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Section 1. Introduction

1.1 Background and aims

The Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack (GCPEA) is a unique interagency organization that aims to end attacks on education in situations of armed conflict.

GCPEA defines attacks on education as any threatened or actual use of force against students, teachers, academics, education personnel, education buildings, resources or facilities. In addition, armed forces and non-state armed groups use schools and universities for military purposes. These violations occur for strategic, political, ideological, sectarian, ethnic, or religious reasons.

Attacks on education have devastating effects on students and teachers and their schools and universities. Students and educators are injured, killed, arrested, or otherwise harmed. Schools undergo lasting damage, which can lead to the over-crowding of other facilities in surrounding areas. In some countries, armed groups specifically target women’s and girls’ education, causing long term-consequences such as diminished learning, early pregnancy, child and forced marriage, and stigma associated with sexual violence.

Since 2010, GCPEA has sought to strengthen the monitoring and reporting of attacks on education. A better understanding of the types, patterns, scope, and scale of attacks on education and military use of schools and universities can inform the design and implementation of preventive and protection measures. For this reason, collecting data is also a core commitment of the Safe Schools Declaration, an international political agreement dedicated to protecting education in armed conflict.

In recent years, GCPEA has made significant advances in strengthening data on attacks on education in situations of armed conflict. GCPEA more regularly publishes data on attacks on education in its Education under Attack series and disseminates monthly Education in Danger Monthly News Briefs in partnership with Insecurity Insight. GCPEA’s Education under Attack data is also publicly available on the UNESCO Institute for Statistics data portal and feeds into the monitoring of Sustainable Development Goal 4 Quality Education; the dataset is also publicly available on the Humanitarian Data Exchange. Data on attacks on education has become more widely available thanks to better awareness and efforts by national and international organizations and monitoring bodies.

In spite of improved monitoring and reporting on attacks on education and military use in recent years, critical data gaps remain. Reporting systems may be absent, weak, or disconnected from effective responses to attacks on education. Monitors, as well as victims or witnesses, may face threats to their safety, or insecurity may prevent monitors from accessing areas where attacks occur. As such, many attacks and incidents of military use go unreported, undermining efforts to calculate their prevalence.

Even when reporting mechanisms exist, data is not usually disaggregated by gender, age, location, type of attack, or perpetrator. Violations such as education-related child recruitment and sexual violence often go underreported. The impacts of attacks on education and military use – such as school days lost, drop-outs, and school closures – remain difficult to calculate
due to such gaps. And even when data collection occurs regularly, its analysis and reporting do not always occur at regular intervals.

This Toolkit for Collecting and Analyzing Data on Attacks on Education builds on GCPEA and partners’ efforts to better measure the scope and impact of attacks on education and aims to address the abovementioned gaps in monitoring and reporting. It comprises a set of technical tools for standardizing data collection, analysis, and reporting. These tools include Guidance on collecting, reporting, and analyzing data; an Indicator Framework; a codebook; and a data template.

The aims of the Toolkit for Collecting and Analyzing Data on Attacks on Education are to:

- Contribute to better harmonization of definitions of attacks on education and military use of schools and universities within and across countries
- Enhance institutional capacity to collect and report data on attacks on education and military use of schools and universities through suggested indicators
- Indicate how data on attacks on education and military use of schools and universities can be analyzed to illustrate the short- and long-term impacts of attacks

1.2 Who can benefit from the Toolkit?

This Toolkit is intended for government, humanitarian and development organizations, and other civil society groups working at the nexus of education, child protection, human rights, academic freedom, sexual violence, and the protection of civilians.

This Toolkit can support organizations that are already collecting data on attacks on education, even if only in one specific area such as higher education, attacks on schools, or sexual violence at school. For instance, the Toolkit can assist in analyzing gaps in data collection and disaggregation and offer possible methods of reporting and analysis to enhance the understanding of trends and impact. Organizations can also use this Toolkit to refine their existing monitoring and reporting tools, log frames, needs assessments, or database systems.

Organizations which have not yet begun collecting data can also use the Toolkit to build a monitoring and reporting system from the ground up, from sectoral analysis to collecting and reporting.

In other cases, organizations may not wish to collect data but instead to analyze different trends in attacks on education and military use; the Toolkit identifies existing data sources and suggests calculations for these purposes.

