

**Understanding and Using the
Minimum Standards for Education in Emergencies,
Chronic Crises and Early Reconstruction**

**26-28 September, 2005
Peshawar, Pakistan**

**29 September – 1 October 2005
Islamabad, Pakistan**

Combined Workshop Report

Submitted 18 October 2005
By Lynne Bethke, InterWorks
Eli Rognerud, IIEP

Table of Contents

I.	Background	3
	<i>Introduction and purpose.....</i>	<i>3</i>
	<i>Workshop facilitation, resource people and observers.....</i>	<i>3</i>
	<i>Participants.....</i>	<i>3</i>
	<i>Venues.....</i>	<i>4</i>
	<i>Overall workshop evaluations.....</i>	<i>5</i>
II.	Session descriptions and recommendations.....	6
	<i>Day 1.....</i>	<i>6</i>
	<i>Day 2.....</i>	<i>9</i>
	<i>Day 3.....</i>	<i>10</i>
	Annex 1: Agendas.....	14
	Annex 2: Participant lists.....	16
	Annex 3: Summary of participants' written evaluation comments.....	18

I. Background

Introduction and purpose

The INEE course, “Understanding and Using the Minimum Standards for Education in Emergencies, Chronic Crises and Early Reconstruction” was piloted tested for the first time at the two three-day workshops held in Peshawar and Islamabad, Pakistan from 26 September – 1 October 2005. Because the workshop in Islamabad was held Thursday-Saturday, the standard agenda for the course was modified slightly, by omitting the session on disaster preparedness, to allow for the Friday afternoon prayer break. The agendas for the two workshops are attached as Annex 1.

The overall objectives of the MSEE course are for participants to:

- Be familiar with the MSEE – the process and product
- Have an awareness of all the standards
- Understand that the standards are interdependent and mutually reinforcing
- Have an in-depth knowledge of the particular standards and indicators that are most relevant to their current work and/or that are most relevant to a particular emergency ‘phase’ (i.e. emergency, chronic crisis, early reconstruction)
- Be able to apply the MSEE to their work
- Commit to the use of the MSEE
- Advocate for the implementation of the MSEE

Workshop facilitation, resource people and observers

The facilitators for the workshops were Lynne Bethke of InterWorks and Eli Rognerud of UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP). In keeping with the recommendations made by Pamela Baxter and Lynne Bethke with regard to the initial roll-out of the training materials, Ms. Rognerud predominantly played a support role in the first workshop in Peshawar in order to familiarize herself with the training materials and the process. She then facilitated several of the sessions at the second workshop in Islamabad.

Participants

There were between 23 and 27 participants in attendance at the workshop in Peshawar (13 women). Two participants attended from the Pakistani government/Education Cell, and four from other Pakistani government institutions and universities. The remaining were representatives of NGOs and UN organizations operating in the area. Most of the participants in the Peshawar workshop were working to support education for the Afghan refugees. Accordingly, the contents of the course were particularly relevant for this group. While most of the participants were able to stay for the entire course, a few commented that the scheduling of the course was difficult as they did not have a lot of notice and because the time period before Ramadan was especially busy. Still, most stayed for the entire course or missed just one or two sessions.

The course in Islamabad was attended by 16-18 participants (only three of whom were women). It was somewhat difficult to hold the workshop from Thursday – Saturday as it impinged on people’s weekends, but most of the participants stayed and attended the entire course. One dropped out completely after the first day for work-related reasons, another became seriously ill after the first day and was hospitalized and another missed Friday but returned on Saturday. In the Islamabad workshop, only six or seven of the participants were actually involved in education programmes for Afghan refugees. Five others worked for humanitarian NGOs but not in education-related programming and the remainder worked in the education sector in Pakistan, either for the Ministry or for local NGOs. These latter two groups did not have experience related to education in emergencies, although the awareness raising objective of the workshop was certainly achieved by their participation.

Still, it seems that some of these people did not find the workshop to be especially relevant to their current work. Therefore, either additional follow-up work should occur with them to discuss how they might be involved in the future with the education of the Afghan refugees or perhaps to discuss in more detail how the MSEE are relevant to their work. (Note: because of the time for Friday prayers we omitted the disaster preparedness session from this workshop; this session might have been more relevant for these national actors.)

While the exercises and activities in the course can be conducted with a smaller group, the workshop in Islamabad may have benefited from the participation of more participants – anywhere from 20-25. In addition, since much of the workshop is designed around participants sharing their experiences and discussing the use of the MSEE, the workshop definitely benefits from the participation of those with relevant experience. Both the number and composition of participants in future workshops should be carefully considered so as to obtain maximum impact from the trainings.

During the interviews conducted by Pamela Baxter and Lynne Bethke before developing the MSEE training materials, one of the interviewees who was evaluating the ARC (Action for the Rights of the Child) training noted that there has historically been a (strong) inverse correlation between the level of power and authority of those being trained and those who are in a position to make programmatic decisions. This may have been true for some of the participants in the Islamabad workshop and is something that future workshop organizers should be aware of and try to avoid.

