



DESK REVIEW

NORWEGIAN REFUGEE COUNCIL EDUCATION RESPONSES IN URBAN SETTING

CASE STUDIES FROM COLOMBIA, IRAN, JORDAN AND LEBANON

NRC

NORWEGIAN
REFUGEE COUNCIL



Author: Kerstin Tebbe

Draft reviewed by Laura Phelps (NRC Urban Adviser), Emma Bonar (NRC Youth Specialist) and Andrea Naletto (NRC Education Adviser).

A particular thanks to the following NRC staff: Oscar Rodriguez and Anne-Laure Rambaud (NRC Colombia), Zahra Khedri, (NRC Iran), Abeer Ammouri and Petr Kostohryz (NRC Jordan), Marta Schena, (NRC Lebanon), Camilla Lodi (NRC Palestine), Abiti Gebretsadik, (NRC Somalia)

© Norwegian Refugee Council, September 2016

Cover photo: © NRC

Layout & design: BakOS DESIGN

CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION	4
2 OBJECTIVES OF THE DESK REVIEW	6
3 RESEARCH QUESTIONS	7
4 METHODOLOGY	8
5 OVERVIEW OF THE URBAN CONTEXTS OF NRC EDUCATION PROGRAMMING	9
6 CASES	12
6.1 Colombia	12
6.2 Iran	15
6.3 Jordan	18
6.4 Lebanon	21
7 KEY FINDINGS	23
7.1 Role of government	23
7.2 Targeting and identification of beneficiaries	25
7.3 Cross sector synergies	27
8 CONCLUSIONS	28
9 RECOMMENDATIONS	30
ANNEXES	31
Annex 1: Key materials	31
Annex 2: Interview Questions.....	32

1

INTRODUCTION

With global urbanisation, circumstances of forced displacement¹ have become increasingly urbanised. The global urban population is estimated to increase from 3.5 billion today to 6.2 billion by 2050, with a third living in informal settlements. This rapid urbanisation is being driven by a range of factors including economic migration from rural areas and displacement on account of conflict, political instability or disasters.

Over half of the world's refugees and internally displaced people (IDPs) live in urban areas². Challenges faced by the displaced in urban areas are different from those faced in camps or rural settings³. Forced displacement can result in landlessness, joblessness, homelessness, marginalization, food insecurity, loss of property, increased morbidity and loss of social capital. All of these can be exacerbated by political marginalization, leading to further loss of social cohesion with the host community. Impacts of forced displacement in urban areas are more complex and not homogeneous, with extremes in levels of poverty, access to basic services and employment, and social cohesion.

Urban programming must respond to distinctive features related to scale, density of population and complexity of the environment. Economic systems, livelihood options, resource availability and governance structures all vary in urban areas as compared to rural or camp-based settings. In addition, although accurate statistics aren't available, field experience confirms that a high proportion of urban displaced do not return once conditions improve, but rather become established in urban environments with implications for the durability of responses.

As of mid 2016, the Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) works in urban areas in 20 out of 25 country programs. **NRC's Urban Vision 2016-18** aims to ensure that *'vulnerable people affected by displacement in urban areas have access to timely and effective protection and assistance and are better able to cope with future shocks and stresses.'* NRC's goals to achieve this are:

- 1 Through appropriate programming, funding and policies the urban displaced (and their host communities) are healthy, productive, and safe, with access to services as well as having their rights upheld
- 2 Vulnerable displaced peoples' safety and dignity in urban areas is significantly improved, and contribute to their ability to access the rights to housing land and property, education and livelihoods in urban crisis
- 3 Key humanitarian stakeholders effectively engage the capacity of authorities and communities affected by urban displacement to meet immediate needs, recover and contribute to durable solutions without creating parallel services

¹ Forced displacement is defined as the situation for persons forced to leave their homes due to conflict, human rights violations, violence and natural disasters. Forcibly displaced persons may be internally displaced or refugees who have crossed international borders.

² Crawford, N., et al (2015) Protracted displacement: uncertain paths to self-reliance in exile, ODI.

³ IRC (2016) A review of urban context analysis tools: Reviewing the gaps and strengths of existing context analysis tools for analysing urban settings.

NRC implements education programs in over 20 countries worldwide promoting a range of flexible formal and non-formal education opportunities to meet learning needs of displaced and conflict-affected children and youth, in line with the INEE Minimum Standards.

1 RAPID EDUCATION RESPONSE IN EMERGENCIES

Basic teaching and learning, recreational activities and psychosocial support aimed at providing protection and building a pathway to formal education after the acute emergency has subsided

2 ACCELERATED EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Support overage children and youth to attain formal schooling equivalencies and/or provide ports of re-entry into continued formal schooling at the appropriate grade levels, addressing the learning and protection needs of children and youth

3 YOUTH EDUCATION

Literacy-numeracy and life skills in addition to vocational skills, aiming at enhancing youth's human and social capital and increasing their participation as constructive community members

4 TEACHER PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND SYSTEM STRENGTHENING

Training and professional development of new, unqualified or under-qualified teachers; capacity building of education authorities in education policy and curriculum development

Besides education program delivery at the field level, NRC engages in a wide range of evidence-based advocacy and policy work at country and global levels.

Demographics in urban areas often skew towards large proportions of young people. The right to education for displaced children and youth is often difficult to realise in urban areas, with multiple pressures on access and availability of education services. Displaced children and youth in urban areas face barriers to accessing education, even where services are available, in both formal and non-formal settings. These include a lack of documentation, policy restrictions, actual (fees) and hidden costs (including transportation), and insecure environments both whilst travelling to school and in school. If they are able to access education, they can face additional challenges related to language or curriculum, and discrimination by teachers and other students, which affects their attendance, retention and learning outcomes. The cost of living in urban areas – often significantly more than in rural areas – is a further barrier. Vulnerable families often cannot manage the loss in income they face if the child or young adult attends education.

The majority of the countries in which NRC works in urban areas include education programs. The focus of these programs is on urban refugees or IDPs and the host community.



2

OBJECTIVES OF THE DESK REVIEW

Despite the growth in interest and learning from humanitarian organisations on urban crisis and response, there is still very little related to education. Within NRC, relevant program experience has not yet been systematically captured. This desk review collates current practice focused on adapted education response to urban contexts and learning from NRC programming in a number of conflict

affected countries. The review focuses on programming approaches and is meant to complement research being carried out by Columbia University's Teachers College (New York) – a study funded by the US State Department's Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration (BPRM) – focused on global and national education policies relevant to urban refugees in the global south.



3 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The key research questions for the desk review focused on how NRC's education programming is adapted to urban contexts. Informants were asked to describe education programming in urban contexts and consider how educational challenges are different in urban settings as compared to rural or camp settings. Additional questions aimed to understand specific program elements and how

they may be different in urban contexts, such as needs assessment; identification and targeting of beneficiaries; community engagement; working with local authorities and partners; integration or synergies across other sectors or NRC core competencies; non-service delivery components such as advocacy; etc. See the Annex for questions used in the desk review.