With strengthened data systems, armed forces, ministries of education, and humanitarian actors can all improve practice to protect education. Systematic evidence on the prevalence and impact of attacks on education can assist militaries, governments, and civil society to improve gender-responsive implementation of the Safe Schools Declaration.

We encourage users to consider the Toolkit for Collecting and Analyzing Data as a menu of options from which to pick and choose indicators and analyses.
### The Tools: Guidance on Collecting and Reporting Data

This section of the *Toolkit* introduces the problem of attacks on education; provides a rationale for better data collection, reporting, and analysis; and describes data sources and existing efforts to collect data.

This section also includes guidance on how to collect data on attacks on education, broken down into actionable steps, and provides sample data collection tools and definitions of key terms.

### Indicator Framework

The Indicator Framework, one of the primary components of the *Toolkit*, serves as a technical guide for governments, non-governmental organizations, and other bodies who are either already collecting data on attacks on education or beginning to establish mechanisms to do so.

The Indicator Framework contains eight domains and a number of sub-domains and indicators to guide data collection and analysis. These domains correspond to GCPEA’s five categories of attacks on education and military use of schools and universities.

Each indicator presents a suggested calculation, data disaggregation, and data sources, and covers their feasibility and possible limitations. Some indicators measure prevalence of attacks while others measure their impact such as the number of school days lost, or the number of teachers or education personnel killed, harmed, or arrested. Other impacts include the damage and destruction to school or university facilities.

Indicators can be selected based on the realities, needs, and capacity on the ground.

Depending on the existing mechanisms of data collection and analysis in a country, this framework may be used to refine or build upon existing structures. It can also be used as a tool when building a monitoring system from the ground up or can be integrated into programmatic tools such as Log Frames, Needs Assessments, or Humanitarian Response Plans and Needs Overviews.

### Codebook

The codebook provides further definitions relevant to attacks on education and military use and instructions for how to enter data into the suggested database template.

### Data Template

The data template, in Microsoft Excel, is a tool that organizations or governments can use directly or to inform the structure of their own existing databases. The Data Template aligns with the Codebook and Indicator Framework; it includes a sheet for event data only and a sheet for the combination of event data and other education data.
1.3 Why collect and report data on attacks on education?  
In *Education under Attack 2020*, GCPEA collected over 11,000 reported attacks on education between 2015 and 2019 which harmed over 22,000 students and education personnel. However, attacks on education continue to be severely underreported. And other subnational, national, and global trends remain difficult to track. Limiting attacks on education is not possible until they are better understood.

A first step to better understanding the scope and impact of attacks on education is to strengthen the quality of data and enhance data analysis and reporting from the ground up. In emerging situations of concern, as well as in contexts where structured data collection systems are already in place, targeted efforts can contribute to a better national and global understanding of the scope and impact of attacks on education.

Beyond data collection, this *Toolkit* seeks to strengthen analyses of short- and longer-term impacts of attacks on education. The *Toolkit* highlights where general education data can be analyzed alongside data on the incidents of attacks on education in order to conduct such analyses. For example, the proportion of schools damaged or destroyed in a region or country by attacks; the number of school days lost due to attacks on education or military use of schools; and so on. Other impacts may include the number of teachers or educators injured, killed, or arrested.

These indicators also serve to strengthen and systematize data on perpetrators, the types of weapons used to perpetrate attacks, geographic location, and types of schools attacked or used for military purposes. The *Toolkit* also helps strengthen and systematize reporting of cross-cutting attacks, such as child recruitment and sexual violence at, or on the way to or from, a school, by encouraging stronger data collection and disaggregated reporting.

By strengthening data collection and analysis, this *Toolkit* supports the implementation of the *Safe Schools Declaration*, which has a commitment to strengthen monitoring and reporting of attacks on education. When better data and analyses exist, governments and partners can more easily reach many of the other commitments set forth in the Declaration, a political commitment endorsed by 106 countries. They will be better equipped for effective planning for prevention of and response to attacks, for advocacy to effect political change, to raise funds to support programming for conflict-affected learners and educators, and to provide targeted support to different levels of education.

---

Where and when to monitor attacks on education?
Attacks on education occur in most situations of armed conflict or similar violence around the world. While sporadic incidents of attack do not require systematic monitoring, analysis, and reporting, when a pattern of attacks emerges, data collection should occur regularly.