The participant lists for both workshops are included in Annex 2.

Venues

The workshop in Peshawar was held at the Royal Continental Guest House. There was some confusion regarding the workshop venue as there is also a Continental Guest House in Peshawar and most of the workshop participants went to that guest house on Monday morning. This resulted in about a 30-minute delay in the starting time of the workshop.

One participant commented that the workshop venue was difficult to reach as it was far from the main highway or main streets. The room was a good size though it was rather dark and the data projector did not project very well. In addition, the lunch room did not have tables so participants had to eat with their plates on their laps. These factors may have contributed to the lower score for the venue.

In Islamabad, the workshop was held at the Holiday Inn. The room was large enough and well lit, though fairly cold.

Overall workshop evaluations

Judging from the evaluations, participants were largely pleased with the workshop and what they learned. A summary of the evaluation scores is included below and participants' comments are included in Annex 3.

Participants rated the course according to the following categories where 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, 4 = strongly agree and 5 = excellent.

	Average score	
	<i>Peshawar</i>	<i>Islamabad</i>
The workshop achieved the aims and objectives	4.4	3.7
The content of the workshop is relevant to my work	4.1	3.6
What I have learned will impact on the way I work.	4.0	3.9
The content of the workshop was well-balanced.	4.4	3.8
The methodology used in the workshop helped me to understand how the MSEE can be applied.	4.4	4.2
The quality of the learning materials and aids was useful.	4.3	4.5
The facilitation and presentation during the workshop was open and helped me to learn.	4.6	4.2
The venue and accommodation were appropriate	3.6	4.1

II. Session descriptions and recommendations

Day 1

Session 1: Introduction to the Minimum Standards

This session starts by introducing participants to both the Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE) and the development process of the Minimum Standards. Then, participants are introduced to the concept of standards, indicators and guidance notes and informed why this terminology was adopted (that is, to be consistent with the Sphere Project). Finally, participants are introduced to the four Minimum Standards categories and to the standards that are “common to all categories” – community participation and analysis. Following this brief introduction, participants are asked to reflect, in small groups, on “where they are now” in terms of implementing and/or achieving the MSEE.

After the small group discussions and a plenary feedback session related to whether participants thought they were meeting the MSEE and obstacles to achieving them, participants were asked to suggest various legal instruments and/or international agreements that they thought supported the concept of the minimum standards for education in emergencies. Participants were generally familiar with the Convention on the Rights of the Child, the Millennium Development Goals and Education for All goals.

This session worked well in both the Peshawar and Islamabad workshops but participants seemed to consistently misinterpret the first question, “Which of the standards is your organisation currently meeting?” Surprisingly, many participants felt that their organisations were “meeting” a number (if not all) of the standards. As a result of the plenary discussion, however, it appeared that what they might have meant was that they were *addressing* certain standards rather than fully achieving them. (At the end of the workshop in Peshawar a couple participants noted that their organisations were not “meeting” all of the standards, as they had previously thought on the first day of the workshop.)

Recommendation: Change the wording of the first question in Exercise 1.1 to “Which of the standards has your organisation (or programme) fully achieved?” This change has been included in the latest draft of the Workbook.

Session 2: Foundations of the MSEE: Rights-based Education

This session follows on to the discussion of a rights-based approach and stresses that the MSEE reinforce this concept. The legal instruments discussed in Session 1 reflect formalized rights, which can often seem abstract. In this session, we attempt to link legal rights to the concrete values that underpin them, and to show how implementing the MSEE reflects a rights-based approach. For example, people have a right to be treated with dignity and respect. The MSEE reflect this right through the standards of community participation which require us to work with communities in *respectful* ways. This session looks at the ways in which education reflects, endorses and develops rights.

It is also an important foundation for the remainder of the course. As participants proceed with the other sessions, it is often useful to refer back to the values and/or rights that were discussed in this session. At the start of the session, participants were asked to brainstorm, at their tables, on constructive values that are particularly important in their society (or the society in which they work). Following the small group brainstorm activity, the values were shared with the plenary and each suggestion was critiqued to make sure that it actually represented a value and that others in the room agreed that it was a constructive value.

The cube game followed this discussion and was a fun way to help participants concretely make the link between how values and underlying rights can be specifically applied within each of the MSEE categories. Following the cube game, participants worked in four small groups to analyze the case studies found in their workbooks. This exercise again reinforced the concept of using the standards and indicators to help resolve educational problems/issues that arise in emergencies and early reconstruction situations.

Recommendation: The session works well as is. No major change is required but additional materials regarding a rights-based approach have been forwarded by Ellen Van Kalmthout and will be reviewed for possible inclusion in the workbook as a background reading.

Session 3: In-depth Review of Standards and Indicators

During the review of the MSEE training materials by the Working Group and Training Group members, several people commented that this session needed more time, especially if participants were really to have enough time to conduct an “in-depth” review of the MSEE. These comments were very useful and were taken into account in both of the workshops in Pakistan.