4 METHODOLOGY

The desk review developed synthesised findings that attempt to capture the learning and highlight good practices in education in urban settings across NRC’s programs. Case studies are included – of Colombia, Iran, Jordan and Lebanon – to demonstrate the different approaches taken.

Telephone interviews were conducted with education program managers and other relevant colleagues as the basis for the desk review. A review of background materials, on urban humanitarian response and programming, education in emergencies programming in urban settings and relevant NRC materials and program documents at global and country levels, was undertaken first in order to provide context and develop interview questions. Key informant interviews were undertaken with NRC staff in Colombia (including views on the Honduras program), Iran, Lebanon, Jordan, Palestine, Somalia (including views on the Kenya

and Uganda programs) and NRC’s head office. An additional round of interviews was conducted with colleagues in Colombia, Iran, Lebanon and Jordan to develop the case studies for those programs. Relevant program documents from those four countries were also reviewed.

For the purposes of the desk review, the definition of “urban” used is “a built up or densely populated area containing the city proper or continuously settled peri-urban areas” (Inter-Agency Standing Committee, IASC, definition). The term “displaced” is used to cover both refugees and IDPs.

5

OVERVIEW OF THE URBAN CONTEXTS OF NRC EDUCATION PROGRAMMING

Key informant interviews confirmed the increased complexity in which NRC education programming in urban contexts takes place. Complexity plays out in:

1 THE CHALLENGES THE DISPLACED FACE

First, the displaced in urban settings often face a host of economic, protection and security challenges. The displaced may be limited in their movement for security reasons such as the presence of armed groups as in Colombia or Honduras, or due to a fear of imprisonment or fines due to inadequate civil documentation. In Jordan, for example, those refugees who do not have an identity card from the Ministry of Interior (MOI) are forcibly relocated to camps. As a result, refugees in urban areas without these cards may move regularly to avoid the authorities, as the requirements for the identity cards, such as a certificate from the Ministry of Health and proof of residence, are often prohibitive.

The displaced living in urban areas are often dispersed and sometimes invisible. Refugee registration or other civil documentation is often required to access services but is often difficult to obtain due to financial or bureaucratic hurdles. In some cases, the lack of visibility is purposefully fostered in circumstances where they lack legal status or face increased risks of violence or other threats if they are identified as such. While the displaced may find it easier to hide in urban areas, the potential for social isolation is greater. Levels of social capital may be lower amongst the displaced given the likelihood of low social cohesion and language barriers, which may also impact access to services.

2 THE CHARACTERISTICS OF DISPLACED COMMUNITIES

The displaced may also face harassment, discrimination and exploitation, especially those who lack legal residence or documentation. Exploitation or extortion may be caused, for example, by armed gangs or by a weak social fabric in urban settings. These dynamics impact access to education. Exploitation related to child labour may, for example, impact learners who are occupied for long hours during the day, excluding them from formal daytime education services. Displaced learners may be bullied by other students, teachers and principals, or on their way to school.

The displaced often have high poverty levels and, in urban settings in particular, must address high costs of living. Economic constraints may strain intentions to ensure children's education where education costs are high, even where school is nominally free. Families may also prioritize work over education in order to cover costs of shelter and food, thereby decreasing the likelihood of children and youth attending education. Socio-economic differences between the displaced and host communities may be greater in urban settings.

Key informants in a number of country offices also noted that displaced communities in urban areas are highly mobile. Issues of legal status or difficult-to-meet rent payments within a context of a high cost of living may trigger regular relocation by the displaced even within urban settings. High

3 THE OTHER ACTORS THAT ENGAGE WITH THEM



mobility has cascade effects for education: for example, learners may change schools frequently, thereby reducing time spent learning and increasing the risk of dropout, or be difficult to track by education programming efforts.

Second, displaced communities in urban settings are harder to distinguish, are less homogenous and cohesive and, as a result, may be more difficult to engage with for education programming purposes. Displaced communities in urban settings do not live in controlled settings such as refugee camps. Where the displaced aren't distinguished by designated physical or geographic locations, or other settlements, distinguishing factors between host communities and the displaced community are often subtle, or purposely hidden, making it difficult to differentiate between the two. To ensure conflict sensitivity, support might target schools instead of the displaced themselves; such measures can avoid identifying the displaced wherein doing so could put them at risk for extortion or compromise their social integration. In Iran and Lebanon, education programming efforts have set geographical boundaries, such as around collective shelters in Lebanon, in order to make beneficiary identification and community engagement more manageable.

In Colombia and Iran, for example, displaced communities in urban settings are not as homogenous, cohesive or organized as in camps or settlements, and often lack community leaders or other representatives. Peoples affected by displacement in urban areas have a range of experiences and backgrounds; for example, some have moved from rural to urban settings, whilst others have moved between urban areas. Others are continuously displaced, as mentioned above, or may blend into the surrounding populations.

As a result, NRC faces multiple challenges in identifying representative focal points within the community with whom to work to develop education programs and who can serve as entry points to identifying beneficiaries or ensuring community participation. Identifying community liaisons, where relevant to education programming, can take longer. In Colombia, the lack of visibility of armed groups and illegal groups in urban settings

can further complicate efforts to identify community leaders wherein it is unclear who is a member of such a group and who is not. Territories might be controlled by illegal groups, thereby creating invisible borders (*fronteras invisibles*) that divide the communities and prevent displaced people to exercise their rights to participation/organization or education. For example, a school located in an area controlled by another armed group can impede attendance. Meaningful community participation may also be more challenging. Gender-related challenges, for example, may be different in urban settings. As cited by a key informant in Iran, it can sometimes be more difficult in urban settings to involve women who are culturally discouraged from leaving the house.

Finally, a plethora of actors may be involved in urban contexts that impact NRC's education programming efforts. In some places, such as Lebanon, urban settings may have an increased presence of other actors, in particular local nongovernmental organisations (NGOs) and civil society organisations (CSOs). A greater presence of other organizations requires more, and more effective, coordination in order to avoid duplication of efforts, among other outcomes. In Colombia, the higher number of actors can be beneficial where NRC can take advantage of their operational capacity and existing relationships within the community, and build on existing initiatives. Beyond NGOs and CSOs, urban settings often entail multiple layers of government (central, regional, municipal) that must be engaged and coordinated with at least and from whom approvals may also be required depending on the context.



6 CASES

6.1 COLOMBIA

As of 2016, the Colombian government's official registry put the number of "victims" of forced displacement at 7.3 million. Colombia's protracted conflict is the main cause of displacement, but spreading criminal violence has also forced people to flee from their homes. According to official sources, on average 200,000 people were forcibly displaced each year from 2010 to 2015. Widespread abuses, including the recruitment of minors, sexual violence, the deployment of anti-personnel mines, extortion and the targeting of human rights defenders, have also forced many people to flee their homes. Children and youth are among the most affected: 3.2 million, or approximately 44%, of the victims registered by the government were between 6 and 28 years old.

