



Safe to Learn

South Sudan Diagnostic Exercise

May 2020



Yabongo Girls Secondary School, Yambio Freedom Square, Western Equatoria State, 2009.
Photo credit: Simon Peter Wani

Lead researcher: Simon Peter Wani



Table of Contents

Table of Tables	4
Table of Acronyms	5
Executive Summary	6
Key priorities and recommendations based on identified gaps and best practices	14
Call to Action 1: Implement laws and policies.....	14
Call to Action 2: Strengthen prevention and response at school level	15
Call to Action 3: Shift social norms and behaviour change	16
Call to Action 4: Invest resources effectively.....	17
Call to Action 5: Generate and use evidence.....	17
1. Introduction	18
2. Background	19
2.1. Education in South Sudan	19
2.2. Violence in South Sudan	21
3. Methodology	21
3.1. Geographic coverage and school sampling	21
3.2. Information collection process	22
3.3. Customisation of the tool to the South Sudan context	23
3.4 Ethical Issues	23
3.5. Challenges/limitations	23
4. Findings and Analysis	25
4.1. Findings for Call to Action 1: Implement laws and policies.....	26
Summary of findings for Benchmark 1	32
4.2. Findings for Call to Action 2: Strengthen prevention and response at school level	35
Summary of findings for Benchmark 2	43
4.3. Findings for Call to Action 3: Shift social norms and behaviour change	45
Summary of findings for Benchmark 3	48
4.4. Findings for Call to Action 4: Invest resources effectively	49
Summary of findings for Benchmark 4	51
4.5. Findings for Call to Action 5: Generate and use evidence.....	53
Summary of findings for Benchmark 5	55
5. Recommendations	57

6. Conclusion.....	61
Annexes.....	65
Annex 1: Call to Action.....	65
Annex 2: Document List.....	68
Annex 3: Sampling Frame	71
Annex 4: Diagnostic Tools.....	73
Annex 5: Terms of Reference (TORs)	114
Annex 6: Schedule of Activities.....	118

Table of Tables

Table 1: Summary table of Benchmark Indicator Status based on the Diagnostic Exercise	12
Table 2: Summary of final sample by region, state and school type.....	22
Table 3: Summary of respondents.....	22
Table 4: Findings for Call to Action Benchmark 1 – Implementation of laws and policies	26
Table 5: Findings for Call to Action Benchmark 2 – Strengthening prevention and response at school level.....	35
Table 6: Findings for Call to Action Benchmark 3 – Shifting social norms and behaviour change	45
Table 7: Findings for Call to Action Benchmark 4 – Investing resources effectively.....	49
Table 8: Findings for Call to Action Benchmark 5 – Generating and using evidence.....	53
Table 9: Summary table of Benchmark Indicator Status based on the Diagnostic Exercise	63

Table of Acronyms

Acronym	Full Term
BOG	Board of governors
CSR	Corporate Social Responsibility
DFID	United Kingdom Department for International Development
EMIS	Education management information system
EU	European Union
GBV	Gender-based violence
GCPEA	The Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack
GDP	Gross domestic product
GESP	General Education Strategic Plan (2018-2022)
GESS	Girls' Education South Sudan programme
IDP	Internally displaced person
MGCSW	Ministry of Gender, Child and Social Welfare
MLT	Medium to long term
MoGEI	Ministry of General Education and Instruction
NGO	Non-governmental organization
PoC	Protection of civilian
PTA	Parent-teacher association
ST	Short term
STL	Safe to Learn
UN	United Nations
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation
UNGEI	United Nations Girls' Education Initiative
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WFP	World Food Program
WHO	World Health Organisation

Executive Summary

Overview of the Safe to Learn Initiative and South Sudan Context

The 'Safe to Learn' (STL) Campaign is a global initiative launched at the Education World Forum in January 2019 where core partners adopted a Call to Action that set out a five-point policy agenda to end all violence in schools by 2024. The action points in this agenda include priorities to: (1) implement policy and legislation; (2) strengthen prevention and response at the school level; (3) shift social norms and behaviour change; (4) invest resources effectively; and (5) generate and use evidence.