While it is true that participants do not have enough time to completely review each of the standards and indicators in the MSEE handbook, this session is quite successful at getting participants to start reading through the MSEE handbook and exploring one category in more depth. This session is also a good way to immerse participants in the standards and indicators. It is a useful way to prepare them for the rest of the workshop since the process of absorbing the standards and indicators happens gradually over the three days as participants are asked repeatedly to suggest which standards and indicators are important for specific situations.

In addition to conducting this session at the two workshops in Pakistan, it was also pilot tested in Nepal. The original exercise consisted of three parts: 1) a review of the indicators for one category where participants suggested strategies/activities for achieving the indicators; 2) consideration of how the standards common to all categories (community participation and analysis) affected the suggested strategies/activities; and 3) consideration of how strategies/activities suggested for one category impacted on (or were impacted by) other categories. In Nepal, it became clear that there was not enough time to complete all three of these activities. Therefore, the second activity (how people

might change their suggestions based on the standards common to all categories) was dropped from this session in the two workshops in Pakistan (and in the subsequent revision of the INEE training materials). This change was made because Session 4 focuses on community participation and all of the analysis standards are taken up in separate sessions.

In addition, because each category consists of multiple indicators (up to 22 in Access and Learning Environment, and Teaching and Learning), there is not enough time for participants to develop one strategy/activity for each MSEE indicator. Therefore, the instructions for the exercise were revised so that participants are asked to develop two-three strategies/ activities for each standard in their assigned category. This worked well.

The last part of the session was revised slightly after the Peshawar workshop to have participants focus on three specific questions designed at illustrating the interdependence of the categories and how strategies/activities developed for one category may link to or have an impact on strategies/activities developed for other categories. These questions were:

1. What links do you see among the suggested strategies/activities? How do they impact on each other?
2. Does any strategy/activity developed for one category contradict a strategy/activity from another category?
3. Which strategies/activities require support from other non-education sectors?

After participants worked on these questions in their groups, each group shared one example of how a strategy or activity suggested for one category had an impact on one or more of the other categories.

Recommendation: Revise the matrix in the Workbook for Session 3 to include a column where participants can write notes on how various strategies/activities suggested for one category have an impact on or impact on other categories. (Note: this change was included in the latest version of the training materials.)

Recommendation: Suggest in the Training Guide that both trainers and participants refer back to this matrix for a summary of standards and indicators when doing the subsequent exercises. While it is essential to get participants to actually familiarize themselves with the handbook, this matrix is a good starting point when participants are asked, for example, to list all relevant standards in response to a scenario. An amended form of this matrix and/or the 1-pager from session 1 could also be separately reproduced and given to participants.

Session 4: Working with Communities and Education Authorities

In this session, participants take part in either a community meeting or a meeting with education authorities. When they are not taking part in a meeting, they are observing the other meeting to see how issues are dealt with and whether discussions reflect meaningful participation. In both of the Pakistan workshops, the two meetings were conducted one after the other and followed by a plenary discussion related to how these types of

meetings can be more effective and meet the standards of community participation and education policy and coordination more effectively.

No changes are recommended for this session.

Day 2

Session 5: Implementing and Monitoring Education Programmes in Emergencies and Chronic Crises

This session uses case studies to highlight the importance of the MSEE in both the implementation and monitoring phases of the project cycle. In the first part of the session, participants are asked to read a case study and then decide which standards should be prioritized during the next six months; which indicators, if any, do not apply; and whether there are indicators from other (non-priority) standards that should also be kept in mind or applied. Following this small group activity, participants are asked to consider how they would monitor the standards and indicators which they have prioritized.

Most participants indicated that they were familiar with the meaning of monitoring, and that they do this as part of their programming. Distinction was made between monitoring (observing whether we meet our objectives), and impact assessment, which is closer to evaluation.

In both of the workshops, it was necessary to focus the groups' discussions during the monitoring part of the session on just one or two examples of how they would monitor specific indicators to determine whether they have been achieved. This change has been reflected in the Training Guide.

Sessions 6 & 7: Simulation: Emergency in Zamborra

During these two sessions, participants are given roles in order to conduct an initial education assessment related to a refugee influx into a fictional country. The assessment exercise works well but was designed with 18 different roles (some of which represent agencies and donors, and others which represent various community roles) and works best when some roles are played by multiple people. Therefore, in Islamabad, where there were only 15 people present at the time of the role play, the exercise was not quite as "exciting."

In both workshops, there were only a few people who had ever conducted an assessment. Therefore, it was necessary to spend time at the beginning of the session discussing assessment basics and highlighting some of the important assessment principles from the Guidance Notes such as bias, participation and triangulation. These changes have been incorporated into the training materials.

In both workshops, the participants that represented 'agencies' carrying out the assessment initially remained in their own room discussing assessment strategies. Only

after hints from the trainers did they actually leave the room to go and talk to the participants in the community group located in another room.

