and lays the groundwork for the next steps. Humanitarian actors often publish a “Who does What Where and When for Whom” or 5W matrix (see a template [here](#)) to assist in coordination efforts among organizations working in certain regions. Consider doing a 5W exercise in relation to monitoring and responding to attacks on education. **In the Appendices of this *Toolkit*, GCPEA has provided a sample Actor Mapping Exercise.**

¹ Other education data refers to relevant datasets, other than those directly comprising attacks on education, which may be useful complements for running analyses and understanding the impact of attacks. These include administrative data on schools or universities and their students and staff, school needs assessments, (H)EMIS data, polling place locations (in contexts where schools serve as polling sites or are used for other political purposes), educational outcomes surveys, and many others.

Key Questions

- What types of national data collection and reporting exist?
- Is there an annual statistical yearbook?
- Are there any human rights observatories or other civil society organizations collecting incident-level data?
- What actors monitor attacks on higher education?
- What types of needs assessments are occurring at the community level and do they take in information on education or protection?
- Are there any variants in relevant humanitarian or education actors between regions within the country?
- How do different organizations currently collaborate and coordinate on other aspects of humanitarian response?
- At the school- or university-level, what information is available to students and educators on what to do in different situations of violence?

Some resources covering attacks on education include:

- [UN OCHA's Humanitarian Needs Overviews and Response Plans](#)
- [UN Human Rights Council Reports](#)
- UN Annual and country-specific reports on [Children and Armed Conflict](#)
- Reports of [UN Peacekeeping and Special Political Missions](#)
- Education or Child Protection Cluster or Sub-Cluster Reports
- Media reports – as cited in Armed Conflict Location and Event Data project, Global Terrorism Database, or found online
- [Insecurity Insight's Education in Danger Monthly News Brief](#)
- [Scholars at Risk Network's Academic Freedom Monitor](#)

Step 2. Assess the security, political, and legal landscape

Monitoring and reporting on attacks on education requires an assessment of security, political, and legal landscapes. Having a lay of the land, especially with regards to any national legislation or military reforms prohibiting attacks on schools or military use of schools or universities can assist in planning for monitoring and reporting. Accurate information on security and humanitarian access will also facilitate planning for data collection and reporting on attacks on education.

This analysis can also support or be part of a wider conflict-sensitive assessment of the education sector. In some contexts, a particular ethnic, religious, or linguistic group may be targeted. In other places, attacks may take on a gender dimension. Understanding these dynamics will ensure that monitoring does not put any community at elevated risk of attack or worsen conflict.

An analysis of the security context will also help identify key trends in attacks on education. For example, in some contexts, attacks on school students, teachers, and other education personnel with firearms may be the most reported form of attack on education. In other contexts, attacks on school or university facilities may occur more frequently and using explosive weapons.

Organizations must take the political landscape into account when publishing reports on attacks on education, particularly if it may lead to restrictions to their access or operations within a country. And knowledge of the political landscape will also help to later advocate for policy changes.

Key Questions

Legal: Has the government endorsed the [Safe Schools Declaration](#)? Do any [international or regional legal instruments](#) apply? Does [domestic law](#) codify prohibitions of attacks on education or military use of schools and universities?²

Conflict: Are government forces or non-state armed groups perpetrating attacks, or both? Do attacks occur in government or non-government-controlled areas? Have non-state armed groups signed Action Plans with the Office of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General on Children and Armed Conflict (OSRSG-CAAC) or Deeds of Commitment with Geneva Call or made other steps to end attacks on education?

Security: What barriers currently exist to accessing areas of the country experiencing attacks on education, or likely to experience attacks in the future? Which organizations have access? Has any organization trained local, community-based monitors? What can be done to ensure the safety of monitors? Are cross-border attacks happening and, if so, what cross-border responses are occurring? Are schools closed due to pandemics, environmental hazards such as flooding, or other factors?

Step 3. [Develop or update relevant tools](#)

Data collection tools should be designed or updated to capture information on the five forms of attacks on education and the military use of schools and universities. Relevant details on each incident of attack include the location, date and time of attack, type of school or university, type of attack, number of students and education personnel harmed, gender of the victims or students served by the school, the number of students attending the facility, and other details described in the Indicators on Attacks on Education section.