GCPEA defines a systematic pattern of attack on education as ten attacks over a two-year period. Attacks and military use may occur in a particular region or across much of the country, depending on the spread of the conflict and the targets of attacks.

In order to begin systematically collecting data on attacks on education soon after they emerge, governments and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in insecure contexts can build relevant questions into security or needs assessments, surveys, or other education or protection data collection efforts.

GCPEA encourages data collection on attacks on education to take place wherever and whenever they occur in situations of armed conflict or similar violence.

1.4 What is already being done?
This Toolkit complements work already being done to collect data on attacks on education and the military use of schools and universities.

In situations where the United Nations (UN) Secretary-General has listed parties to conflict in his annual report on children and armed conflict, the Monitoring and Reporting Mechanism collects data on attacks on schools and protected personnel and the military use of schools, as well as the cross-cutting violations of child recruitment or sexual violence when they occur at schools or along school routes. The Country Task Force on Monitoring and Reporting (CTFMR) manages the collection and verification of MRM data, as well as engaging in advocacy and response.

Data on sexual violence at, or on the way to or from, school and university may also be collected by the Monitoring, Analysis, and Reporting Arrangements (MARA) under the mandate of the Special Representative to the Secretary General on Sexual Violence in Conflict. The UN does not have a dedicated mechanism for monitoring attacks on higher education, but some incidents may be included in the annual report on the Protection of Civilians in Armed Conflict.

International and local NGOs typically play a role in reporting attacks on education, either independently or though participation in the humanitarian sector, such as an Education Cluster or Protection Cluster. Attacks on education are now frequently reported in humanitarian documents such as national Humanitarian Needs Overviews and Response Plans.

Other non-governmental or civil society organizations and rights monitors may also monitor attacks on education. For example, in Yemen, the Civilian Impact Monitoring Project reports on violent attacks affecting civilians, including attacks on schools and universities. In Ukraine,
the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe’s (OSCE) Special Monitoring Mission frequently reports attacks on schools and the military use of schools.

Finally, local and international media is reporting on attacks on education in certain contexts. Some databases on political violence or conflict also compile education-related events.

Some resources for accessing data on attacks on education include:
- UN OCHA’s Humanitarian Needs Overviews and Response Plans
- UN Human Rights Council Reports
- UN Annual and country-specific reports on Children and Armed Conflict
- Reports of UN Peacekeeping and Special Political Missions
- Education or Child Protection Cluster or Sub-Cluster Reports
- Media reports – as cited in Armed Conflict Location and Event Data project, Global Terrorism Database, or found online
- Insecurity Insight’s Education in Danger Monthly News Brief
- Scholars at Risk Network’s Academic Freedom Monitor

1.5 How to use the Toolkit for Collecting and Analyzing Data on Attacks on Education

We encourage organizations to read the Guidelines on Collecting Data and the definitions of attacks on education and other key terms before reading through the Indicator Framework. Considering the context, needs, and patterns of attacks on education first will guide an informed reading of the indicators and support in selecting the most relevant indicators for integration in monitoring and reporting efforts.

This Toolkit also includes a data template and codebook, however many of these indicators and disaggregation may not be feasible in every context. The Indicator Framework provides notes on limitations and feasibility for each indicator. Users can pick and choose, using the codebook and template, as both inspirational and aspirational guides. A first step could be collecting data on a handful of subdomains with some suggested disaggregation to strengthen data and analysis.

The following Diagnostic Tool serves as a guide for using the Toolkit. Once users situate themselves in the table based on their current capacities and data landscape, the Diagnostic Tool suggests next steps to improve data collection and analysis.