These sessions were designed so that the assessment and analysis “phases” would take place before lunch and then participants would work on developing their plans after lunch. In both workshops, there was not enough time for participants to fully complete the separate exercise (6.2) on analyzing their assessment findings. The workshop in Islamabad was further complicated by the long Friday afternoon prayer break. Participants did return and develop their education plans in the afternoon, but the long break diminished their enthusiasm a bit.

Recommendation: Whenever possible, schedule future course offerings so that participants are able to attend for the full three days and preferably not over the weekend.

Recommendation: Omit the separate exercise “Analysis of assessment findings” and incorporate the question “What other information do you need in order to design your education programme or plan your response strategies?” into the exercise “Planning/designing the education programme in Zamborra.”

Session 8: Evaluating education programmes

This session builds on the case introduced in sessions 6 and 7. Participants are told that the refugees have now been in Zamborra for three years and are given additional information related to the educational situation for refugees. Each of the three case studies focuses on a separate issue: gender, youth and teachers. Because of this, the case studies highlight specific educational or cross-cutting issues as well as stressing the importance of evaluation and looking for unintended consequences of programs.

While there is not enough time to fully address the gender and youth issues that are raised in these case studies, the debriefings did highlight the key points and resulted in interesting discussions of some of the issues.

Note: Because of the Friday afternoon prayer break in Islamabad, this session was conducted on Saturday morning.

Recommendation: Include a brief write-up of the OECD DAC evaluation criteria in the participant Workbook, as suggested by Hassan.

Day 3

Session 9: Disaster Preparedness

This session begins with an overview/introduction of key disaster management topics including definitions of hazards, disasters, risk, vulnerability and capacity. These topics were introduced via a facilitated plenary discussion. Then, participants worked in one of three groups (conflict, drought, flood) to discuss the typical effects of their assigned

hazard on the education system, possible disaster preparedness activities related to education and relevant standards and indicators to be used in the preparedness activities.

The groups were instructed that their feedback was to be something creative – a skit, a song, something other than reading from a flipchart. While the groups did not have quite enough time to fully develop their creative presentations, we had a rough draft of a poem in Pashtu related to the effects of floods, a short skit on drought, and an orchestrated presentation of various anti-war slogans from the conflict group.

Note: This session was only conducted in Peshawar because there was not enough time in Islamabad due to the schedule change on Friday afternoon.

Recommendation: Stress in the Training Guide that the groups should decide on three hazards that are most relevant to their situation and possibly add a few other hazard types (or at least earthquake) to the list.

Session 10: Education Policy and Coordination in Situations of Early Reconstruction

This session introduces a new case study (the country of Islandia) which is emerging from conflict. The purpose of this session is to focus participants on the early reconstruction stage and to highlight key education policy issues that (generally) should have been thought about much earlier in the response. In Peshawar, the session went exactly as planned and we were able to complete both the small group activity and the debates. In Islamabad, however, the group became so involved in the process of walking through and discussing the answers to the case study questions that there was not enough time to finish with the debates. In general, however, I recommend following the existing plan as the debates are an interesting exercise for participants and are one additional method for reinforcing the concept that the Minimum Standards are appropriate for all stages of an emergency.

Recommendation: As suggested during the first review round, the case study has been changed to the situation in Arcazia and Zamborra in order to avoid introducing another case at this point. In addition, rather than just focusing on certification and repatriation issues, the revised case study also includes more details related to the reconstruction of the Arcazian education system. This revised case study will have to be tested and evaluated at the next pilot workshop.

Session 11: Application and Synthesis

This session was great! Participants thoroughly enjoyed the MSEE Quiz and it was useful for them to work on their Executive Briefings. In both workshops, I ran the session slightly differently than what was suggested in the Training Guide, partially because people had a slight tendency to drift back from lunch. Before the Quiz, I asked people to find two (or three) partners and work on their Executive Briefings. When there were multiple attendees from one organization, they found it useful to work together on this

exercise. The participants were given roughly 20-25 minutes to work on their briefings. They were then asked to stop working so the group could do the quiz.

In Peshawar we had a nice grassy (but not too shady) area outside of the workshop room and one of the participants brought a basketball for use in the quiz. In Islamabad, there was no grassy area anywhere near the hotel, but we found a wonderful (but hot) open area on the roof! For the quiz in Islamabad, one of the participants brought a beach ball, which added an interesting new dimension since it didn't seem to want to stay in one place while I read the questions. Both of the quizzes were run as team competitions but the winning teams were strongly encouraged to share their "prize" (toffees in Peshawar and a giant chocolate cake in Islamabad) with everyone. Everyone enjoyed the quiz and several people commented that it was a useful way to review the MSEE and a good way to do an end of course review. One participant commented that he was going to do this in his future trainings.

Following the quiz/energizer, the group returned to the plenary room for the Executive Briefings. In both workshops, the groups opted to have every team present since there were roughly only five or six presentations in each workshop. For me, the highlight of the Executive Briefings was when a Sphere trainer (whose group all worked for NGOs but in non-education capacities) observed that he/they were going back to their offices and tell people that education should be part of their emergency programs.