At this point, organizations collecting data on attacks on education should build upon the mapping of relevant actors (Step 1) to improve inter-sectoral harmonization. Inter-Cluster meetings, inter-ministerial forums, or other settings that promote dialogue across different areas of work may facilitate necessary exchanges. The mapping exercise in Step 1 may have revealed which organizations collect data on each category of attack on education and military use. If a specific organization or set of organizations only collects data on one violation, such as child recruitment, partner organizations should review their data collection tools to ensure that relevant information is collected, for instance if the recruitment occurred at or en route to school, and then confirm the data is shared with the relevant actors. If needed, a coordination group, such as an Attacks on Education Working Group formed by the Education Cluster, could be established to facilitate such exchanges.

The Indicators on Attacks on Education section provides suggested ways of disaggregating data reporting for each attack – these should guide the drafting of data collection tools. For instance, if interview questionnaires or survey instruments do not include questions about the gender of students and educators affected by attacks, these questions should be added to the tools. Sample data collection tools can be found in Appendix B.

Differing contexts, and whether or not an MRM or other system is in place, will also influence the type of monitoring tools developed or refined. For example, incidents of child recruitment and sexual violence at, or on the way to or from, school may be collected through the MRM or MARA; tools that allow for capturing disaggregated data, however, ensure these violations are identified as an attack on education rather than only recruitment or sexual violence.

Data collection tools should be developed in a conflict-sensitive way, making sure that questions have been reviewed for any sensitivities related to group identity, gender, or other factors. When possible, relevant information pertaining to the ethnicity, religion, or gender of the students served by an affected school and its education personnel may be collected.

² Right to Education's [Monitoring Education Under Attack from a Human Rights Perspective](#) may be a useful resource for identifying international legal instruments and determining the progress a government has made towards meeting its commitments to such instruments.

In addition, data on attacks may be collected at the same time as other types of education data and therefore analyzed together to better understand impacts on learning or other areas. In some cases, information on the number of schools damaged or destroyed may be collected through a survey or needs assessment.

Finally, organizations will have to plan for secure data entry, management, and storage. GCPEA provides a Data Template in this *Toolkit*. Other organizations, such as Education Clusters, may also make their data templates publicly available (see Section on Global Education Cluster Guidance). The data management system (e.g., datasheet) should align with the tools used to collect data (e.g., questionnaires) for ease of data entry and to ensure all relevant details are captured.

Given data sensitivities, organizations should explore data security options and select those that best suit their needs and ethical responsibilities, such as password encryption, storing data on a private server, de-identifying sensitive data (e.g., names of schools, students), and using a key to (de)code sources. For more information on safe and ethical data management, see the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs' (OCHA) [*Data Responsibility Guidelines*](#) and Harvard Humanitarian Initiative's [*The Signal Code: A Human Rights Approach to Information During Crisis*](#).

Key Questions

- Do existing data collection tools reflect the realities of the situation on the ground?
- Are there observed impacts of attacks on education on learning and education that a data collection tool should capture? For instance, are there impacts on education infrastructure such as damage or destruction not captured in existing data collection instruments?
- Does data collection on attacks on education occur at the same time as monitoring for other grave violations against children or other child protection or education issues?
- Do existing data collection tools ask gender-sensitive questions?
- Are existing data collection tools conflict sensitive?
- Are incidents of school-related sexual violence and child recruitment by parties to conflict included in current data collection efforts?
- Is data entry systematic? And does the data entry system align with the data collection tool?
- Does all the information fit easily into the datasheet? Are additional columns needed to analyze new quantitative data? Are new tabs required to store qualitative data or context information?
- What data security strategies are in place?
- How do data templates used by different actors correspond?

The Global Education Cluster's Approaches to Attacks on Education

The Global Education Cluster (GEC) has developed a guidance note on [Systematizing Approaches for Attacks on Education](#) to support education clusters in integrating attacks on education into the humanitarian program cycle (HPC). This guidance supports country coordination teams in identifying key actions to ensure integration of the impact of attacks on education into humanitarian responses, by building on existing tools and mechanisms.

GCPEA's *Toolkit* is one of the resources listed in this guidance and aligns with the tool on several aspects. While this *Toolkit* provides technical tools related to collection, measurement, and analysis, the GEC guidance provides specifications corresponding to existing tools within humanitarian planning and response frameworks. The guidance note also suggests appropriate data collection mechanisms to support responses to attacks when they occur as well as indications for resource mobilization and advocacy.

With regards to data collection on attacks, the GEC guidance provides specifications for integrating attacks on education into various data collection efforts including: Secondary Data Review, Needs Assessments, and Incident Monitoring.