Table 2 Diagnostic Tool for using the Toolkit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Current data collection and reporting</th>
<th>Suggested next steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Emerging conflicts; Organizations or government beginning to collect data or to systematize efforts.</td>
<td>Limited incident-level data on attacks on education may exist; reports may not align with GCPEA definitions; No</td>
<td>• Identify one or two accessible data sources (see Section 1.1 and Steps 1 and 2 in Section 2); assess the data collection landscape and context.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2 | Established conflicts or crises; NGO, government, or other mechanism with experience collecting and reporting on attacks; MRM or coordination structure may exist; | Collection of incident-level data on attacks on education and regular reporting; categories of attacks may not fully align with GCPEA’s categories or suggested disaggregations. | • Review sample data collection sheets (see Appendix B)  
• Begin to input data into a basic datasheet (see Datasheet and Codebook)  
• Release short reports or infographics if possible  
• Harmonize attack definitions with GCPEA; expanding to additional categories of attack which may be less common or less frequently reported (e.g. Domains 3, 4, and 5)  
• Identify new indicators or disaggregation from the Indicator Framework  
• Revise data collection tools and spreadsheets to accommodate indicators and suggested disaggregation  
• Report disaggregated data more regularly; identify and incorporate additional data sources and build relationships with data repositories where needed  
• Drawing on the Framework, report simple impact analyses (e.g. 1.3.1 Number of students and education personnel reported injured or killed in attacks on schools or 1.4.1 Number of school days reportedly missed due to attacks on schools) |
| 3 | Established or prolonged conflicts; NGO, government, or MRM with long-standing experience collecting and reporting on attacks | Collecting and managing data on attacks from diverse sources; Routinely and accessibly reporting across all relevant attack categories to broad audiences using standard definitions | • Revise data collection tools and spreadsheets to accommodate indicators and suggested disaggregation  
• Collect and manage as much disaggregated data as possible, even if for a limited geography or time period  
• Obtain other education data (e.g., EMIS); run the more advanced analyses in the Indicator Framework  
• Report on the more complex impact of attacks (e.g. Indicator or 8.2.1 Overall proportion of educational institutions) |
1.5.1 Limitations to tracking the impacts of attacks

This Toolkit has two limitations in tracking the impact of attacks on education and military use of educational facilities. First, several common indicators of impact are not included due to data limitations. Specifically, students’ learning outcomes after an attack, whether learners continue their education or permanently drop out years after an attack, and the duration of students’ or educators’ detentions or arrests for their academic work or participating in education-related protests are not included as indicators since the longitudinal data necessary for the analyses are very rare. Second, other common indicators of impact are not found in the Indicator Framework due to strict definitions of attacks on education. Specifically, the Toolkit does not consider school closures due to generalized insecurity (rather than attacks or threats of attacks) or specific parents not sending their kids to school due to generalized fear (rather than a threat against the student or an attack on their school). The Toolkit follows GCP EA’s definitions of attacks on education and military use, which do not include school closures due to generalized insecurity or students remaining home out of generalized fear of attacks on education.
Section 2. Guidance on Collecting, Analyzing, and Reporting Data on Attacks on Education

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

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

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

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

---

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

**Step 1. Map relevant actors**
Organizations in the field should coordinate to assess existing data collection efforts. Often times, the Education or Child Protection Clusters take the lead on monitoring attacks on schools. Where a peacekeeping or special political mission is active, Clusters may work closely with these bodies to report incidents which the UN may then verify. NGOs, together with Clusters, may also produce sectoral needs assessments. The Ministry of Education may also capture some relevant information. In some cases, local media may also play an active role in reporting attacks or a civil society organization may be releasing regular reports on a specific type of attack on education.

Mapping these different actors will improve harmonization and lay the ground for the next steps.

**Key Questions**
What types of national data collection and reporting exist? Is there an annual statistical yearbook? Are there any human rights observatories or other civil society organizations collecting incident-level data? What actors monitor attacks on higher education?

What types of needs assessments are occurring at the community level and do they take in information on education or protection?

Are there are any variants in actors between regions within a single country? Humanitarian actors often publish a “Who does What Where and When” or 4W matrix (see a template [here](#)) to assist in coordination efforts among organizations working in certain regions. Consider doing a 4W exercise in relation to monitoring and responding to attacks on education.

**Step 2. Assess the security, political, and legal landscape**
Monitoring and reporting on attacks on education also requires an assessment of security, political, and legal landscapes. Having a lay of the land, especially with regards to any national legislation or military reforms prohibiting attacks on schools or military use of school can assist in planning for monitoring and reporting. Accurate information on security and humanitarian access will also facilitate planning for attacks on education.