Recommendation: Change the Training Guide to reflect the order of activities as they were conducted in the Pakistan workshops. This makes sense as participants have a chance to come back and re-group after lunch, move to the game (before the after-lunch effect kicks in) and then return for the Executive Briefings.

Session 12: Conclusion and Evaluations

Due to demands to end both workshops early (in Peshawar because the trainers had to catch a plane and in Islamabad because it was Saturday), the final session consisted only of the review of INEE and other resources related to education in emergencies and the written evaluations. In addition, participants in Islamabad were also asked what additional follow-up they would like as a result of the workshop. The two points raised by the group were:

1. Translate the MSEE into Pashto, Dari and Urdu.

After the workshop, we met with UNICEF representatives in Islamabad who informed us that they had already begun an Urdu translation of the MSEE. Eli Rognerud is following up with UNICEF on that translation. In addition, Eli had discussions with UNESCO-Islamabad about the possibility of completing a Pashto translation and is also following up on this.

2. Make lessons learned regarding the use of the MSEE widely available and possibly develop a cadre of people to serve as resources/experts to advise others

who are trying to use the standards in their programs. (Apparently Sphere has a similar process.)

The group was informed that initially the best way of accomplishing this is through the INEE listserv and website but that the request would also be passed to the Working Group for consideration.

The groups then completed their written evaluations before the conclusion of the workshop. In general, participants were satisfied with the workshop as reflected in the section above, "Overall Workshop Ratings." Participants' detailed comments are included in Annex 3.

Recommendation: Include in the Training Guide and possibly in the programme, provisions for a plenary discussion on what the participants suggest should be specific follow-ups to the course.

Annex 1: Agendas

Peshawar Agenda

Day 1 – Monday 26 September	
Time	Sessions
9:00	Welcome and introductions
9:30	1: Introduction to the Minimum Standards
11:00	Coffee/tea break
11:30	2: Foundations of the MSEE: Rights-based Education
13:00	Lunch
14:00	3: In-depth Review of Standards and Indicators
15:30	Coffee/tea break
16:00	4: Working with Communities and Education Authorities
17:30	End of Day 1
Day 2 – Tuesday 27 September	
9:00	5: Implementing and Monitoring Education Programmes in Emergencies and Chronic Crises
10:30	Coffee/tea break
11:00	6 & 7: Simulation: Emergency in Zamborra
12:30	Lunch
13:30	6 & 7: Simulation: Emergency in Zamborra, continued
15:00	Coffee/tea break
15:30	8: Evaluating Education Programmes
17:00	End of Day 2
Day 3 – Wednesday 28 September	
9:00	9: Disaster Preparedness
10:30	Coffee/tea break
11:00	10: Education Policy and Coordination in Situations of Early Reconstruction
12:30	Lunch
13:30	11: Application and Synthesis of the Minimum Standards
15:00	Coffee/tea break
15:30	12: Conclusions and Evaluations
17:00	End of Day 3

Islamabad Agenda

Day 1 – Thursday 29 September	
Time	Sessions
9:00	Welcome and introductions
9:30	1: Introduction to the Minimum Standards
11:00	Coffee/tea break
11:30	2: Foundations of the MSEE: Rights-based Education
13:00	Lunch
14:00	3: In-depth Review of Standards and Indicators
15:30	Coffee/tea break
16:00	4: Working with Communities and Education Authorities
17:30	End of Day 1
Day 2 – Friday 30 September	
9:00	5: Implementing and Monitoring Education Programmes in Emergencies and Chronic Crises
10:30	Coffee/tea break
11:00	6 & 7: Simulation: Emergency in Zamborra
13:00	Lunch / prayer break
15:00	6 & 7: Simulation: Emergency in Zamborra, continued
16:30	End of Day 2
Day 3 – Saturday 1 October	
9:00	8: Evaluating Education Programmes
10:30	Coffee/tea break
11:00	10: Education Policy and Coordination in Situations of Early Reconstruction
12:30	Lunch
13:30	11: Application and Synthesis of the Minimum Standards
15:00	Coffee/tea break
15:30	12: Conclusions and Evaluations
17:00	End of Day 3