Secondary Data Review

A Secondary Data Review (SDR) is an ongoing process of analysing existing information used to help monitor the changing needs of the affected population. The SDR can be used to support data collection and analysis of attacks on education as it enables collection of information from diverse sources. These include media, partner reports and non-public/non-conventional sources such as email exchanges or telephone conversations. The [GEC guidance on needs assessments](#) provides an overview of secondary sources and provides an [example of a template for SDR](#).

Needs Assessments

Needs assessments are an essential component of humanitarian planning and are critical to identifying the scale of response needed and generating adequate financial and human resources to plan and execute a response. In several contexts, attacks on education are explicitly integrated into needs assessments. The Global Education Cluster has many [resources](#) for conducting needs assessments.

Joint Education Needs Assessments (JENA) are led by Education Clusters and focus on education using a single tool and methodology. Good examples of JENAs that include attacks on education have been conducted, such as in [South Sudan](#) and [Central African Republic](#). Both assessments provide examples on analysis of the impact that extends beyond providing counts of incidents. The questionnaires used for the assessments can be found on GEC Box.

Multi-sector needs assessments (MSNA) provide key information on needs and assist in the development of shared understanding of the key priorities for a response. MSNAs are typically led and coordinated by an entity with a specific mandate such as OCHA, UNHCR, UNDP or the government. Including questions on attacks on education within integrated multi-sector needs assessments will support data collection which is relevant beyond the education sector. The [Joint Intersectoral Analysis Framework \(JIAF\)](#) provides further guidance and tools for such assessments in support of the Humanitarian Programme Cycle.

Needs assessments typically assess the impacts of attacks on education – including the number of schools damaged or destroyed due to attacks, the number of schools used for military purposes, the number of students injured, killed, or whose learning was affected. When conducting a needs assessment, it is critical to ensure that schools in areas impacted by attacks on education are included in the sample.

Incident Monitoring

Through their regular programming activities, partners may also identify cases of attacks on education in their areas of operation. Cluster coordination teams should be prepared to receive these reports and ensure the right course of action is followed. The appropriate action to be taken depends on the type of case (e.g., military occupation of a school, child protection), as well as the extent of an education partner’s capacity and the relevance of their mandate to the case. The GEC has also developed an [Attacks on Education Data Template](#) for Cluster Partners to track attacks. This tool aligns with GCPEA’s data template.

In some cases, Education Clusters, or their partners, receive reports which are then shared with the UN Monitoring and Reporting Mechanism for future verification. This type of monitoring and sharing requires funding and capacity to manage the database. Some Education Clusters and partners have successful models in place which link planning, fundraising, and response. GCPEA’s Case Study [“Measuring the impact of attacks on education in Palestine,”](#) written in collaboration with the occupied Palestinian territories Education Cluster outlines some of these good practices.

See the Global Education Cluster’s [Guidance Note](#) for further specifications and resources.

Adapted from [Systematizing Approaches for Attacks on Education](#)

Step 4. Training, awareness raising, and relationship building with local partners

Organizations or governments may need to train their staff and partners on good practices in data collection and entry, as well as in identifying attacks on education in the field and using relevant tools to record incidents. In some cases, these monitors may already be collecting other education or protection data.

In most contexts, the more staff that are trained to identify attacks on education and military use, the more robust and accurate reporting will be. Not all staff need to be trained on the full reporting process, but they should know the procedure for safely informing a focal point in the event of an attack on education or military use.

Awareness raising among local residents and civil society organizations on attacks on education is a critical step to better monitoring and reporting. In some contexts, unless a school is significantly damaged or destroyed, communities may not know that it is necessary to report the violation or to whom they can make a report. In other cases, the military use of schools occurs so frequently that communities may not deem it a violation necessary of reporting.

If communities know about different types of attacks on education or the military use of schools and how they may violate their rights, they will be better equipped to identify and report violations to appropriate actors.

In addition, local and national media often report on attacks on education or military use of educational facilities, especially in contexts where international media presence is restricted. However, journalists may not be aware of the different forms of attacks on education, different international and national legal frameworks related to the protection of education, or methods for writing about the attacks to provide relevant details while also protecting witnesses, survivors, and victims. Journalists may benefit from orientations on the matter. Useful resources are *Education Under Attack: a monitoring guide for journalists and photographers* and *Documenting Education Under Attack: Five key lessons for collaborations between civil society organizations and journalists* from Right to Education Initiative, and for an example of good practices, see *Caught in the crossfire: The right to education in eastern Ukraine*.