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

An analysis of the security context will also help identify key trends of attacks on education. For example, in some contexts, attacks on school students, teachers, and other education personnel with firearms may be the most commonly reported form of attack on education. In other contexts, attacks on school or university facilities may occur more frequently and using explosive weapons.
Organizations must take the political landscape into account when publishing reports on attacks on education, particularly if it may lead to restrictions to their access or operations within a country. And knowledge of the political landscape will also help to later advocate for policy changes.

**Key Questions**

**Legal:** Has the government endorsed the Safe Schools Declaration? Does domestic law codify prohibitions of attacks on education or military use of schools and universities?

**Conflict:** Are government forces or non-state armed groups perpetrating attacks, or both? Do attacks occur in government or non-government controlled areas? Have non-state armed groups signed Action Plans with the OSRSG-CAAC or Deeds of Commitment with Geneva call or made other steps to end attacks on education?

**Security:** What barriers currently exist to accessing areas of the countries that are, or are likely to, experience attacks on education? What organizations have access? Has any organization trained local, community-based monitors? What can be done to ensure the safety of monitors? Are cross-border attacks happening and, if so, what cross-border responses are occurring? Are schools still closed due to Covid-19 or other factors?

For more information on safety and security of monitors, consult Right to Education Initiative and the Field Manual on Monitoring and Reporting Mechanism on Grave Violations against Children in Situations of Armed Conflict (OSRSG-CAAC, UNICEF, and DPKO).

**Step 3. Develop relevant tools and collect data**

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

The Indicator Framework provides suggested ways of disaggregating data for each attack – these can also guide the creation of data collection tools.

Differing contexts, and whether or not an MRM or other system is in place, will also influence the type of monitoring tools. For example, child recruitment and sexual violence at, or on the way to or from, school may be collected through the MRM or Mara; disaggregated data, however, can allow this information to be captured as an attack on education rather than only recruitment or sexual violence.

Data collection tools should be developed in a conflict-sensitive way, making sure that questions have been reviewed for any sensitivities related to group identity, gender, or other factors. When possible, relevant information pertaining to the ethnicity, religion or gender of the students served by an affected school or the education personnel affected may be collected.
In addition, data on attacks may be collected at the same time as other types of education data and therefore analyzed together to better understand impacts on learning or other areas.

Finally, organizations will have to plan for data entry and storage. In this Toolkit, GCPEA provides a template datasheet. However, others, such as the Ukraine Education Cluster, have made theirs publicly available and are included in Appendix B of this Guidance. The datasheet should align with the tools used to collect data (e.g., questionnaires).

**Key Questions**

What are the impacts of conflict on education? What impacts of attacks on education are most prominent (school closures, damage and destruction, teachers threatened)? Are there any other observed impacts of attacks on education on learning and education? Is data on attacks on education being collected at the same time as other educational data or protection data?

Do data collection tools ask gender sensitive questions? Do data collection tools reflect the realities of the situation on the ground? Are incidents of school-related sexual violence and child recruitment by parties to conflict included in current data collection efforts?

Does data collection on attacks on education occur at the same time as monitoring for other grave violations against children or other child protection or education issues?

Where is data entered? What data protection strategies are in place? Does the data entry system align with the data collection tool? Does all of the information fit easily in the data sheet?

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

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

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

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

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

**Key Questions**

What trainings have already occurred in-country or regionally? Are field monitors typically local or international staff or community-based partners? Are there any local organizations working with local communities on rights-based reporting?

What tools, knowledge, or systems are needed to more accurately collect and report on attacks on education?

What media sources currently report on attacks on education and is the reporting of good quality? Have journalists been trained in the definitions of attacks on education and the benefits of including key details in reports, such as the alleged perpetrator and gender of affected students?

What local perceptions exist of attacks on education?

**Step 5. Analyzing data**

The Indicator Framework of this *Toolkit* provides detailed information on indicators and subdomains for each form of attack on education. The framework is separated into eight domains, with 24 subdomains and 38 indicators. Each of the 38 indicators suggests calculations and possible disaggregation, as well as data sources if an organization is not planning to collect primary data.

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

Although context-specific, the first indicator in each domain (e.g., 1.1.1, 2.1.1, 3.1.1) may be worth prioritizing. The number of reported attacks is often the most pressing piece of information and these indicators are foundational for subsequent calculations. Other indicators, such as damage or impact on education, are valuable but often less pressing and

---

\(^3\) For more on the importance of incorporating reports from local NGOs and communities, see: Bennouna et al., “Monitoring and reporting attacks on education in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Somalia,” *Disasters*, 2018, 42(2): 314–335.