The Call to Action was subsequently translated into a set of benchmarks, which were developed based on international child rights frameworks, United Nations (UN) tools and minimum standards, and best practice from the field of child safeguarding. The Call to Action is set out in Annex 1 while the benchmarks are described in detail throughout this report and summarised in table 1. For each benchmark, there are national, state and school-level 'checkpoints' or requirements that governments and the education sector should meet in order to ensure that schools are safe and protective. These benchmarks formed the basis for a Diagnostic Tool which aims to measure the degree to which governments are meeting these standards.

The Diagnostic Tool was then used to conduct diagnostic exercises in five focal countries to gauge governments' compliance, identify best practices, gaps and priorities, and establish a baseline for tracking countries' progress. This report presents the results of the diagnostic exercise conducted in South Sudan between November 2019 and March 2020 and summarises the status of each benchmark and checkpoint in table 1. Key informant interviews and surveys were undertaken with officials at the national and state levels, as well as head teachers, teachers and students in 24 schools across the Western Bahr el Ghazala, Upper Nile and Equatoria regions. Regarding selection, national, state level, head teacher and deputy head teacher respondents were sampled purposively according to their role, while teachers and students were first stratified by gender and then randomly sampled. Despite the wide geographic coverage, however, the final sample is not nationally representative of South Sudan and the findings in this report cannot be generalised to other schools or areas across the country.

The context of South Sudan poses certain challenges concerning both the provision of education and the conduct of the diagnostic exercise. Education takes place against a backdrop of political instability, a struggling economy, extreme poverty, food insecurity and environmental issues such as flooding. According to a 2019 Humanitarian Needs Overview, 7.1 million people out of a total population of 11.4 million require humanitarian assistance, one out of three people have been displaced, five out of 10 children are out of school, and six out of 10 people now face food insecurity.

Notwithstanding these difficulties, this report sets out examples of good practices that were identified, the challenges and gaps that remain, and the recommendations to support the Government and education sector to meet the STL benchmarks in order to ensure that schools are safe environments that enhance learning for all children.

Overview of current legislation and policies regarding violence in schools

The Government of South Sudan has enacted various pieces of legislation relating to the education, protection and safeguarding of children. Both the **Transitional Constitution 2011** and the **General Education Act 2012** passed by the National Legislative Assembly recognise the provision of free and compulsory primary education as a right for all. They further prohibit the mistreatment of children with article 17, section 1(f) of the Transitional Constitution 2011 stating that 'children have a right to be free from corporal punishment and cruel and inhuman treatment by any person including parents, school administration and any other institutions.

The **Child Act 2008** was also developed to promote and protect children's rights in South Sudan. Section 21b specifies that 'no child shall be subjective to corporal punishment by chiefs, police, and teachers, prison guards in any place or institution including schools, prison and reformatories. Anyone who fails to comply with the Act commits an offence according to section 35, and upon conviction shall be sentenced to imprisonment for a term not exceeding six months or a fine or both. In addition, there is a national **Girl Child Protection Policy**, which sits under the custody of the Directorate of Gender and Child Welfare.

Under both the 2008 and 2012 Acts, the Ministry of General Education and Instruction (MoGEI) has responsibilities regarding response to and the referral of incidences of violence. This includes collaboration with the Ministry of Gender, Child and Social Welfare (MGCSW) to assess the situation, the Ministry of Health to treat the victim (if necessary) and the Ministry of Justice to enforce the law, which may involve convicting the perpetrator depending on the magnitude of the violation. The MGCSW also has counsellors who offer psychosocial support and desks at police stations to deal with school-related and gender-based violence (GBV).

The nationalisation and implementation of the relevant legislation and policy is conducted through the **General Education Strategic Plan (2018-2022)** (GESP) and **South Sudan Education Policy** which recognise the need to address violence against children, emphasise the importance of safety for learners, and highlight the need to locate schools near communities to ensure security for children on their way to and from school. These are complemented by policies, strategies, plan and other documents developed by technical teams through research and verifications exercises in the country. Furthermore, the Government of South Sudan has endorsed the **Safe Schools Declaration** and developed national guidelines to ensure school buildings and grounds keep students safe.