In most contexts, local NGOs, as well as community leaders and members, can act as important partners in data collection. First, these local partners will have access and knowledge international or capital-based monitors, or even the media, may not, meaning (a) increased reports of attacks and military use, which will address chronic underreporting of violations and ensure more precise total counts; and (b) diverse data streams so that reporting biases, such as those towards urban, high-impact attacks, are addressed making counts and analyses more representative. Second, even when attacks and military use would have otherwise been picked up by monitors or the media, reports from local partners are likely to (a) provide more details, so that fuller disaggregation is possible; and (b) increase the accuracy of reports by allowing for triangulation of sources.³ Local partners should be approached ethically, however, and any information they share should be strictly voluntary.

Key Questions

- What relevant trainings have already occurred in-country or regionally?
- Are field monitors typically local or international staff or community-based partners?
- Are there any local organizations working with local communities on rights-based reporting?
- Have representatives from different sectors been trained, or only protection staff?
- What tools, knowledge, or systems are needed to more accurately collect and report on attacks on education? Specifically, what tools do field-based partners or local communities say they need to report on attacks?
- What media sources currently report on attacks on education and is the reporting of good quality?
- Have journalists been trained in the definitions of attacks on education and the benefits of including key details in reports, such as the alleged perpetrator and gender of affected students?
- What local perceptions exist of attacks on education?

Step 5. Collecting data

This step represents the cumulative efforts taken in the four previous steps. With a strong understanding of the security, legal, and humanitarian contexts, and efforts to create inter-sectoral collaboration and communication around attacks on education, as well as the creation or strengthening of robust collection tools and systems for information storage, data collection is ready to begin. Monitors and relevant stakeholders are also better informed on the issue and ready to both provide and collect information on the topic.

At this stage, *Toolkit* users should ensure the safety and security of both informants and monitors, then undertake data collection. While organizations have already assessed the security landscape in Step 2, organizations should

³ For more on the importance of incorporating reports from local NGOs and communities, see: Bennouna et al., “Monitoring and reporting attacks on education in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Somalia,” *Disasters*, 2018, 42(2): 314–335. For more on the importance of actively pursuing “diverse and contrary data points” during monitoring, see: *Guide to: Conflict Analysis* (New York, UNICEF: November 2016), pp. 41-43.

also assess their own organizational protocols to determine the appropriateness of monitoring and their readiness to deploy monitors to the field. Once organizations are confident in their procedures for managing staff and informant safety, they may send monitors into the field to survey, interview, or otherwise collect information about attacks on education from informants, including school administrators, attack survivors or their families, community leaders, local authorities, perpetrators of attacks, or humanitarian professionals. For more information on field-based data collection procedures, see *Monitoring Education Under Attack from a Human Rights Perspective* from the Right to Education Initiative. Other organizations may, instead, be set up to receive incident reports from partner organizations or contacts in conflict-affected areas without sending staff to those areas. Data may be collected via digital or telephone interviews or through reports made from remote areas or those where travel restrictions are in place due to conflict, natural disasters, or other health and safety concerns like Covid-19. Safety measures should still be in place for informants and monitors, however, even if data is collected from a distance. Yet other organizations may both send monitors to conflict-affected areas and receive reports from a distance.

Data collection should occur in strict alignment with ethical and humanitarian principles of Do No Harm, humanity, and sensitivity to local customs and cultures. For *Toolkit* users collecting primary data through interviews or surveys, a referral protocol should be in place for mandatory reporting or other support in cases of certain violence, especially if speaking with children. These protocols are in addition to gaining informed consent (from adults) and assent (from children, along with their parents' or caregivers' consent). For guidance on ethical data collection and responding to reports of violence, see *Safe Schools Common Approach: Ethics and Child Safeguarding* from Save the Children and *WHO Ethical and Safety Recommendation for Researching, Documenting and Monitoring Sexual Violence in Emergencies* from the World Health Organization.

For more information on safety and security of monitors and informants, consult the *Field Manual on Monitoring and Reporting Mechanism (MRM) on Grave Violations against Children in situations of Armed Conflict* (pp 22-23).⁴ If informants or monitors face an unacceptable level of risk, or monitors cannot ensure data collection adheres to principles of Do No Harm or do less harm, then data collection may need to be postponed or suspended.

In countries with an established MRM, organizations that receive reports of attacks on education should refer information to relevant focal points for verification. In other circumstances, human rights organizations like Amnesty International or Human Rights Watch may also verify incidents according to their own protocols and standards. While verification is important for accountability, it may not be possible or necessary for every reported incident. This *Toolkit* is not meant as a guide for collecting court-admissible evidence, although it may contribute to broader accountability efforts.⁵

⁴ Published by the Office of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General on Children and Armed Conflict (OSRSG-CAAC), Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO), and the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) in 2014.