The displaced population has moved mainly to urban areas. Stigmatized or threatened in cities, displaced persons have generally tried to remain invisible among a host population of low socio-economic status. As a result, in Colombia there are no major displacement camps, but there are significant urban settlements of IDPs in municipal centres. These populations are exposed to human rights abuses and live in dire circumstances, with inadequate housing, scarce employment opportunities and limited access to public services. The number of IDPs below the poverty line is 63.8%, while 33% are living in extreme poverty.



NRC'S PROGRAMMATIC RESPONSE

NRC has been active in Colombia since 1991 and has been directly implementing programmes there since 2005. NRC in Colombia works in the areas of Information, Counselling and Legal Assistance (ICLA), Education, and Emergency Response. NRC's activities are primarily based in rural areas where access of the population to protection and assistance is most precarious (e.g. Pacific Coast and Catatumbo in Colombia and border areas in Ecuador and Venezuela) but services are also provided and activities implemented in urban areas when the protection gaps are significant (e.g. in Tumaco).

NRC's Education strategy in Colombia is based on two core approaches. First, the Education in Emergency (EiE) component aims to improve the material and non-material conditions during acute emergency to ensure that affected children rapidly resume education activities in a protective learning environment. Second, the Access to Education component involves close coordination with schools, public technical and vocational skills (TVS) training centres and education authorities at local levels (department and municipalities) to provide relevant education and training opportunities to conflict-affected out of school children and youth.

Flexible education models and bridging programmes are central to NRC's programming. Among children and youth affected by conflict, NRC aims to

reach those who are not able to access education or training activities in safe and protective environments and particularly those in isolated rural areas or in urban areas affected by conflict with high concentrations of IDPs. NRC undertakes a door-to-door census of the out-of-school and illiterate population in order to identify the children and adolescents who are not accessing education. Tailored assistance is then offered to children and adolescents whose education has been disrupted by the conflict, to out-of-school youth who have not completed basic or middle education and illiterate youth who have never accessed education opportunities.

NRC's education activities also focus on children and youth among the host communities that share the same vulnerabilities as mentioned above and children affected by natural disasters or other non-conflict related emergencies occurring within the prioritized areas of intervention. In order to provide a comprehensive intervention, public school teachers, technical and vocational trainers and other education personnel (school principals, civil servants of Secretariats of Education, Community Education Agents, Flexible Education Models (FEM) teachers, etc.) are targeted. The parents and guardians of the targeted children and youth are also given assistance in order to ensure that households have the economic capacity to send their children to school.

URBAN-SPECIFIC PROGRAMMING CHALLENGES AND LESSONS

NRC's education programming in urban areas in Colombia entails addressing the complexity of IDPs' vulnerabilities. IDP profiles include those that have moved from rural to urban areas, and those that have moved between different urban areas. IDPs might be restricted in their movement for security reasons, such as control of geographic areas by armed groups within urban contexts. The higher cost of living in urban areas, including higher rental payments and food costs, can result in economic vulnerabilities for IDPs.

Identifying IDPs in urban areas is a challenge for the education program in Colombia, although the legal framework that recognizes displacement facilitates the identification process in comparison to other countries such as Honduras. It may be difficult to find the IDPs situated within a community and/or to tell them apart from the poor host population, especially in cases of individual displacements where the family does not access the necessary information on its right to be recognized as a victim of the armed conflict and to benefit from specific support. On the other hand, applications by people affected by poverty to be registered as IDP in order to benefit from the government support and access the specific IDP's rights have been well documented. This situation tended to create tensions between IDPs and non-IDPs and weakens social links between displaced and host community. Displacement patterns are often murky: movement from rural areas to a city may be followed by multiple moves within that city. A child may arrive in a community from another part of the same city but programme staff may not know why or even be able to distinguish that child from others within the host population. As such, identification of IDPs requires more direct intervention with house-to-house canvassing and conducting specific interviews with children and parents or caregivers.

Moreover, lack of freedom of movement created by the high level of insecurity is a major issue limiting access to education in urban areas. Consequently, NRC education programmes in Colombia not only target IDPs and host communities, but also communities that cannot access basic services due to movement restrictions.

Needs assessments form the basis for programming decisions, often focusing on which types of bridging programs can most successfully bring out-of-school children/youth into formal education and assure retention. Information on beneficiaries is collected using an adapted version of the generic census tool that is used across the targeted areas of the country. Programming is therefore not necessarily adapted to the urban context per se but is adjusted to the needs of the beneficiaries identified and tracked, based on their specific needs and vulnerabilities, which are different in the urban contexts

As in other areas, NRC works with community leaders and liaison officers to identify displaced communities and target its needs assessments to potential beneficiaries. In urban areas it often takes more time to identify appropriate community liaison, where possible ensuring that they are not associated with armed groups. Moreover, the diversity of the ethnic and identity groups in Colombia represents another challenge in urban settings. For example, more than 50% of NRC beneficiaries of the southwest region identify themselves as Indigenous or Afro-Colombians. Being displaced in urban settings often has a greater impact on minority ethnic groups, as it may directly threaten their culture, identity and way of life. Consequently, it is necessary to adapt the responses, as well as the government policy, in order to allow these communities to preserve their culture and identity, as well as to prevent segregation and racism in the education institutions.

A community approach has been found to be effective as a means for targeting IDPs. Such an approach allows NRC to work not only with the IDPs but also the host population, defining education as an issue for the community as a whole.

Through engagement with ICLA, Education programming has been able to target and get some out of school children back into the education system. The support provided by ICLA on how families can access state services and improve livelihoods has helped families be able to prioritize education or have increased capacity to send their children to school.



6.2 IRAN

Over the last three decades, the government of Iran has hosted one of the world's largest protracted displacements of Afghan refugees. The modern history of Afghan migration to Iran started in 1979 with the Soviet Occupation. Since then, Afghan migration to the country has continued unabated, primarily motivated by the direct and indirect effects of war, insecurity, unemployment and inflation in Afghanistan. Of 950,000 documented Afghan refugees in Iran, around 97% live in urban and sub-urban areas, as do 100% of 1,500,000 undocumented Afghan nationals residing in the country. UNHCR estimates that some 24 percent of registered refugees are considered as vulnerable, a rate that is increasing due to the removal of subsidies, hyperinflation and international economic sanctions in recent years.

In May 2015, the Supreme Leader of Iran issued a decree that allows all Afghan children, regardless of their residency status, to attend public Iranian schools from September 2015. As a result, 70% of school-going Afghan children are now attending primary school. There is, however, a sharp decrease in the number of school-going Afghan children in junior high school and high school indicating that many drop out. The high cost of education for Afghan families, with an average of 5 children per family, is one of the major reasons why many heads of households stop sending their children to school. Engaging in income generation activities, early marriages and pregnancies, substance abuse, and committing petty crimes and felonies are some of the reasons that children and young adults remain out of the education system. Preparing the undocumented Afghan children, who will often have missed out on any previous education, for the formal educational system is yet another challenge.