At the school level, there is the **South Sudan Teachers Professional Code of Conduct 2008** which sets out general expectations around teachers' conduct but no specific provision regarding zero tolerance to all forms of violence. For example, part IV number 4.9 sets out that 'the teacher shall not carry to class dangerous items like guns, grenades, arrows unless cleared by the school authority' and more generic wording in part VI number 6.3 requires that 'the teacher shall observe the laws of South Sudan particularly in matters of sex, marriage and parenthood and at all times set a good example to children'. Head teachers are responsible for implementing and enforcing the Code of Conduct and can suspend an offending teacher for a period of one month. Thereafter, the head teacher can also inform the school sub-committee on discipline to make a ruling, which can involve relieving the teacher of his or her duties, expulsion, suspension or complete withdrawal of the teacher's certificate. In addition, there is the **South Sudan Teachers Code of Conduct for Emergency Situation**, which was developed by MoGEI with support from UNICEF. This supplementary Code is more explicit in terms of child rights and safeguarding, and prohibits the use of physical punishment, shaming or humiliation in schools.

Overview of NGO and Donor Activities

Numerous international agencies and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) are active in South Sudan, however, few initiatives deal directly with violence in schools. Partners like the UN's Children's Fund (UNICEF), War Child Canada, Save the Children, the UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) and INTERSOS support the MoGEI in relation to engagement with stakeholders to build knowledge, research and appreciation of child rights and laws prohibiting violence. Humanitarian agencies also provide qualified counsellors through health facilities in protection of civilian (PoC) sites and refugee camps to provide comprehensive support to learners. UN agencies and NGOs further help to coordinate cluster groups with different sub-national authorities, such as the MoGEI, Ministries of Health and Justice, the MGCSW and the Ministry of Internal Affairs, to deal with issues like child violence across sectors.

More broadly related to education, various organisations such as UNICEF and the Girls' Education South Sudan programme, funded by the United Kingdom Department for International Development (DFID), provide direct support to girls in schools and the national MoGEI, sometimes allocating a member of staff within the ministry to oversee, advise or report on certain activities. Support also comes through the provision of capitation grants which go directly to schools. UNICEF further provides an education in emergencies package under the government's Back to Learning (BTL) Initiative with support from the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), The Royal Norwegian Embassy and the European Union (EU). This includes a focus on the provision of temporary learning spaces, the training and recruitment of volunteer teachers, particularly in PoC sites, and the provision of learning materials. Integrated within this package is training for teachers, MoGEI staff and community social workers on the provision of psychosocial services both in and around school settings. Meanwhile, DFID has established an initiative to keep teachers in school by paying them a stipend of \$40 per month to supplement their government salary and the World Food Program (WFP) facilitates a school feeding programme where they provide food to registered schools.

Overview of findings: good practices identified

There are several examples of good practice identified in South Sudan, often demonstrating resilience among education stakeholders in the face of a challenging operational context. In each case, however, the examples are not necessarily representative of practices across South Sudan but rather indicate initiatives that are being undertaken in at least a few different settings and show what can be done.

First, in addition to its legislation and policies regarding child protection and safeguarding, South Sudan is rolling out a **new curriculum framework** to replace the previous 'teacher-oriented' curriculum. The content of the new curriculum is broad and inclusive, having been developed on the cultural and environmental context and experience of South Sudan. Life skills, violence and safe behaviour, and the promotion of inclusion of marginalised groups appear to have been given priority in light of the conflict-affected context. However, the topics and syllabus have not yet been comprehensively broken down to provide details regarding the scope or magnitude of each component.

More broadly, the new curriculum fits into a national drive and agenda for peace and unity. At the national level, there is a **radio programme aired country wide called 'Sawa Shabaab'** that particularly focuses on youth and encourages them towards dialogue, cooperation and unity, rather than violence. Beyond government, **organisations like Safe to Play and programmes like UNICEF's 'Safe to Learn'** offer other initiatives that are addressing violence. Schools also reported encouraging their learners to participate in **key initiatives including traditional music, drama, arts and crafts, trainings, radio shows, games and sports** as ways of addressing differences to minimise violence. These activities are often organised by the schools to give learners opportunities to engage with students from different tribes and other backgrounds.