⁵ Accountability efforts are in line with the Safe Schools Declaration, which commits States to: "Investigate allegations of violations of applicable national and international law and, where appropriate, duly prosecute perpetrators." For more details about accountability for attacks on education, see: Zama Coursen-Neff, "Attacks on education: Monitoring and reporting for prevention, early warning, rapid response and accountability," and Bede Sheppard, "'Painful and inconvenient': Accountability for attacks on education," in *Protecting Education from Attack: A State-of-the-Art Review* (UNESCO: Paris, France: 2010), as well as *Protecting Education in Insecurity and Armed Conflict: An International Law Handbook*, 2nd edition (Education Above All Foundation and British Institute of International and Comparative Law, 2019).

Responding to reports of attacks on education or military use

When monitors collect information on attacks on education, they may encounter situations requiring interventions from protection specialists or other responders, in addition to education support. Informants may also recount violations or abuse that occurred separately from an attack but affected a child at school or a community member. In such instances, *Toolkit* users should follow organizational protocol and other established referral mechanisms to respond to reports when necessary and appropriate.

For instance:

- send a social worker or protection specialist to follow-up with survivors of sexual violence or child recruitment, or follow an organizational referral mechanism, if reports of such abuse are received;
- in cases of physical damage to educational facilities, alert the Education Cluster or similar mechanisms to needs for technical assistance or repairs; and
- support the safe reopening of schools or universities following attacks by sharing resources such as safety checklists with local community members and education personnel.

The mapping activity recommended in Step 1 will enhance *Toolkit* users' ability to rapidly identify organizations, protocol, and resources available in a country or region which can support a timely response.

Step 6. Analyzing data

The Indicators on Attacks on Education section of this *Toolkit* provides detailed information on analyzing each form of attack on education. The Indicators section is separated into eight domains, with 26 subdomains and 42 indicators. Each of the 42 indicators suggests calculations and possible disaggregation, as well as data sources if an organization is not planning to collect primary data.

Not every form of attack on education may occur in every country and context. For this reason, GCPEA suggests that organizations select a range of relevant indicators from the following framework to collect data on and calculate.

Although analyses should be context-specific, the Standard Indicators may be worth prioritizing. The number of reported incidents of each type of attack is often the most pressing piece of information and these indicators are foundational for subsequent calculations. The Supplemental Indicators, such as the number of students and education personnel injured or killed in attacks on schools or during military use, are relevant and may reach significant sums in many contexts. Where useful and practical, these indicators should also be collected. Finally, the Advanced Indicators, for instance proportion of schools damaged or days of schooling missed due to attacks, are valuable but often less pressing and may require additional data from an outside source. Based on local capacities and data availability, these latter indicators may be aspirational in many contexts.

Thus, when selecting indicators to integrate into monitoring and reporting, organizations should consider the main types of attacks that are occurring or likely to occur in the country. The suggested disaggregations for the indicator(s) should then be reflected in a data collection tool and data entry template, as mentioned in Step 3.

These indicators can also help education actors to identify, compile, and analyze data from other sources (e.g., government ministry, NGO, statistical repository) to generate a full description of attacks on education and their impact.

MEASURING INCIDENTS AND IMPACT:

This Toolkit provides guidance and tools for measuring attacks on education that correspond to a range of data collection methods and capabilities. Funding, staffing, and security access, along with the intended usage of data, may influence data collection methods and plans.

In many settings, GCPEA encourages data collection actors to collect as much detailed information as possible on individual incidents of attacks, as this type of data enables a more comprehensive range of analyses used to understand the scope and impacts of attacks. In cases where data is used for accountability purposes, fine-grained details, including the date and time, perpetrator(s), and potential violations of human rights or international law, are essential for later legal analysis and verification.

However, there are contexts where the collection of incident-level data, whether in real-time or after an event happens, is not feasible. If a conflict has impacted a large number of schools in a short amount of time, and a significant level of damage or destruction has occurred, a needs assessment which compiles information on the number of schools damaged and the extent of damage may better suit the needs of humanitarian and education partners. This type of assessment may not record information on the perpetrator of an attack, or whether several schools were damaged in the same conflict event. However, information necessary to respond to the attack will be recorded.