Annex 2: Participant lists

Peshawar Participant List

Name	Organisation	Tel/email
1. Fazal Ghani Kakar	NRC	EDU.pk@nrcafpk.org
2. Shagufta Naz	CIDA AREP	shagufta@irc-pk.org
3. Mohammad Israr Khan	BEFARe	israr@befare.org
4. Sayyed Jonaid Shah NO	BEFARe	jonaid@befare.org
5. Roza Gul	Ockenden International	roza_gul@yahoo.org
6. Batin Shah Safi NO	Swiss Aid for Afghans	
7. Azad Khan Khattak	BEFARe	azad@befare.org
8. Shukria Yasini	AWN	shukria_yasini@hotmail.com
9. Hamish Khan	Basic Education and Employable Skills Training) BEST	bestpak@brain.net
10. Yousaf Ali Khan	Education cell (CAR)	yousaffeo=72@yahoo.com
11. Sami Ullah Khan NO	Education cell (CAR)	
12. Ashraf Ali	Provincial Institute for Teacher Education (PITE) NWF Peshawar	ashraf_ali06@yahoo.com ashrafali781@hotmail.com
13. Mehmuda Rehman	BEFARe	mehmooda@befare.org
14. Waheeda Farouk Adam	BEFARe	waheeda@befare.org
15. Magriet Veenma	UNHCR	veenma@unhcr.ch
16. Pilar Robledo	IRC	pilar@fep.irc-pk.org
17. Ghulam Dastger Khwareen	UNESCO	khawrin@yahoo.org
18. Noorzia Salehi	IRC/FEP	noorzia_salehi@yahoo.com
19. Hawa Khanan Khel Ahmadzai	Ockenden International	oikohat@brain.net.pk hawakhanzad@hotmail.com
20. Javed Shaukat	CIDA AREP	shaukat@irc-pk.org
21. Hilde Lemey	RET	lemey@r-e-t.com
22. Tahmina Qahir	Sanayee Development Foundation (SDF)	Tahmina_Qahir@hotmail.com
23. Nazneen Shah	Institute of Education and Research, University of Peshawar	nazneen60@yahoo.com
24. Wazheem Khan	Institute of Education and Research, University of Peshawar	wazimnj@yahoo.com
25. Khadija Aziz	Institute of Education and Research, University of Peshawar	KA@yahoo.com
26. Fatima Wardark	IRC	fatima@fep.irc-pk.prg
27. Fahima Rahimpur	IRC	fahima@fep.irc-pk.org

Islamabad Participant List

Name	Organisation	Tel/email
1. Mohammed Shahbaz Ullah	NFBE Project, Projects wing, Ministry of Education	
2. M. Anwaar Hussain	Curriculum Wing, MOE	9258950 (office)
3. Saeed A. Choudhary	Pakistan Education Foundation	
4. Umair Hasan	Save the Children UK	uhasan@scfuk-pak.org.pk
5. Javed Khan Tanoli	ISRA International	2279091 isra@comsats.net.pk
6. Al Malik Khoja	FOCUS Pakistan	almalik.khoja@focushumanitarianpk.org
7. Minerva John	World Vision International	2651972 minerva_john@wvi.org
8. Maira Zahur	CWS- P/A	cwsisb@isb.comsats.net.pk
9. Fakhar Zamam	BEFARe	fakhar@befare.org 091 5840631
10. Sagheer Ahmed	CIDA AREP	sagheerarep@yahoo.com
11. Najeeb Khan	SCUK	Was ill for days 2 and 3
12. Abdul Ghaffar	Save the Children USA	aghaffar@qta.savechildren.org.pk ghaffarjan_2005@yahoo.com 2831035/03337803189
13. Abdul Bari	Save the Children USA	abari@qta.savechildren.org.pk
14. Noorul Haq	PITE (Provincial Institute for Teacher Education) Quetta	
15. Muhammad Siddiq	Ockenden International	siddiq@ockenden.com.pk
16. Sohail Mahboob	Ockenden International	pakockenden@comsats.net.pk
17. Asma Anjum	National Education Foundation	staff@nef.org.pk

Annex 3: Summary of participants' written evaluation comments

Peshawar

What parts of the workshop were most useful for you?

- Training, teaching, curricula, community participation, instruction
- All parts
- Discussions of the workshop were most useful for us
- Training, teaching, curricula, instruction, community participation
- The trainers were amazing, well informed and used participatory methods. The activities all drew the participants' attention to the standards and key indicators. The training pace was accurate and material appropriately built on previous days. The participants were diverse and represented a broad range of government/UN/NGOs.
- All part of workshop was useful and interesting for me but among the all part I learned more in/by group work.
- All parts are very useful for me
- All parts were useful and important. We know more about the INEE.
- All were useful
- All the sessions were highly effective and helpful for me, especially the group works and case studies.
- The scenarios/practical work
- Group work and presentation
- Almost all
- Group work
- Group work, role plays and simulations
- In-depth review of standards and indicators; group work
- All
- Throughout the workshop we learned how to use the handbook. The exercises were very practical and interesting and made me understand the content and use of the handbook. And the debriefings after every session made it very clear to me what to do with these standards and indicators.
- All parts of the workshop were useful. There was a link between the training material and the activities. The systematic approach helped to understand the INEE minimum standards.
- The workshop as a whole was highly useful to understand the minimum standards for education in emergency

What improvements/changes would you suggest for another workshop?