NRC'S PROGRAMMATIC RESPONSE

NRC's programmes in Iran seek to preserve the asylum space and reinforce the coping strategies of vulnerable Afghan refugees living in the country. NRC in Iran works in the areas of Education, Food Security/Livelihood (FSL), Shelter, Water, Sanitation & Hygiene (WASH), ICLA and Advocacy, Awareness Raising and Research. NRC programme activities in Iran target the most vulnerable refugee households in settlement and urban settings in the four provinces of Kerman, Semnan, Qom and Alborz.

In Education, NRC provides Afghan children going to public and NGO schools with extracurricular activities as alternative learning opportunities. NRC supports durable transportation through Memorandums of Understanding with the government and hygiene solutions through other partnerships in order to lift the barriers on children's access to education. NRC includes Afghan children's parents, adult caregivers and siblings in various awareness raising for basic literacy and life skills training workshops, to help them be able to make more informed decisions about the education and attendance of their children. NRC also encourages and assists parents to form Parent-Teacher Associations.

In order to provide more Afghan children with an opportunity to access safe and inclusive learning opportunities, NRC targets both children and adults. Primary-school-age Afghan children as primary beneficiaries are divided into two categories: 1) school-going and 2) out-of-school. Efforts are made to keep the school going in school and to motivate the out-of-school to go to primary school. To equip children with the necessary psychomotor and psychosocial skills required to commence primary school, NRC offers alternative non-formal student centred trainings such as LEGO Education.

Adults, as secondary beneficiaries, are divided into three categories: 1) parents and/or elder siblings of school going and out of school Afghan children; 2) educational officials at central and provincial level working with Afghan children; and 3) Afghan university students and/or graduates that could become community trainers and peer educators. To better target the most in need, efforts are made to direct the assistance towards the most vulnerable while simultaneously empowering Afghan and

host community members to contribute to a safer, more durable and more inclusive access to education. NRC continues to expand its network of national NGO partners to achieve its goals.

URBAN-SPECIFIC PROGRAMMING CHALLENGES AND LESSONS

As the majority of refugees in Iran are based in urban areas, NRC is moving to provide more services outside of the settlements in which it has traditionally worked. NRC's transition mirrors that of the government which, after many years of focusing assistance on settlements, is increasing support to refugees in urban areas and opening access to them by other agencies. This shift further coincides with the government edict in 2015 that education is free and accessible for all children regardless of legal status thereby increasing activity around education exponentially. At present, NRC is still establishing its *modus operandi* for how to engage in urban settings.

Work outside of settlements poses a range of challenges for NRC via the increased complexity of programming across urban settings. Whereas in settlements NRC can engage with communities that are cohesive, with established entry points and counterparts (e.g. settlement managers, community or women's councils), such structures don't exist for refugees spread across cities. Urban refugees are also more likely to be on the move, migrating from one area or neighbourhood to another perhaps regularly. More time is thereby required to establish and manage programming, such as finding key informants and community liaisons or gathering people for group discussions.

One approach initiated by NRC to address the challenges of dispersed beneficiaries has been to establish links with Afghan university students or graduates who can serve as entry points to their communities. While NRC hasn't systematically engaged with this group yet, it hopes to draw on the knowledge and capacities of these individuals as key informants and community liaisons.

Whereas settlements are controlled areas in terms of geography and population, programming in urban settings is both more complicated and costly



in order to scale up to reach dispersed communities. NRC often chooses to take an area-based approach that defines beneficiaries within geographic boundaries given that home visits to identify beneficiaries who are highly dispersed are unrealistic. Similarly, needs assessments must consider varied needs across different areas, such as the likelihood of child labour in industrial neighborhood's or likelihood of substance abuse in areas where drug use is high. Approaches to complex vulnerabilities call for a range of relevant expertise and an efficient referral mechanism that may not exist.

Another issue faced in Iran is how to ensure the 'do no harm' principle is adhered to, so that blurred lines between beneficiaries and their host communities do not disturb relations or create tensions. It also means ensuring that NRC programmes don't disrupt the coping mechanisms established by vulnerable refugees that can increase their resilience. Whereas traditionally the most vulnerable would go to settlements, the shifts to urban areas and the protracted caseload in Iran has meant that refugees develop their own coping mechanisms and NRC programming must avoid creating dependencies on its services without building the capacity of refugees and their host communities.



6.3 JORDAN

Facing increasingly difficult living conditions, the approximately 650,000 registered Syrian refugees in Jordan struggle to provide for their families, remain registered, and access essential services including education for their children. More than five years on, the Syrian refugee crisis meets the international definition of a protracted crisis. In 2015, close to 79% of Syrian refugees were living outside of camps in host communities, mainly in northern Jordan; more than 86% of these refugees outside of formal camps in Jordan live under the national poverty line. Syrian refugees in Jordan are increasingly forced into desperate choices of finding occasional illegal work, some opting for unsafe return to Syria where the conflict continues. Some are attempting to travel to Turkey and on to Europe in the hope of a future. In 2015 significantly fewer asylum seekers were able to access Jordan than in previous years despite record high numbers of people in need and fresh displacement caused by renewed hostilities across large parts of Syria. An estimated 120,000 Syrian refugees are aged 15-24 years, the majority of whom (104,000) live in host communities. As of February 2016, the Ministry of Education reported that a third of all Syrian refugee children remained out of school.



NRC'S PROGRAMMATIC RESPONSE

NRC in Jordan works in the areas of Camp Shelter/ Non-Food Items (NFI), ICLA, Education, Youth, and Integrated Urban Shelter. In Education, NRC is working in cooperation with the Ministry of Education (MOE) to increase capacity of public schools in refugee influx areas. NRC is working to rehabilitate and build additional classrooms and sanitation facilities in crowded public schools in northern Jordan. In early 2016, NRC handed over 11 newly constructed classrooms and two WASH blocks to two schools in Irbid governorate increasing the number of school places in the double shift schools by 680 learning spaces. It is currently working on expanding five schools with 41 classrooms to provide additional space for over 2,000 students per year. NRC also supports the attendance of refugee children in second shift schooling in areas outside of the camps. Based on referrals from formal schools, NRC provides remedial learning opportunities to both host community and refugee learners in English, Arabic, mathematics and science to support them in school and prevent dropout. NRC also provides education services in the refugee camps. NRC advocates with

key stakeholders on the need for coordinated longer-term approaches that could provide space for Syrian and Jordanian youth alike to continue their education and prepare them for the future.

URBAN-SPECIFIC PROGRAMMING CHALLENGES AND LESSONS

The poverty rate among urban refugees in Jordan is very high, which results in a number of challenges to tracking and serving beneficiaries. For one, as the biggest expenditure for most urban refugees is rent, mobility is high wherein refugees without resources to cover rent payments move regularly. Refugees without proper legal status also tend to remain invisible and on the move. Tracking vulnerable children as they move is very challenging. Similarly, families focused on raising funds to cover basic living expenses, including rent payments, often prioritize income-generating activities over education. Incidences of child labour are increasing at the expense of participation in education.