Regarding government bodies, respondents repeatedly referred to the **coordination and collaboration between the MoGEI and the MGSCW in tackling violence against children**. Particular activities described included proactively and regularly visiting schools to collect details of violations, especially related to gender, and monitoring how community and social processes affect learners. Respondents also reported that the MGSCW is collaborating with teachers and head teachers to handle cases of GBV, which may be reported to the Director General, to take more formal action or increase pressure on teachers to comply with the Code of Conduct. However, there were queries around whether the MGCSW has an established system to record and retain this information, and if the data is reliable for formal decision-making.

At both state and school levels, various stakeholders displayed considerable resilience in the face of conflict, insecurity and limited government resources. In some cases, and because of the limited dissemination of physical policy documents, states and schools had gone ahead to work with NGOs and established their **own guidelines for child protection and safeguarding, and mechanisms and procedures for responding to incidents of violence** in schools. With teachers leaving schools to flee conflict or pursue alternative sources of income, many schools are now staffed by volunteer teachers. Although not ideal for long-term sustainability and continuity, teaching by volunteers serving their community at least helps to minimise disruptions to children's learning.

Indeed, there is evidence that in some schools **parent-teacher associations (PTAs)** play a crucial role in supporting volunteer teachers, ensuring the continuing operation of schools and, in some cases, dealing with issues of violence. Through PTAs, communities and individual parents provide incentives for volunteer teachers, which may include money, food, clothing, accommodation or other ways of appreciating a teacher's service. PTAs and their representatives may also be charged with monitoring child safety and welfare in schools, overseeing and enforcing school rules, or influencing responses to particular cases of violence. The involvement of PTAs in these issues further helps to sensitise parents and other members of the community about policies relating to child protection. However, if schools rely on PTAs for funding it may also risk excluding those children whose families cannot afford to pay fees or contributions, or even purchase school uniforms.

In some schools visited, the **pupils themselves also have more formal roles in dealing with issues of school violence**. At both primary and secondary levels, such schools have selected learners, who may be prefects or the head boy or girl and possibly elected by other students, as first responders to handle incidents of conflict or violence in schools. These representatives work with duty teachers to ensure the safety of all learners.

Overview of findings: challenges and gaps identified

Child protection, safeguarding and education face major challenges in the South Sudan context. Many of these relate to or result from the **country's ongoing conflict and political instability**, in which parties have committed serious abuses against civilians, including children. National insecurity has given rise to **extreme poverty and widespread hunger**, preventing children from growing up in a secure and peaceful environment and exercising their right to education. Across the country, 21% of schools are reportedly closed and 15% of the schools visited during the diagnostic exercise reported having faced an attack, ranging from theft to looting by armed forces.

Even where schools are open and operating, learners may be exposed to increased risks of violence. There is evidence that some **schools are occupied by military forces or internally displaced persons (IDPs)**, or simply not being used for fears of insecurity. In certain places, **multiple schools share the same crowded facilities** to enable learners to continue with their studies. Within the classroom, both teachers and learners still appear to fear the consequences of perceived tribal or political allegiances while some students have reportedly been recruited by politically motivated criminal groups. With ongoing political uncertainties concerning the future administrative structure of South Sudan, some of these obstacles look likely to continue.

In addition to the effects of conflict and insecurity, **budget and financial constraints** also pose major challenges for education generally, and the reduction of violence in schools specifically. At the national level, respondents indicated that the education budget is allocated according to priorities including human resources, staff costs and incentives (1%), use of goods and services (11%), transfers to subnational structures (59%) and capital expenditure (29%)¹, but is inadequate overall and

¹ UNICEF (2019) Education budget brief, South Sudan

insufficient for violence prevention and response initiatives. Despite a budget allocation increase to over 9% of total national budget during the 2018/2019 fiscal year, spending on the sector has remained low, particularly when adjusted for hyperinflation due to the country's sharp fall in real gross domestic product (GDP)².