- Follow-up workshops are needed
- For better improvement of education in emergencies, MSEE is the best-designed
- Give the topics and material before the starting of the workshop
- Follow-up workshops are needed

- It is unnecessary to address a group of adults and to condescend to them about starting 20 minutes late but not apologizing for the mix up in the invitation. It is also unnecessary to walk around and remind people of the time when they are on break.
- Day one, session 2 needed more time
- Advance planning would have been helpful. It was difficult for many to take off 3 days and this caused some participants to be absent from some sessions which interrupted the flow.
- The fluent language of trainer was a little difficult to understand. I suggest to consider the problem of audience in language.
- All useful – no changes
- It was perfect but I would like to say that if we have the summary of each day it would be more effect and also if we have to evaluation of each day, that will help us more to understand the concept effectively.
- If the workshops have some trip/practical exercises to national and international NGOs or communities.
- No comments yet
- No suggestion
- Initially the participants need to have detailed information/briefing on MSEE
- Individual work/home work to be added in
- Time insufficient
- Though the activities were open ended that encouraged critical thinking and reasoning on the part of trainees, yet I feel that the facilitator was expecting (sometimes) specified solutions to problems. It is suggested that participants must be given opportunity to express and forward their views and arguments, this will help to facilitate the thought process divergently.
- Some more group work and exercise to use standards and indicators should be put in.
- This is the best workshop that I have attended. Very interesting, not a moment did I feel bored. No suggestions.
- You know already but for the planning of work of participants, it would be useful to inform earlier. To makes sure everyone can participate fully. I found the content of the workshop very good especially the different exercises that kept the participants sharp and to the point.
- The training is complete and achieved its objectives. There is no room for improvement so far.
- There was nothing in particular in the context of methodology of the workshop to pinpoint; however the location that was chosen was quite far from the highway/main streets and if transportation system, possibly, was provided could solve this problem to level best. Or if the timing was decreased, instead the period of implementation was increased.

How will you use the Minimum Standards book in your work?

- I will use it – trainings, monitoring, assessment and evaluation
- We will use and follow
- This is very simple
- I will use it in trainings, monitoring, assessment and evaluation

- Immediately, especially with policy and coordination. Big steps are ahead of us as we prepare for the expiry of the Tripartite Agreement in December 2006 and the ways that programmes for the refugee-affected areas will emerge. Close coordination and other MSEEs are going to be critical to include at this juncture.
- I will use as I have learnt in the workshop.
- Very used the Minimum Standards book in my work
- It was not much related to our work but the whole it was good and we can use it in the near future.
- According to my responsibility in sectoral issues, I will use the minimum standards at my office.
- MSEE was translated to Dari and presented to rest of trainers to use them in programs daily activities and I will do monitoring of the activities
- In consultation, further extent of ability
- As we practiced during this workshop
- As much as possible
- Referring to it and be used frequently
- Minimum Standards book is helpful as it provides guidelines in all the aspects required for planning, management, implementing and assessment processes. It also strengthens the process of curriculum development, material development and teacher training.
- By daily at least daily look and read out standards briefly from the book.
- For me, this book is “going to be my ‘Bible’”
- I don’t know yet, sorry. But I will try to use these for the country operation plan and the planning for next year. Unfortunately, I am not responsible for education in this office, but for sure I will use it in my next assignment.
- The indicators and guidance notes will help to develop indicators and implementation plan for any other forthcoming projects. These standards will help to improve the existing planning, implementation and monitoring.
- The work our NGO is up to is already scheduled and is being implemented that means the book is not being utilized for our ongoing projects; however, if in emergency cases to districts of Afghanistan, a new educational program is designed, the MSEE standards and indicators would be best to be taken in view!

Please give any other comments/suggestions.

- It will be better to improve the training material based on g. (ground?) realities
- Time was short, not enough 3 days
- Everything is very good and I appreciate the honest working of the organized
- It will be better to contextualize the material and training
- Thank you to Lynne and Eli – who are excellent and have lots of background. We look forward to the materials on the website.
- In next workshop!
- If I have comments or suggestions, I will give you through email.
- This workshop was good and useful. I hope that the same workshop is provided for all the staff who are working in NGOs.
- Thank you for providing us this opportunity.

- I appreciate the efforts, way of communication and methodology adopted by the facilitator which very much understandable to all the participants throughout the workshop.
- The workshop was successful due to the reasons.
 - It encouraged the participants to be involved fully
 - It helped to comprehend the required concepts related to
 - Timings for various types of activities were utilized properly
 - It helped to conceptualize all the standards and indicators and interdependence among them
 - Developed skills to apply these standards in any type of emergency situations
- Thank you very much.
- Lynne you have done a good job. I can see how much effort you put in this Capacity Building workshop. Hope to see you again someday in another workshop. Take care. God bless you.
- Well done and thanks a lot.
- There must be a link between the trainers/organizers and the participants to get update on the future development in MSEE.
- Not any in particular! I personally appreciate the hard work and excellent presentation of the trainers with the program. Thank you!