Education programming in urban areas in Jordan generally means less control, less structure and

organization, and more bureaucracy to work through. NRC supports the integration of refugees into formal schools via a second shift. NRC works to establish Parent Teacher Associations (PTAs) and school councils and works on outreach as well as supporting the school with pedagogical aids. Whilst teachers in refugee camps are Syrian, directly hired by NRC, they are often more prepared and a framework is implemented by NRC for teacher training, both pre-service and in-service. Teachers providing second shift education to refugees in formal schools including in urban areas are hired and administered by the Jordanian government. These teachers are often freshly graduated from university and not under NRC's administration for training and other quality control purposes. This means that NRC is not allowed to provide additional training to these teachers, such as psychosocial support. However, at the request of school principals, NRC has been able to provide informal mentoring and teacher support. In 2016, after agreeing a Memorandum of Understanding with the MOE, teachers for the remedial learning programmes were hired by NRC as contract teachers, receiving a short pre-service training, mentoring and support.

Overcrowded school facilities in urban areas impact on the quality of services provided to refugees in those areas. Because schools are fully occupied during the week, remedial learning programmes can only be held on weekends when schools aren't in session. These programmes are thereby more scaled down than in refugee camps.

The role of government is more integral to working with refugees outside of camps in Jordan. NRC is required to work through formal schools and not allowed to undertake activities in host communities that the government doesn't oversee. This means that the capacity and policies of the government in Jordan has a significant impact on the scope and scale of NRC's programming. In short, NRC interventions are shaped by the government position, which in turn reflects the impact that NRC and others can have. The Jordanian government is taking an increasingly strong lead in controlling the types and means of intervention with refugees not living in camps and working within the strictures of the government can be challenging. All projects must be approved by the Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation (MOPIC) with a recommendation from the line ministry (i.e. MOE for education). Education programming primarily supports the existing education system, as the government wants to avoid parallel systems. However, gaps in government capacity and strategy limit NRC programming. NRC also works locally with departments of education who help determine the locations of interventions. Of those 15-20 areas suggested by the local departments of education based on the number of out-of-school children, NRC is working within 7 of them. Support to the existing system also means that some needs are not met. Addressing youth needs is a challenge, for example, where the majority of young people in urban areas are not served by primary education services.

⁴ Figure updated at the end of June 2016



6.4 LEBANON

Lebanon is not a signatory to 1951 Refugee Convention. It has the highest number of refugees per capita in the world: with a population of 4.2 million original inhabitants, it is hosting an estimated 1.5 million Syrian refugees (1,033,513 registered with UNHCR⁴). The war in Syria has also forced around 45,000 Palestinian refugees to flee the war ravaged country and seek safety in Lebanon, adding to the long-standing caseload of 270,000 Palestinian refugees, also known as Palestinian refugees from Lebanon (PRL). This creates pressure on public services and impacts the country's demographic balance. Since 2015, Lebanon's borders are de facto closed to civilians fleeing Syria and it is difficult for refugees already in country to renew their legal stay. Access to assistance and basic services is limited. Donor funding is diminishing and there are limited legal income-earning opportunities. Seventy percent of Syrian refugees in Lebanon live below the national poverty line. The burdensome conditions, costs and procedures for maintaining legal stay in country has also resulted in approximately 70% of refugees from Syria living in Lebanon without valid papers.

NRC'S PROGRAMMATIC RESPONSE

Through its core activities NRC provides protection and assistance to people affected by displacement, including refugees from Syria, Palestinian refugees and Lebanese host communities. NRC in Lebanon works in the areas of ICLA, Shelter, Education, WASH, and Collective Site Management and Coordination (CSMC). NRC is currently one of the main providers of shelter and legal assistance to refugees from Syria.

NRC's main education activities include supporting access and retention in formal education, and various non-formal education modalities to address the learning needs of out-of-school children. NRC's non-formal programmes are aimed at ensuring that children can join and remain in formal education as soon as it becomes available. NRC runs education programmes through its Community Centres, other learning spaces in areas with high concentration of refugees and in UNRWA schools. Life skills, vocational training and language classes for out-of-school youth and young adults are offered at Community Centres. In addition to non-formal education activities, NRC also supports the back to school campaign and enrollment in public schools with outreach activities and provision of transportation to and from schools. As part of the 2015-2016 back-to-school campaign, NRC supported and referred more than 10,000 children through outreach and advocacy campaigns.

URBAN-SPECIFIC PROGRAMMING CHALLENGES AND LESSONS

Reaching out to highly dispersed refugees, and particularly the most vulnerable among them, is challenging in Lebanon's urban areas. Refugees in Lebanon are very mobile for reasons of legal status, access to resources and livelihoods opportunities, among others. It is difficult for programme staff to identify areas where there are high concentrations of refugees. NRC identifies education beneficiaries in urban areas by contacting focal points, local authorities and municipalities, or using UNHCR data, along with referrals from NRCs' other core competency programming and door-to-door home visits to identify out-of-school children. Approaches are sometimes used to identify beneficiaries within specific neighborhood's such as, for example, within areas around collective shelters (e.g. buildings previously used as hotels, shopping malls, etc. or unfinished buildings) that serve as communal housing areas with high concentrations of refugees. Education staff work with other core competencies through the integration of education-specific questions into needs assessment tools.

Where NRC supports the Ministry of Education & Higher Education's efforts to move refugees into public schools via a second shift, the efforts have been more successful in urban areas where more public schools exist as compared to rural areas. At the same time, overcrowding, limited seats available and distance of second-shift schools combined with limited freedom of movements are major obstacles to access formal education.

Finally, a heightened presence of NGOs and CSOs in urban areas entails increased coordination to avoid duplication of efforts and support local organizations in their work. However, where possible, NRC partners with local organizations to carry out joint outreach and education activities, to make use of their premises, and to step in to support them (financially and otherwise) as appropriate.



7 KEY FINDINGS

Interventions within a number of the countries in which NRC works could be characterised as urban programming. However, key informant interviews along with review of program documents confirmed that distinguishing “urban” responses from rural or camp-based approaches is not currently a common approach taken within NRC country programs. Contextualizing each response – whether camp, rural or urban – is common practice and was highlighted as critical for appropriate, effective programming. At the same time, “urban” is not currently an explicit organizing principle for NRC education programming or beneficiaries. The distinction between urban and rural or camp settings is implicit through contextualization but not articulated as such in the adaptation of programs to urban settings.

Key findings can be organized into three broad and sometimes overlapping categories:

1 | the heightened **ROLE OF GOVERNMENT** particularly outside of camp settings

2 | more complicated **TARGETING AND IDENTIFICATION OF BENEFICIARIES**

3 | **CROSS SECTOR SYNERGIES** represented by links between Education and NRC’s other core competencies

7.1 ROLE OF GOVERNMENT

As opposed to other sectors in which NRC works, a formal or structured system almost always exists for education. Government authorities will thereby be interlocutors for NRC education programming. The role of government in NRC’s education programming seems to increase in breadth and depth in urban areas.