For more on the importance of actively pursuing “diverse and contrary data points,” see: Guide to: Conflict Analysis, UNICEF, November 2016, pp. 41-43.
may require additional data. Based on local capacities and data availability, these latter indicators may be aspirational in many contexts.

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

These indicators can help education actors to identify, compile, and analyze data from other sources to generate a full description of attacks on education in the field.

Table 3: Attacks on Education Indicator Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Subdomain</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Attacks on schools</td>
<td>1.1 Incidents of attacks on schools</td>
<td>1.1.1 Number of reported attacks on schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.2 Proportion of schools reportedly attacked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Damage and destruction</td>
<td>1.2.1 Proportion of schools reported as damaged or destroyed by attacks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 Casualties</td>
<td>1.3.1 Number of students and education personnel reported injured or killed in attacks on schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4 Impact on education</td>
<td>1.4.1 Number of school days reportedly missed due to attacks on schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4.2 Reported number of students or education personnel whose education or work was affected by attacks on schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Attacks on students, teachers, and other education personnel</td>
<td>2.1 Incidents</td>
<td>2.1.1 Number of reported attacks on students, teachers, and other education personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.2 Reported number of incidents of excessive use of force at education-related protests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 Students or education personnel harmed</td>
<td>2.2.1 Number of students or education personnel reportedly injured, killed, or abducted in targeted violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.2 Number of students or education personnel reportedly injured or killed in incidents of repression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 Arrests and detentions</td>
<td>2.3.1 Number of students or education personnel reportedly arrested or detained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Military use of schools and universities</td>
<td>3.1 Incidents of military use</td>
<td>3.1.1 Number of reported incidents of military use of schools and universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1.2 Total number of days affected by military use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1.3 Number of schools and universities reportedly used for military purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 Casualties</td>
<td>3.2.1 Number of students or education personnel reported injured or killed in military use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3 Impact on education</td>
<td>3.3.1 Reported total number of days that schools or universities were closed due to military use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3.2 Number of students or education personnel whose education or work was reportedly affected by military use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1 Incidents</td>
<td>4.1.1 Binary assessment of the existence of child recruitment at, or on the way to or from, school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Sub-section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Child recruitment at, or on the way to or from, school</td>
<td>4.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sexual violence at, or on the way to or from, school or university</td>
<td>5.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Attacks on higher education institutions</td>
<td>6.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Attacks on higher education students, academics, and other personnel</td>
<td>7.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Overall Attacks on Education</td>
<td>8.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Step 6. Reporting on attacks on education

Once collected, organizations should share data with local, national, and international stakeholders. The methods and frequency of reporting should align with the policy, accountability, and prevention and response needs of actors in the field.

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

These different types of reports can inform education sector planning and direct resources to repair schools or ensure that students and education personnel have adequate support to continue learning. For example, an understanding of the proportion of schools damaged and destroyed in a conflict would support educational planning but also advocacy efforts with governments, donors, and even perpetrators of attacks.

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

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

GCPEA publishes its data on the Humanitarian Data Exchange and the UNESCO Institute for Statistics websites.

Key Questions?
What types of data are being published and where? How often is data being published? If the MRM is in place, is the number of unverified reports also published? Do other UN agencies, such as a peacekeeping, release UN-verified data on a regular basis? Can data on attacks on education be reported regularly enough to support prevention and response? Do donors have access to data on attacks on education?

What other education or protection data is regularly published? Are there other forms of disaggregation that would support advocacy or response?

What sensitivities around the data exist and what measures can mitigate these risks? Are there any data sets that could be shared publicly or with specific stakeholders?
Appendices

Appendix A – Definitions and Key Concepts

Definitions

Attacks on education are defined as any threatened or actual use of force against students, teachers, academics, education support and transport staff (e.g., janitors, bus drivers), education officials, education buildings, resources, or facilities (including school buses). They are perpetrated by armed forces, other state security forces, or non-state armed groups for political, military, ideological, sectarian, ethnic, or religious reasons. Attacks that clearly have criminal motivations, or that are perpetrated by lone wolf actors are not included.