Table 3
Indicators on Attacks on Education

Standard Indicators
Supplemental Indicators
Advanced Indicators

Domain	Subdomain	Indicator
1 Attacks on schools	1.1 Incidents of attacks on schools	1.1.1 Number of reported attacks on schools
		1.1.2 Proportion of schools reportedly attacked
	1.2 Damage and destruction	1.2.1 Proportion of schools reported as damaged or destroyed by attacks
	1.3 Casualties	1.3.1 Number of students and education personnel reported injured or killed in attacks on schools
	1.4 Impact on education	1.4.1 Number of school days reportedly missed due to attacks on schools
		1.4.2 Reported number of students or education personnel whose education or work was affected by attacks on schools

Standard Indicators
Supplemental Indicators
Advanced Indicators

Domain	Subdomain	Indicator
2 Attacks on students, teachers, and other education personnel	2.1 Incidents	2.1.1 Number of reported attacks on students, teachers, and other education personnel 2.1.2 Reported number of incidents of excessive use of force at education-related protests
	2.2 Students or education personnel harmed	2.2.1 Number of students or education personnel reportedly injured, killed, or abducted in targeted violence 2.2.2 Number of students or education personnel reportedly injured or killed in incidents of repression
	2.3 Arrests and detentions	2.3.1 Number of students or education personnel reportedly arrested or detained
3 Military use of schools and universities	3.1 Incidents of military use	3.1.1 Number of reported incidents of military use of schools and universities
		3.1.2 Total number of days affected by military use
		3.1.3 Number of schools and universities reportedly used for military purposes
	3.2 Damage and destruction	3.2.1 Number of schools and universities reported as damaged or destroyed during military use
	3.3 Casualties	3.3.1 Number of students or education personnel reported injured or killed in military use
	3.4 Impact on education	3.4.1 Reported total number of days that schools or universities were closed due to military use 3.4.2 Number of students or education personnel whose education or work was reportedly affected by military use
3.5 Intersection with attacks on education	3.5.1 Number of reported incidents of child recruitment linked to military use 3.5.2 Number of reported incidents of sexual violence linked to military use 3.5.3 Proportion of educational institutions used for military purposes then targeted for attack	

Standard Indicators
Supplemental Indicators
Advanced Indicators

Domain	Subdomain	Indicator
4 Child recruitment at, or on the way to or from, school	4.1 Incidents	4.1.1 Binary assessment of the existence of child recruitment at, or on the way to or from, school
		4.1.2 Number of reported incidents of child recruitment at, or on the way to or from, school
	4.2 Children recruited	4.2.1 Number of children reportedly recruited at, or on the way to or from, school
5 Sexual violence at, or on the way to or from, school or university	5.1 Incidents	5.1.1 Binary assessment of the existence of sexual violence at, or on the way to or from, school or university
		5.1.2 Number of reported incidents of sexual violence at, or on the way to or from, school or university
	5.2 Students or education personnel harmed	5.2.1 Number of students or educators who reportedly experienced sexual violence at, or on the way to or from, school or university
6 Attacks on higher education institutions	6.1 Incidents of attacks on higher education institutions	6.1.1 Number of reported attacks on higher education institutions
		6.1.2 Proportion of higher education institutions reportedly attacked
	6.2 Damage and destruction	6.2.1 Proportion of higher education institutions reported as damaged or destroyed by attacks
	6.3 Casualties	6.3.1 Number of students and education personnel reported injured or killed in attacks on higher education institutions
	6.4 Impact on education	6.4.1 Number of days of learning reportedly missed due to attacks on higher education institutions
		6.4.2 Reported number of students or education personnel whose education or work was interrupted by attacks on higher education institutions

Standard Indicators

Supplemental Indicators

Advanced Indicators

Domain	Subdomain	Indicator
7 Attacks on higher education students, academics, and other personnel	7.1 Incidents	<p>7.1.1 Number of reported attacks on higher education students, academics, and other personnel</p> <p>7.1.2 Reported number of incidents of excessive use of force at education-related protests</p>
	7.2 Casualties	<p>7.2.1 Number of higher education students and personnel reportedly injured, killed, or abducted in attacks</p> <p>7.2.2 Number of higher education students and personnel reportedly injured or killed in incidents of repression</p>
	7.3 Arrests and detentions	<p>7.3.1 Number of higher education students and personnel reportedly arrested or detained</p>
8 Overall Attacks on Education	8.1 Incidents of attacks on education and military use	<p>8.1.1 Number of reported attacks on education and incidents of military use of educational institutions</p> <p>8.1.2 Number of reported attacks on education related to repression</p>
	8.2 Damage and destruction	<p>8.2.1 Proportion of educational institutions reported as damaged or destroyed by attacks and military use</p>
	8.3 Students and education personnel affected	<p>8.3.1 Number of students and education personnel killed, injured, abducted, arrested, or detained in attacks on education and military use</p> <p>8.3.2 Number of students and education personnel reportedly arrested or detained</p>

Step 7. Sharing reports of attacks on education

Once collected and securely stored, organizations should securely share data with local, national, and international stakeholders. The methods and frequency of reporting should align with the policy, accountability, and prevention and response needs of actors in the field. Organizations may choose to share raw data, incident accounts with journalists, or write-ups of attack trends.