Whereas in camps NRC may run parallel non-formal education delivery programs, responding in urban settings generally requires working more strictly within government systems and policies. The specific implications for urban programming vary across countries but generally 1) governments desire and require more engagement for activities that take place outside the controlled areas of camps or settlements and 2) because of the local presence of political and ministerial actors, the

scope of education programming more strictly follows government-dictated policies. As a result, in urban areas NRC often supports system strengthening by working with the public system and integrating the displaced into it. These programming choices are often the result of government decisions such as in Lebanon, Jordan and Iran where government policy focuses on mainstreaming the displaced into the formal public school system, often via second shift classes.

In urban settings NRC may run into challenges wherein its mission and mandate are at odds with the realities of the operating environment. Challenges exist in particular where the government policy or agenda isn’t seen as responding to the needs of the displaced given NRC’s mandate to serve the most vulnerable. Cases of displaced

learners whose complex needs keep them from integrating into public schools are not uncommon in urban settings. At the same time, complementary programming by NRC that is designed to meet the needs of the most vulnerable who cannot easily be integrated into the formal system may be limited by government restrictions on non-formal programming. In these cases, NRC often undertakes advocacy with education authorities as appropriate and possible but programming may still be restricted, such as in Lebanon. NGO roles may also be unclear in settings where governments control service delivery. Alternative learning programs in Lebanon are managed and run by the government in schools; other non-formal programs run by NGOs are not recognized, resulting in lack of clarity for other actors, including NRC, who would otherwise provide these services.

NRC also faces a constrained operating environment where it must follow government dictates. Government approvals are more likely to be required in urban settings: in Iran, for example, the authorities are more reluctant to allow NGOs to work in urban areas and to involve the host Iranian communities in identifying the displaced and vulnerable. Governments' heightened interest and increased approvals may sometimes cross multiple levels and agencies from central level (e.g. MOEs and perhaps other agencies such as the Bureau for Aliens and Foreign Immigrants Affairs, BAFIA, of the Iranian Ministry of Interior) to regional or provincial government as well as municipalities. Delays in programming due to increased coordination requirements between stakeholders or the withholding of approvals outright may result in significant programme intervention and quality challenges. On the other hand, strong relationships with central authorities can help to facilitate engagement with local authorities: in Colombia a strong relationship with the MOE has trickled down to stronger relationships with local education secretariats.

While NRC supports the development of equitable and sustainable formal education services for the displaced, where such inclusion is not possible in the immediate term NRC responds with non-formal approaches to build the links between learners and formal education systems. In Colombia, for example, NRC delivers bridging programs that support learners to register and enter into mainstream education, adapting to their needs per data collected via NRC Colombia's census tool. Where governments don't allow programming that is not designed to mainstream displaced learners into public schools, however, the space for NRC's operations can be constricted. Through on-going advocacy, outreach and support, NRC can try to engage with the government to shape these approaches. These efforts may be limited, though, where direct or indirect channels to the government are inadequate or restricted, such as in Lebanon where the education working group was disbanded by the government leaving no alternative mechanisms.

Where governments lack the capacity to implement their dictates, government inefficiencies can become NRC's inefficiencies. Where government may want to ensure certain policies and programs, it might not be in a position to do so based on capacity and resources. In these cases, NRC may be impacted, for example, where there are delays in developing programs while at the same time the provision of alternative education services isn't allowed. Such was the case in Lebanon where the government undertook to establish four service delivery packages (including early childhood, basic literacy and numeracy, accelerated learning programs (ALP) and non-formal youth education) but had only developed the ALP at the time of writing. Because the MOE chose to itself develop the other curricula and policies for delivery as well as monitoring, NGOs including NRC were asked to put on hold any non-formal education activities and refer learners to the public school system. During the delay in development of the other packages, NRC was not allowed to provide alternative non-formal services.



© NRC

7.2 TARGETING AND IDENTIFICATION OF BENEFICIARIES

As part of its mission, NRC involves displaced persons and host communities in the identification of their needs as well as in the design, implementation and evaluation of programs⁵. Needs assessments and analysis are the first step in appropriately targeting and identifying beneficiaries in any context, urban or otherwise. Such assessments and analysis likewise provide the foundation for programming from design through implementation and monitoring, regardless of context.

In most places, the same tools are used for needs assessment for programming in rural areas or camp settings as are used in urban settings. These tools are adapted based on context, such as with the

census tool used in Colombia, which may mean the addition of urban specific questions related to context analysis or governance. The majority of key informants believed that a thorough needs assessment can address differences across urban and rural contexts. Key informants noted that similar types of programming can be undertaken across a range of contexts as long as the assistance is tailored to the needs of the beneficiaries: needs are specific to beneficiaries, not an automatic product of the context in which they live.

Targeting must first identify the displaced and then identify the most vulnerable among them. Where the displaced are dispersed and blend into host communities in urban settings, identification and targeting for education programming can be extremely difficult as well as time and labour

⁵ NRC Policy Paper. Norwegian Refugee Council. May 2012.

intensive. Door-to-door home visits and direct interviews with children/youth – as exemplified by Colombia’s Out-of-School Census tool – may be needed to search for and identify the displaced that are out-of-school. Such activities require an increased level of effort and can take significantly more time and money, especially in relation to the verification processes as communities can be considered less representative when they have a highly mobile displaced population. High mobility among the displaced can make identification and tracking more difficult, as well as increase dropout rates.

Alternatively, areas or neighborhood’s can be identified within which targeting can be undertaken, often referred to as area-based programming. In Iran, targeting efforts are defined by geographic boundaries in order to set limitations on home visits based on identifying and prioritizing areas known to be deprived. The scale and scope of dispersion of the displaced within urban settings would make home visits otherwise impossible. NRC in Lebanon also tries to identify areas of high concentrations of refugees for targeting, sometimes based around collective shelters.

In some cases, identifying beneficiaries requires engagement with the government. In Colombia, for example, NRC is making use of the government’s IDP registration system to identify beneficiaries. Equally, NRC is helping the government to identify out-of-school children/youth to feed into the new IDP registration. Such synergistic cooperation requires a strong relationship with local authorities and the MOE.

Targeting efforts often involve community liaisons that assist with outreach and identification, as with rural or camp-based programming. While the approach is the same, as mentioned above community liaisons can be more difficult to find in urban settings where the community may be less cohesive, or less well known to the community workers, or the support systems among the displaced weaker. In Iran, the lack of a strong network of community liaisons that can serve as informants means reliance on counterparts in BAFIA for identifying beneficiaries. This lack of direct community counterparts can mean that the most vulnerable may not be identified.

Host communities are also targeted by NRC’s programming as good practice and a means to ensure ‘do no harm’ principles. The need to engage and include host communities can be particularly compelling in urban settings given proximity and the vulnerabilities that host communities may share with the displaced. Lines are often blurred between displaced and host communities in urban settings, not least given the purposeful invisibility of the displaced and generalized levels of poverty across hosts and the displaced. Host communities living in the same areas as the displaced do not suffer the same barriers to services, such as access to legal redress, but at the same time do not necessarily benefit from the support received by the displaced on a humanitarian basis. The broad catchment to include host communities as a means of good practice and to avoid tensions or conflict may however be constrained by donors whose funds are designed for programs directly and only targeting the displaced.