Islamabad

- Each part was essential on its own and had an important contribution towards the entire concept. The entire strategy would need to be used holistically in order for the impact to be effective.
- Application of Minimum Standards; education as part of humanitarian response in emergencies
- Simulation, brainstorming, case studies
- Assignments, role play, discussions
- Presentation and exercises
- Monitoring and evaluation; community participation and its role; assessment of the program
- The assignments were especially useful to understand the use of the Handbook on Minimum Standards for Education in Emergencies.
- Community participation and evaluation was very useful for any project success. Especially the role play and presentations and involvement of all the participants in the workshop was excellent.
- Group discussion. Sharing information and also Q&A session with the course conductors.
- Group works on the different scenarios.
- To apply these standards and indicators during the work on my duty station and also in the future.
- All the sessions on categories, standards and indicators were most useful for me.
- Group work, presentations and through different other activities, I learn a lot about education policy and planning in emergency.

- Use of MSEE handbook frequently enabling me to link together different indicators; brainstorming approach helped me to refine my understanding on EE.
- Training methodology, i.e. working on workbook corresponding with MSEE book; our views and suggestions were respected; group work activities was excellent.
- Applying of education strategies particularly in crisis situation

What improvements/changes would you suggest for another workshop?

- None
- Longer workshop; more participants
- Real problems and real situation may be given more space
- The time was little short, so make it 5-day training
- A little more of elaboration regarding the standards and key indicators before simulation exercises would be more helpful.
- Three days are very short for such a workshop, so the time must [be] two weeks; number of resource persons; the overall education also be included in the program
- To have more understanding of the standards, duration of the workshop should be increased.
- Short of time, if possible for 5 days in the future
- Time and duration of workshop should be enhanced
- The INEE MSEE be translated into Pashto; greater representation of authorities and decision making bodies, i.e. government
- More time to have time for group work and more discussion.
- Duration of the workshop may be increased in order to understand the contents comprehensively.
- The workshop may produce much better results if participants could be provided learning material before joining the workshop.
- If participants are more relevant and directly attached to edu programs, the inputs are more relevant to enrich the discussions.
- It will also be better if the organization (INEE) come up with some notes or case studies that give information about the organizations who used MSEE and got some excellent results. The trainers should also share good practices.
- Period of workshop may be extended up to two weeks at least

How will you use the Minimum Standards book in your work?

- It will help in analysis and planning, not only in education-centered projects but it has a wide scope, encompassing other projects of uplift and betterment.
- Initial assessment checklist; as a mandate, education programmes would benefit from this guiding tool
- Develop minimum standards in general education
- Well it seem to be a good resource for any project proposal
- Now that there is an awareness, it will helpful to do that
- To assess the impact of our teachers; to assess the students achievements
- These standards will be particularly helpful in proposal writing as well as in monitoring and evaluating the ongoing programs of our organization.

- Will be able to give suggestions during program designing.
- Will try to implement the MSEE whenever needed in critical situations.
- Create awareness among the relevant department re: MSEE
- During the implementation of activities and also to face any kind of problem regarding education program.
- I will evaluate and compare all the categories with my work and apply the standards accordingly.
- Applying the different parameters of minimum standards for Education in Emergencies
- 1) Appraise current programs/projects against standards given in the book; 2) use for future prog/project development; 3) monitoring tool
- My organization is already using MSEE concepts and now I will personally give briefing about MSEE to other personnel in organization and especially the master trainers who are working with us. We will put MSEE awareness to our in- and pre-service teachers and will make them sensitive about MSEE.
- In the light of Guidance Notes given in a book

Please give any other comments/suggestions.

- It was a very educating experience and other workshops like this would be very welcome. The facilitators were quite knowledgeable and had a good grasp of their project and effectively delivered it further. They were also very helpful and cooperative.
- Translation [of handbook] in Urdu/Pashtu/Persian; establishment of an “Advisory Board” to guide us to actually implement the programmes [facilitator note: this was also raised in the final session in relation to the Advisory Board that Sphere has set up]
- Recommendations may be formulated and action plans be made in the end to tackle real issues
- MSEE is a useful tool. We hope that we have so much resource to use it well
- The program was productive and will benefit more and other participants. The number of participants in the future may be increased up to 40.
- For sharing of experiences, participants from the field can be included.
- Just excellent way of communication on part of facilitators.
- These kinds of workshops and trainings would be conducted frequently to improve the skills of implementers.
- It would be better to organize these types of workshops in areas where emergencies have occurred to ensure realistic and greater representation of the people involved. Also, please try to organize workshops on days other than the weekend.
- Translation of guidebook workbook in refugee languages (common languages) like in PAK for Afghan in Pashto and for Pakistani in Urdu.
- Facilitators were having good command on their topic that found way for smooth running of training and increased the interest of participants.
- The workshop has been completed with full cooperation of donors and experts.
Thanks.

- If this workshop could be formalized in a permanent contact group or cohort to remain in contact. A follow-up of this workshop is highly suggested.
- I am really appreciate the trainers, INEE org, UNESCO and CIDA-AREP who initiated the program here and will also do so inside Afghanistan and other affected areas. Our GREAT TRAINERS were very cooperative, punctual and having extensive knowledge about MSEE; we are feeling ourself well-equipped before we were.
- To establish overall standards of education strategies for poorly under developing economies on the basis of survey