At the state level, MoGEI respondents reported that **allocated funds are not provided for their intended purpose and education activities remain underfunded**. State ministries often rely on off-budget support provided by NGOs or development partners to allow them to carry out basic functions. As a result, school inspection and the monitoring and reporting of key issues relating to school management, not least compliance with violence-related legislation and policies and implementation of the Teachers Code of Conduct, remain extremely weak in most cases. Earmarked funding for specific donor projects means that there is limited contribution towards the promotion of child-friendly and gender-sensitive learning spaces that contribute to the reduction of violence and GBV specifically. For example, while basic infrastructure and classrooms have been provided in some cases, the majority of schools still struggle to maintain and renovate building structures leaving spaces unsafe, and there is rarely adequate funding for the provision of gender-sensitive sanitary facilities which impacts the safety of female learners in particular.

Budget and capacity constraints also appear to have given rise to the **limited dissemination and implementation of national policies and formal guidelines**, relating to violence or otherwise. Despite the endorsement of the Safe Schools Declaration, and the existence of child protection legislation and the Teachers Code of Conduct, few schools seemed able to access the relevant documents and a lack of effective dissemination to both states and schools limits their knowledge and understanding of what should be implemented and how. At the national level, even though these policies exist within individual ministries, they are not easily accessible because **there is no central repository** and they are usually **unavailable online**. Similarly, due to decentralisation and weak monitoring and reporting mechanisms from the state to the national level, there is limited evidence to suggest that the central MoGEI has suitable mechanisms in place to monitor the implementation of policies and legislation in schools. Related to this, **language presents another barrier that hinders effective dissemination and implementation**. In addition to the cost of printing documents, the multiplicity of languages spoken in South Sudan increases the demand for resources. For example, as the main language in South Sudan, all policies generated by the Government are written in English, but in northern locations the majority of the population including state ministry officials and school staff still speak Arabic. Without budget for suitable translations, effective dissemination and capacity building, the implementation of the relevant documents will likely remain a challenge.

The **informality and instability of the teaching workforce** presents a further gap in ensuring children's protection from violence in schools. Although the commitment of volunteers and communities to minimise educational disruption is commendable, the use of **unqualified and untrained teachers** poses potential additional risks in terms of learning quality and children's safety as only a small number of volunteers are professionally trained and schools have to rely on NGOs for training on issues such as positive discipline. This **informality also affects the vetting and accountability of volunteer teachers**. South Sudan has no guidelines for states or schools on how to conduct background checks to assess teachers' suitability for working with children and the wide use of volunteer teachers likely opens up further laxity. Furthermore, since such teachers are not on the payroll, the state ministries perceive themselves as having limited authority over them and fear that increasing demands or enforcing policies could risk pushing them away, leaving schools and classrooms unstaffed.

Overall, there are several major gaps in providing protection to children from the violence in schools in South Sudan. At the national level, there is the Girl Child Protection Policy but **no explicit policy**

² Ibid.

that addresses the welfare or protection of male children. Likewise, there are no national policies that provide guidance on implementing or researching interventions to address social norms regarding violence. Within schools, **students indicated that corporal punishment is still practised** and one NGO reported that violence is not typically considered serious until someone needs medical attention. The vast majority of teacher respondents had little or no access to key documents such as the Code of Conduct, 86% were unaware of a policy that prohibits corporal punishment and only 15% of learners surveyed in the exercise were aware of their school having a step-by-step process for responding to violence. More broadly, there appear to be **no guidelines or mechanisms for schools to establish safe and confidential response processes** and few schools seem to systematically record and report instances of violence. Sensitive issues like child abuse by teachers, pregnancies and forced marriage, for example, are not shared, and tend to be managed at the school and community levels.

Table 1: Summary table of Benchmark Indicator Status based on the Diagnostic Exercise

A = In place	B = Partially in place	C = Not in place
--------------	------------------------	------------------

Please note: The below assessments were based on the findings from the study. Discussion and rationale are provided in the report.