The scope and scale of needs in urban settings can strain the limitations of NRC’s mandate. While protection is a cross-cutting issue for NRC, complex and particularly challenging protection issues often arise in urban settings that push the boundaries of a flexible and adaptive programme response, whether through its education (or other) programming. Out-of-school children or youth may have clear education needs, combined with issues regarding legal status in their host country. However, these same children/youth may face a matrix of risks that is increased in urban settings – for example related to child labour, forcible recruitment or other exploitation, which requires integrated education and other core competency programming. Further compounding the challenges, NRC often works in contexts where there are no other international partners due to the security risks; or where state institutions are weak, sometimes limiting the options for referring or transferring these cases.

7.3 CROSS SECTOR SYNERGIES

To a limited extent the urban programming good practice that other sectors – or in NRC’s case, core competencies – can be advantageously leveraged in urban areas was substantiated. For example, ICLA support is provided to parents, teachers and school communities to enable access to civil documentation, support refugee status identification, or more broadly to facilitate tenure security interventions, or dispute resolutions. In Lebanon, information sessions are held jointly with ICLA for parents given that issues of legal status are some of their most pressing problems. Also in Lebanon, NRC provides education programming through community centres in urban settings that often also house an ICLA office.

Another example was information sharing across core competencies during the needs assessment phase or at other moments where education needs were identified by colleagues working within a different core competency. In Colombia, census tools for identifying beneficiaries cover both education and ICLA-related needs. Referrals would be made to education where, for example, shelter or WASH staff undertaking their own needs assessments or other work might identify out-of-school children as in Lebanon. However, in general education programming did not involve NRC’s other core competencies in urban settings in significant programmatic efforts and not necessarily any more than in rural areas or camps.



8

CONCLUSIONS

Urban displacement is unique from a rural or camp displacement in that it occurs in dense and highly complex environments that have adapted to absorb large populations and a range of economic activities. Urban displacement has distinctive features of: scale; density; economic systems and livelihood strategies; resource availability; governance and public expectations; large informal settlements; increased likelihood for compound and complex disasters; and potential for secondary impacts on rural or regional producers.⁶

Analysing needs and defining responses as specifically “urban” is a new lens within NRC. Overall, operational and bureaucratic constraints to NRC programming seem to be greater in urban settings than in rural areas or camps/settlements. The contexts for urban programming are marked by the complexity of dispersed, non-cohesive communities and beneficiary vulnerabilities as well as the implications of governments’ interest in and control over activities outside of camps or settlements – both of which must be navigated. Inroads to

cross-competency collaboration could be deepened to help address some of these challenges.

Adequate assessment and analysis upfront can address challenges of different contexts. Tackling complex needs in urban settings requires understanding of where and who the displaced are, and of the obstacles to education. Because they are more complex in urban settings, vulnerabilities and risks may also be more individualized. Blanket approaches to individualized needs may be ineffective. For example, establishing a school bus system to attend classes may address one need of many learners but it doesn’t address other vulnerabilities they face. Case-based approaches to addressing needs are labour intensive and require deeper community mobilization. Individualized responses must be weighed against the costs and benefits of such approaches and the alternatives, and cost efficiency in targeting is often lower in urban settings given the complexity. Employing multiple, triangulated approaches to ensure that programs cover the greatest catchment of beneficiaries is preferred.



The table below summarizes the key challenges for education programming in urban displacement across a number of factors and issues.

FACTORS/ISSUES	Challenges for education programming in a context of urban displacement
DELIVERY OF SERVICES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to schools and education facilities may be limited by distance, places, or economic access • The scope of education programming often needs to strictly adhere to government-dictated policies • Limitations may exist on other programming including non-formal where government policy/ focus on mainstreaming into formal systems • Challenges to NRC's mandate may exist where government policy or agenda isn't seen as responding to the needs of the most vulnerable
ROLE OF GOVERNMENT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governments demand more transparency and engagement to prevent parallel service provision in urban areas • Multiple government ministries and other stakeholders require more complex coordination mechanisms in order to seek approval and understand the changing policy context with possible delays in programming
IDENTIFICATION AND TARGETING OF BENEFICIARIES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highly dispersed and mobile communities make Identification and targeting difficult as well as time and labour intensive • Areas or neighborhood's may be identified for targeting to better focus resources and enable coverage of the most vulnerable areas
LEVERAGING OTHER SECTORS (CORE COMPETENCIES)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information sharing and beneficiary engagement to assess rights, needs and vulnerabilities, enables an accountable multi sectorial approach • Support to identification and targeting beneficiaries via referrals and/or multi sector needs assessments

9

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are suggested for NRC and education actors in urban settings:

RECOGNISE THE NATURE, SCALE AND COMPLEXITY OF URBAN EDUCATION CRISIS

Education interventions in urban areas must apply an urban lens, recognise the specificity of urban crisis and tailor responses accordingly. This includes identifying specific barriers to education in each urban context and designing programs accordingly.

- 1 Identify the most at-risk urban areas within NRC's country portfolio and identify specific barriers to education in each urban context
- 2 Develop innovative and flexible education programs that address these specific barriers to education within the urban context
- 3 Consider innovative and triangulated education approaches that address the complex needs of beneficiaries (such as multipurpose cash grants to meet other needs or accompanied transport support for children who do not attend due to security or safety risks, or livelihood interventions to accompany an education response)
- 4 Consider integration with the host community from the beginning of the intervention to reflect the likelihood that not all urban displaced will return to their place of origin

WORK WITHIN THE EXISTING SYSTEMS AND CONSTRUCTIVELY WITH LOCAL AUTHORITIES AND GOVERNMENTS

Move from a mind-set of supplying assistance to one of support, to enable responses to scale in urban areas without the creation of parallel systems.

- 1 Understand through urban specific multi sector assessments the role of the local authorities and relevant policies, procedures and programs, as well as where other sectors can complement and strengthen education responses

- 2 Undertake advocacy and foster collaboration in order to work with other actors or partners and within the strictures of various local authorities (for example, to find ways of reaching the most vulnerable through alternative education or vocational training programs that complement government approaches to mainstream the displaced into formal schooling)
- 3 To the extent possible, develop and implement complementary and supplementary education service delivery programs that support government policies such as integration of the displaced into formal schools

SUPPORT UNDERSTANDING AND MULTI SECTOR RESPONSES TO URBAN DISPLACEMENT

Ensure that in large urban emergencies and protracted displacements in urban areas that NRC recognizes the existing urban vulnerability and the strain that new displacement places on service provision and the host community.