A national government or international organization may publish data in an annual statistical yearbook, a humanitarian needs overview, or other planning and reporting documents. In some cases, monthly country situation reports, or weekly or bi-weekly regional dashboards include data on attacks on education. And in other cases, organizations publish needs assessments that include data on attacks on education.

These different types of reports can inform education sector planning and direct resources to repair schools or ensure that students and education personnel have adequate support to continue learning. For example, an understanding of the proportion of schools damaged and destroyed in a conflict would not only support educational planning but also advocacy efforts with governments, donors, and even perpetrators of attacks.

Organizations may also consider issuing press releases or speaking to journalists about emblematic or egregious incidents to encourage national and international coverage. This type of reporting can marshal international support and raise awareness about the topic.

Sharing reports safely and ethically includes carefully reviewing and editing drafts to ensure that no details are made public that could breach the dignity, confidentiality, safety, or security of an attack survivor, or affected education facility or community. For more details on relevant ethical considerations, refer to OCHA's guidance note on [Responsible Approaches to Data Sharing](#) and the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)'s [Ethical Reporting Guidelines](#), as well as [The Inter-Agency Minimum Standards for Gender-Based Violence in Emergencies Programming](#) and the [Media Guidelines for Reporting on Gender-Based Violence in Humanitarian Contexts](#) from the Global Protection Cluster Gender-Based Violence Area of Responsibility.

With appropriate protection and data security measures in place, organizations may also consider making entire datasets publicly available. This would allow organizations like GCPEA to access and analyze data, potentially in conjunction with other relevant education data, to more fully analyze the scope and impact of attacks on education and other relevant questions.

GCPEA publishes its data on the [OCHA Humanitarian Data Exchange](#), the [UNESCO Institute for Statistics](#) (Thematic Indicator 4.a.3) website, and the [Track Attacks on Education \(TRACE\) Data Portal](#).

Key Questions

- What types of attacks on education data are being published and where? Also, what other education or protection data is regularly published and where?
- How often are relevant data being published?
- If the MRM is in place, is the number of unverified reports also published?
- Do other UN agencies, such as a peacekeeping, release UN-verified data on a regular basis?
- Can data on attacks on education be reported regularly enough to support prevention and response?
- To what extent does data on attacks on education inform measures to prevent attacks on education?
- To what extent does data on attacks on education inform responses to attacks on education?
- Do donors have access to data on attacks on education?
- Would sharing disaggregated data support advocacy or response?
- What sensitivities around sharing data exist and what measures can mitigate these risks?
- Are there any data that could be shared publicly or with specific stakeholders?

CASE STUDY: USING DATA ON ATTACKS ON EDUCATION FOR TIMELY RESPONSE

The occupied Palestinian territories (oPt) Education Cluster uses data on attacks on education to respond to attacks on students, teachers, and education facilities when they occur. The oPt Education cluster has an online dashboard where attacks are reported in real-time. In addition, the Cluster conducts assessments as needed following conflict escalations.

After assessing the impacts of an attack on education, the Cluster determines whether and what type of response is required, and which Cluster partners are best placed to respond. The Cluster sends alerts to partners to respond to a range of attack impacts, including through: mental health and psychosocial support, recreational activities, Water Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) programs, cash transfers, emergency educational supplies, legal aid, advocacy for access to school, distribution of school furniture, repair or rehabilitation of schools, or catch-up classes or other remedial learning.

In the case of the conflict escalation in Gaza in May 2021, the Education Cluster deployed an Assessment Team to conduct a needs assessment and incident verification for schools run by the Palestinian Ministry of Education, while the UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East assessed its own schools, and Save the Children and the United Nations Development Programme assessed kindergartens and private schools. Following the assessments, Task Forces of oPt Education Cluster members were activated to support the response, based on organizations' geographic area of operation, resources, and programmatic expertise. The oPt Education Cluster's assessment revealed that around US\$3.55 million would be required to repair damaged schools.