Call to Action	Benchmark Indicator	Sub-Indicator	National	State	School
1. Implement laws and policies	1.1 Prevention of violence in and around schools is identified as a specific strategy in the national education sector policy or plan.		A = In place	B = Partially in place	B = Partially in place
	1.2 There is explicit prohibition of corporal punishment in schools, and policies are in place to support positive discipline and classroom management.	Laws that prohibit corporal punishment are implemented and enforced.	A = In place	B = Partially in place	B = Partially in place
		Teacher training covers positive discipline and classroom management.	C = Not in place	C = Not in place	C = Not in place
	1.3 The roles and responsibilities of the Ministry of Education in response and referral to incidents of violence are clearly set out in a multi-sectoral national child protection policy framework.	A national and multi-sectoral policy framework outlines the role of key formal actors.	B = Partially in place	B = Partially in place	B = Partially in place
		The Ministry of Education has established a national child protection/safeguarding policy which is enforced.	B = Partially in place	B = Partially in place	B = Partially in place
	1.4 The country has endorsed the Safe Schools Declaration and in situations of armed conflict is implementing the Guidelines for Protecting Schools and Universities from Military Use during Armed Conflict.		B = Partially in place	C = Not in place	C = Not in place
2. Strengthen prevention and response at school level	2.1 Key violence prevention strategies are embedded in curriculum-based activities for children.		B = Partially in place	B = Partially in place	C = Not in place
	2.2 Child safeguarding principles and procedures are in place in schools, inclusive of codes of conduct, and safe recruitment standards.	National guidelines to establish safe and confidential reporting mechanisms.	B = Partially in place	B = Partially in place	B = Partially in place
		Norms and standards of ethical behaviour in Teachers Code of Conduct.	B = Partially in place	B = Partially in place	B = Partially in place

		Pre- and in-service training on obligations for child safeguarding and reporting/response.	B = Partially in place	C = Not in place	C = Not in place
		Policies that regulate hiring of new teachers and staff and their transfer to ensure suitability for working with children.	C = Not in place	C = Not in place	C = Not in place
	2.3	Each school has at least one focal point who is capacitated to provide front-line mental health/psychosocial support to children experiencing violence.	C = Not in place	C = Not in place	C = Not in place
	2.4	The physical environment in and around schools is safe and designed with the well-being of children in mind.	B = Partially in place	C = Not in place	C = Not in place
3. Shift social norms and behaviour change	3.1	There is wide dissemination and engagement with stakeholders to build knowledge and appreciation of child rights and laws prohibiting violence.	B = Partially in place	C = Not in place	C = Not in place
	3.2	Specific, evidence-informed interventions are researched and implemented, addressing social norms that drive key forms of violence and/or helping children manage risks.	B = Partially in place	C = Not in place	C = Not in place
	3.3	Young people, parents, teachers and community members in and around schools are engaged and active on the topic of school violence.	B = Partially in place	B = Partially in place	B = Partially in place
4. Invest resources effectively	4.1	Domestic resources have been allocated to support interventions and capacity building activities to prevent and respond to violence in schools.	C = Not in place	C = Not in place	C = Not in place
	4.2	Development partners provide resources targeting national or subnational level to end violence in schools, investing in effective approaches.	A = In place	B = Partially in place	B = Partially in place
	4.3	There is private sector engagement in the provision of financial and non-financial resources including technical support, expertise and advocacy towards ending violence in schools.	C = Not in place	C = Not in place	C = Not in place
5. Generate and use evidence	5.1	Information and reporting of incidents allow for disaggregated baseline information and monitoring of trends and that reflect needs and gaps in the system.	C = Not in place	B = Partially in place	C = Not in place
	5.2	There is regular data collection on prevalence and forms of violence in schools using methods that follow high ethical standards.	C = Not in place	B = Partially in place	C = Not in place
	5.3	Decisions on replication and scale-up of violence prevention initiatives are based on evaluations of trialed models and approaches.	C = Not in place	C = Not in place	C = Not in place

Key priorities and recommendations based on identified gaps and best practices

The findings outlined above point to numerous key priorities and recommendations for the government and other stakeholders to meet the benchmarks for the five STL Calls to Action. In each case, such recommendations must be considered within the wider context of South Sudan, not least the ongoing conflict, political uncertainty and extreme poverty. These factors impact on the education system in major ways, for example, by creating instability in the teaching workforce and limiting the budget available for spending on education, particularly at the state and school levels. The feasibility and likely success of new initiatives will therefore depend, at least in part, on the extent to which some of the larger systemic factors have also been addressed. Each recommendation has also been categorised as being suitable for the short term (ST) or medium to long term (MLT), although these designations will again depend on changes in the wider environmental context.