- 1 Improve understanding of the specific urban vulnerabilities and capacities of the displaced in urban areas, as compared to host communities by assessing multi sectorial needs and profiling these groups
- 2 Where possible take an integrated multi sectorial area based approach to needs to ensure that education is not addressed in isolation, thereby enabling a broader group of vulnerable children and youth to access education in urban areas (through ICLA, shelter, WASH, Food security and livelihood programmes)
- 3 Support, where possible, the creation of and access to livelihood opportunities for displaced populations ensuring better integration and engagement in education and a reduction in risky coping mechanisms

A ANNEXES

ANNEX 1: KEY MATERIALS REVIEWED INCLUDE:

J. Crisp, T. Morris and H. Refstie, 2012

Displacement in urban areas: new challenges, new partnerships. Disasters Journal: Special Edition: Urban vulnerability and humanitarian response. P. S23-S42.

NRC, 2009

NRC Education Handbook, NRC, Oslo

NRC, 2012

NRC Policy Paper, NRC, Oslo

S. Pantuliano, V. Metcalfe,

S. Haysom and E. Davey. 2012.

Urban vulnerability and displacement: a review of current issues. Disasters Journal: Special Edition: Urban vulnerability and humanitarian response. P. S1-S22.

E. Parker and V. Maynard, 2015

Humanitarian response to urban crises: A review of area-based approaches. IIED Working Paper. International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), London

L. Phelps, 2016

Guidance Note Field Operations: Urban Displacement Programming, Draft. NRC, Oslo

R. Sanyal, 2014

Urbanizing refugee: Interrogating spaces of displacement, International Journal of Urban and Regional Research. Vol 38.2. P. 558-72.

UNHCR, 2011

Ensuring access to education: Operational guidance on refugee protection and solutions in urban areas. UNHCR, Geneva

ANNEX 2: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEWS INCLUDED:

- Oscar Rodriguez, Colombia program
- Anne-Laure Rambaud, Colombia program
- Zahra Khedri, Iran program
- Abeer Ammouri, Jordan program
- Petr Kostohryz, Jordan program
- Marta Schena, Lebanon program
- Camilla Lodi, Palestine program
- Abiti Gebretsadik, Somalia program
- Andrea Naletto, NRC head office

FIRST ROUND INTERVIEW QUESTIONS INCLUDED:

OPENING QUESTIONS:

- What's your position (title)?
- How long have you been in that role?
- Have you worked with NRC in other urban contexts?
- Please tell me about your current role and NRC's education programming the urban areas in ____.

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS:

Follow-up questions were asked dependent upon the description provided by the respondent about their current role and NRC's education programming. The questions below are not listed in any particular order but were drawn upon as most relevant as the interviews evolved.

NEEDS ASSESSMENT AND ANALYSIS:

- Was the program design informed by a needs assessment? And was this adapted for the urban context?
- Are other agencies undertaking urban education responses and did this inform the analysis or influence program design?
- Was there any context analysis of urban education actors to inform the program?
- Are we working in the urban areas due to an assessment / strategy or funding opportunity?

PROGRAM AND POLICY:

- Is the education response a typical NRC response as in rural areas or has it been adapted to the urban context? How so?
- Did you undertake a participatory approach to design and implement the program? If so, how so?
- Have we engaged outside of NRC's normal scope i.e. working with private sector schools where there are not enough state school places? Is there more that we could do?
- What are/were the entry points for programming? Are these different from rural areas?
- What's the scope of the programming? (e.g. geographic, sector(s), etc.) Is the program integrated with other NRC sectors or with gender or protection mainstreaming elements?
- What proportion of the response is direct service delivery verses working through partners or advocating?
- Does your program reflect city, regional or national plans and/or policies (both education or urban)? And how do these direct / influence your work?

TARGETING:

- What criteria do you use for beneficiary selection for different urban education response? (Both displaced and host)
- Is your programming inclusive of a whole population (i.e. displaced and host/receiving community)? If yes, what proportion is host community? Does working with the host community improve access to the displaced community? If beneficiaries are refugees and IDP please specify.
- What are the different barriers and vulnerabilities you need to take into account with displaced / host populations?
- Do you have any challenges accessing any of the beneficiary population? What are the barriers to access i.e. child labour, girls not expected to attend school, caring responsibilities etc.?
- Do you feel confident that you are targeting the most vulnerable urban dwellers? If not are there program adaptations which would enable better access to the hard to reach communities

STAKEHOLDERS:

- How much do you work with or within existing systems or services? i.e. working with local authority or other partners.
- Who do you coordinate with? (e.g. other humanitarian or development agencies, national or local government or other authorities, etc.)
- Do you coordinate across multiple sectors? Within NRC? With other organizations or authorities?
- Are you working/coordinating with non-humanitarian partners?
- How do you engage with civil society organizations or the community?

FUNDING:

- Please list the funding sources, budget amounts and budget codes.
- How significantly are you influenced by donors or are you able to influence and access more innovative education or urban funding?

OUTCOMES AND IMPACTS:

- What are the challenges you face and how do you try to address them?
- What are your successes? (Why are they successes? How did you achieve them?)
- How do you monitor and evaluate outcomes or impacts?
- What does your monitoring data reflect in terms of program impact?
- Have there been any unanticipated positive or negative consequences?
- Has your program evolved over time? Do you have that flexibility?
- Have there been significant changes over time?
- Have there been key defining moments or triggers for change?
- Do you have any reflections on program quality?

URBAN V. RURAL CONTEXTS:

- What's your background? Do you have other experiences working with displaced populations (e.g. in rural contexts)?
- In your experience, what is the difference between working in an urban context?
- What are the educational challenges in the urban context and are they different from rural areas in the country that they are working in?
- Are there any areas of the intervention that are more challenging in urban areas, i.e. targeting, community liaison, beneficiary engagement, assessment of needs, etc.?
- How have you adapted any of the program responses specifically for the urban context?

LEARNING:

- Are there areas of the program response in urban areas which have been outside of your experience, i.e. working with local authorities or local partner organisations, for which you would have liked NRC support with guidance or support?
- Are there innovative elements to your urban education response which you would like to share with other education specialists?

- Are there any adaptations to urban education responses that you have made or would like to make but have not been able to due to NRC ways or working, policy or funding?

SECOND ROUND INTERVIEW QUESTIONS INCLUDED:

- What are the educational challenges in the urban context and are they different from rural areas in the country that they are working in?
- What are/were the entry points for programming? Are these different from rural areas?
- Are there any areas of the intervention that are more challenging in urban areas, i.e. targeting, community liaison, beneficiary engagement, assessment of needs, etc.?
- How have you adapted any of the program responses specifically for the urban context?
- How do you address the increased complexity of dispersed beneficiaries in urban settings?
- How do you find and target the most vulnerable in urban contexts?
- How are you working with local authorities? Have you had to adapt your ways of working to do so?
- Are there other stakeholders or partners you are working with that are different in urban areas?
- Are there any cross-cutting issues that exist across Education and other core competencies and are specific to urban settings?
- Can you tell us more about protection issues?
- Can you tell us more about access issues?
- Can you tell us more about gender issues?
- Have you had to develop incentives or other interventions in order to increase enrolment and retention that are specific to urban contexts?



NRC

NORWEGIAN
REFUGEE COUNCIL