GCPEA divides attacks on education and military use into six sub-categories:

- **Attacks on schools**: Targeted violent attacks or threats of violent attack on primary or secondary school infrastructure, or collateral damage to that infrastructure due to indiscriminate fighting or attacks. Examples include arson, explosive attacks, airstrikes, shelling, or crossfire.

- **Attacks on students, teachers, and other education personnel**: Targeted violent attacks or threats of attack on primary or secondary school students or educators, which take place in school settings or on the way to or from school, or otherwise target these individuals for education-related reasons. Also included are cases in which repression to silence students or education personnel in the context of education (e.g. in school settings or in education-related protests). Examples include targeted killings, injuries, torture, abductions, forced disappearances, threats of violence, or use of force against or arrest of students or education personnel.

- **Military use of schools or universities**: Cases in which armed forces, other state security forces, or non-state armed groups occupy schools and use them for purposes that support a military effort, such as bases, barracks, and temporary shelters for those associated with fighting forces; for fighting positions, weapons storage facilities, and detention and interrogation centers; and for military training or drilling soldiers.

- **Child recruitment at, or on the way to or from, school**: Cases in which armed forces, other state security forces, or non-state armed groups forcibly recruit children from their schools or school routes. GCPEA considers all recruitment of children under the age of 18 as child recruitment, in line with international standards, regardless of the legal instruments or other commitments signed by states or armed groups. Children may be recruited as fighters, spies, or intelligence sources; for domestic work; to transport weapons or other materials; or for any other purposes associated with the armed group.

- **Sexual violence at, or on the way to or from, school or university**: Cases in which armed forces, other state security forces, or non-state armed groups rape, sexually harass, or abuse students or educators; abduct students or educators for sexual purposes; recruit students or educators to serve a sexual function in an armed force or armed group; or threaten to engage in such conduct.

- **Attacks on higher education**: Targeted violent attacks or threats of violent attack on higher education infrastructure or collateral damage to that infrastructure due to indiscriminate fighting or attacks. Also includes targeted violent attacks or threats of attack targeted university students, professors, or personnel, as well as cases in which violent repression, including the excessive use of force, is used against students or education personnel in the context of education-related protests or in relation to their academic work.
**Students** are defined as any learner studying at a formal or nonformal educational institution.

**Education personnel** refers to anyone working professionally, or volunteering, in the education system, at any level. Personnel may include teachers, academics, education officials, or education support and transport staff such as: education administrators, janitors, bus drivers, and librarians.

**Educational facilities** are defined as any site where students learn from a designated instructor, or where the learning process is supported, at any level of learning. In addition to primary and secondary schools, this includes preschools, kindergartens, universities, technical and vocational education training institutes, and non-formal education sites, as well as student or teacher dormitories, school buses, and warehouses or vehicles dedicated to storing or transporting educational materials. These facilities may be run by the state or other entities, including religious organizations.

**Educational materials** include textbooks, school records, or teaching and learning supplies.

**State armed forces** may include national military and armed forces. **Multinational forces** include regional forces and UN peacekeeping forces. **Other state security forces** include paramilitary groups, law enforcement, paramilitary police, police acting as combatants in an armed conflict, and intelligence or security services.

**Non-state armed groups** may include rebel, opposition, separatist, or extremist groups, but does not include criminal gangs.

**Excessive force** is any force which is in excess of what is necessary for the performance of law enforcement duties. This includes cases in which armed forces, law enforcement, or other state security entities use live ammunition, teargas, or water cannons, or other force against students or education staff during education-related protests.

An **Education-related protest** either (a) occurs on school grounds, regardless of its aim, or (b) is related to education, even if it occurs off school grounds. Education-related protests do not include incidents in which students or staff participate in off-campus protests unrelated to education, even if the leaders of the protest were students.

An **arrest** refers to the arrest, charge, detention, or imprisonment of students or education personnel. Although “detention” (reasonable suspicion) and “arrest” (probable cause) are different notions in law enforcement, language used in media or other reports may conflate these.

**Damage** is defined as any physical harm, whether light or heavy, that occurred during an incident of attack.

**Destruction** occurs when an educational facility is fully destroyed during an incident of an attack. An educational facility is considered “fully destroyed” if a source reports that it was “fully destroyed,” “destroyed,” or “rendered unusable.”