The Education Cluster confirmed that the data supported Cluster partners to respond to the attacks on schools in Gaza. Based on the data, the Cluster developed Task Forces around areas of response such as catch-up classes and other summer activities, mental health and psychosocial support (MHPSS) services, and school repair and rehabilitation. The needs assessment spreadsheet also included a column for partners to track their response. For example, 17 Cluster partners provided summer activities to around 190,000 school children in Gaza. By the end of 2021, Education Cluster partners had supported the full rehabilitation of 70 percent of the schools damaged, while the remaining 30 percent were undergoing repairs.

Adapted from GCPEA's case study "[Measuring the impact of attacks on education in Palestine.](#)"

Using attacks on education data to mitigate risk and measure prevention and response efficacy

As governments and organizations increasingly act to protect education, in line with commitments in the Safe Schools Declaration, there is increasing interest in measuring the efficacy of interventions to mitigate, prevent, and respond to attacks. Although evaluating the efficacy of such interventions is beyond the scope of the *Toolkit*, indicators taken from these pages might be usefully combined with indicators from another project to carry out such evaluations. Several examples might serve to illustrate this point.

In terms of *mitigating* the effects of attacks on education, indicators from the *Toolkit* could be used to assess trends in attack type which could inform strategies to mitigate those attacks. For instance, calculations from the *Toolkit* might reveal that shelling of schools is growing in prevalence in a given region. This information suggests that strategies such as reinforcing windows or building bomb shelters would best protect students, educators, and facilities.

Indicators from the *Toolkit* can also be adapted to calculate the proportion of at-risk schools with mitigation strategies and whether those strategies are helping reduce harm and damage. In more detail, the calculation used to determine the proportion of schools attacked in a region (Indicator 1.1.2) could easily be adapted to estimate the proportion of schools with mitigation strategies in an at-risk region. Then, to help establish the efficacy of such measures, the *Toolkit's* existing indicators (1.2.1 and 1.3.1) could be used to compare the number of attacks that produce damage or harm to the number of attacks that do not.

The *Toolkit* might also be used to assess the efficacy of measures to **prevent** attacks on education. For instance, a project might be developed to prevent targeted attacks on teachers, academics, and other education personnel, in a given region; prevention measures might include relocating the educators, providing them protection, or negotiating with a non-state armed group issuing threats. Despite the many confounding factors, indicators from the *Toolkit* (2.1.1 and 2.2.1) could be adapted to track attacks against educators with and without prevention measures, which could be compared with other efficacy measures from the project.

In terms of **response**, indicators from the *Toolkit* could be used, for example, to calculate the number of schools damaged by attacks in a given region over a given time period (Indicator 1.2.1). With this data, the ministry of education or international and civil society organizations could then determine the amount of funding needed to repair schools and, once funds are raised, report the number of schools repaired. The numbers could be compared to determine whether all attacked schools were rehabilitated or whether some were left because they were beyond repair or because of gaps in funding, for instance. The above example of the oPt Education Cluster's work, in which 70 percent of damaged schools were repaired by the end of 2021, illustrates this point.

The *Toolkit* may support governments in their efforts to report on progress in implementing the Safe Schools Declaration. GCPEA has already explored possible connections between endorsement of the Safe Schools Declaration and reductions in military use of schools and universities (Indicator 3.1.1). A [Global Coalition factsheet](#) found that the overall reported incidents of military use declined by more than half between 2015 and 2020 in the 13 countries that endorsed the Declaration in 2015 and 2016 and experienced at least one incident of military use. The number of incidents declined from at least 180 as reported by UN, NGO, and media sources in 2015, to some 70 in 2020. Governments, or other organizations tracking implementation of the Safe Schools Declaration or Security Council Resolution 2601 may use similar approaches.



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This *Toolkit* was authored by Amy Kapit, Jerome Marston, and Marika Tsolakis, with contributions from Christine Choi and Felicity Pearce. The Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack (GCPEA) is grateful for guidance provided by the Expert Reference Group.

GCPEA is a coalition of organizations that includes: Amnesty International, Education Above All Foundation, the Institute of International Education (IIE), Human Rights Watch, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), Plan International, Save the Children, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), and the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF).

The *Toolkit* is independent of the individual member organizations of the Steering Committee of GCPEA and does not necessarily reflect the views of the Steering Committee member organizations.

Support for the *Toolkit* has been provided by Education Above All Foundation, Education Cannot Wait (ECW), UNESCO, UNICEF, the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and an anonymous donor.

January 2023

Toolkit for Collecting and Analyzing Data on Attacks on Education

Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack

Secretariat

350 5th Avenue, 34th Floor, New York, New York 10118-3299

Phone: 1.212.377.9446 · Email: GCPEA@protectingeducation.org

www.protectingeducation.org