**Explosive weapons** include air-dropped bombs, artillery projectiles, missiles and rockets, mortars, antipersonnel mines, and improvised explosive devices. Some are launched from the air, while

---

4 More on the use of excessive force and human rights law can be found in the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights *International Human Rights Standards for Law Enforcement* or *Basic Principles on the Use of Force and Firearms by Law Enforcement Officials*
others are ground launched; they generally create a zone of blast and fragmentation with the potential to kill, injure or damage anyone or anything within that zone.

**Abduction** is defined as taking a person away by means of persuasion, fraud, or force.

**Notes on scope**

Attacks on education do not include violence perpetrated by criminal organizations or individuals, such as lone gunmen, without an affiliation to armed forces, other state security forces, or non-state armed groups. Likewise, violence perpetrated by teachers against students, students against other students, students against teachers, or by students or teachers against education facilities is not considered an attack on education for the purposes of this Toolkit, unless those individuals are affiliated with an armed force or group and acting in that capacity.

In many cases, it is clear which armed force or group is responsible for an attack on education or military use of an educational facility. For instance, the perpetrator may issue a statement claiming responsibility for the action, a UN agency or NGO may investigate and release findings, or a local or international justice system may convict a perpetrator guilty of an attack or military use. In such cases, this information is considered when determining whether an event qualifies as an attack on education. Sometimes, however, the perpetrator of a violent event is unknown. For instance, a fire may appear to be intentionally set in a school, but it may be unclear whether criminals or an armed force or group set the fire and, thus, whether the event is common arson or qualifies as an attack on education. In such cases, Toolkit users should rely on other details to determine whether the violence meets the criteria for an attack on education or military use, including determining whether there is an established pattern of attacks on education by armed forces or groups in that context.

**Incident reports and aggregate counts explained:**

**Incident:** one attack on education or case of military use of an educational facility.

**Aggregate count:** a tally of attacks on education or military use of educational facilities, often over a range of time such as a month or year, published as one number by one source. An aggregate count contains at least two incidents, but details about these individual incidents are not available. (Aggregate counts are distinct from incident tallies, because they are a figure published by one organization, rather than a collation of incident reports from many organizations).

**Examples of incident and aggregate count from external sources:**

Example of an incident report: “Over the past two weeks, the Tabotaki and Dan-Marké secondary schools closed due to threats made by alleged armed group members. The Tillabéri Department of Secondary Education has brought 80 students, including 28 girls, to a more secured area in Abala village where they will continue pursuing their education in preparation for their final examinations scheduled from 6 to 8 August...According to local authorities, as of 10 March, 263 schools remain closed due to insecurity in the Tillabéri region.”

---

Example of an aggregate count (school): “The United Nations verified 24 attacks on schools (9) and hospitals (15), all of which were unattributed.”

Example of an aggregate count (military use): “Four incidents of the military use of schools by the Popular Mobilization Forces were verified.”

Example of where miscategorizing an event is possible (lack of differentiation): “Three attacks affected schools and related protected personnel.”

Example of a report not including exact numbers of students or personnel affected: “On Monday, the police had to resort to water cannon and lathicharge...due to which, a few teachers complained that they received injuries on their heads. Computer teachers from across Haryana gathered at Sector 5 in Panchkula to protest against the state government. They claimed that the government is ignoring their long-pending demands, including hike in their salaries and permanent jobs.”

Notes on counting

Where reports use imprecise language to report on the number of student or education personnel killed, numbers are tallied as follows: a few is tallied as 3; tens is tallied as 20; a dozen is tallied as 12; dozens is tallied as 24; hundreds is tallied as 200; a score is tallied as 20; scores is tallied as 40; students (e.g., “students were killed”) is tallied as 2; teachers (e.g., “teachers were killed”) is tallied as 2. If the role of those killed is not clear (e.g., it is not clear whether those killed were students or education personnel as opposed to other civilians or fighters), then those numbers should be excluded from the tally.

If an educational institution is being used as a center for internally displaced persons at the time of attack, then any students or education personnel killed or harmed are not counted in the total number of students and education personnel killed or harmed because they were not killed or harmed in their capacity as students or education personnel.

The Codebook provides additional details for how to count attacks on education and casualties.

Appendix B – Sample tools

This section will include a range of tools collected from different education cluster partners.

---