Cutting across the benchmarks is the need to improve the flow of information between different levels of the education system, not least from the national to the state and school levels. In addition to the dissemination of physical documents, all such efforts should be supplemented with training briefings or orientations wherever possible to strengthen the capacity of system actors to ensure an effective implementation. Similarly, teachers' remuneration through salaries and incentives needs to be reviewed and regularised to make the profession more attractive and to stabilise the teaching workforce.

Call to Action 1: Implement laws and policies

- **Benchmark 1.1 – Prevention of violence in and around schools is identified as a specific strategy in the national education sector policy or plan.** The GESP recognises the importance of children's health and safety but without explicitly acknowledging the risks learners face once inside their schools. An explicit objective within the GESP to prevent and reduce violence within schools (ST), accompanied by strategies, key performance indicators and budgets for its implementation and enforcement (MLT), would be much more powerful and effective. Such an objective should include specific strategies for developing a clear, concise and user-centred summary in English, Arabic and other relevant languages to be printed and disseminated nationally to states and schools (ST), and then incorporated into orientations and training programmes for teachers and other education actors (MLT). Government and donor funding could be consolidated through support for or alignment with this strategy.
- **Benchmark 1.2 – There is explicit prohibition of corporal punishment in schools, and policies are in place to support positive discipline and classroom management.** There are clear laws in place prohibiting corporal punishment in schools, but better dissemination and enforcement of these laws and monitoring of schools' compliance is needed. Improved dissemination could be achieved through the preparation and printing of simple and visual posters in all appropriate languages, which could be distributed to schools for posting in prominent public spaces (ST). Since states have limited resource and capacity to support enforcement, communities, PTAs, school management committees, boards of governors and schools should have intermediate processes and protocols to hold teachers to account. This could be supported through increased use of radio programmes and content, again in the major national languages (MLT). The national level MoGEI should create a central, ideally online, repository for documents relating to child protection and safeguarding (MLT), and also develop and disseminate short guidance documents for teachers, including temporary volunteers, on how best to manage their classrooms without violence or corporal punishment (ST), backed up by training, wherever possible (MLT).
- **Benchmark 1.3 – The roles and responsibilities of the Ministry of Education in response and referral to incidents of violence are clearly set out in a multi-sectoral national child protection policy framework.** The Girl Child Protection Policy is a laudable step towards a multi-sectoral child protection and safeguarding framework, but its scope should be revisited and expanded to cover all children, both male and female (ST). In terms of implementation and enforcement, the relevant sectors should come together under a formal institutional coordination and referral framework involving the MoGEI, the MGCSW, the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Internal Affairs and any other relevant ministries, to develop practical, consistent, harmonised and multilingual guidelines for coordinating actions, sharing information and otherwise minimising variation between states to ensure that the victim's needs are put first (MLT). Such guidelines should be written into state and county level development action plans with clearly defined targets and responsibilities to ensure that ownership sits with the Government in the longer term (MLT). Once prepared, they should also be summarised into a shorter, user-centred

document in all main languages for printing and dissemination to schools for compliance by volunteers as well as registered teachers (MLT).

- **Benchmark 1.4 – The country has endorsed the Safe Schools Declaration and in situations of armed conflict is implementing the Guidelines for Protecting Schools and Universities from Military Use during Armed Conflict.** At present, few stakeholders are aware of South Sudan’s endorsement of the Safe Schools Declaration and many schools remain directly and heavily impacted by the ongoing conflict. The Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack (GCPEA), the global partnership behind the Safe Schools Declaration, has collected examples of concrete measures to protect students and teachers from attack, and schools and universities from attack and military use, which can serve as inspiration to fellow states and other stakeholders. MoGEI could review these examples, or directly draw on GCPEA for support, to develop a strategic and appropriate approach to facilitate the removal of all military personnel from school buildings and classrooms (ST). Thereafter, some short and simple guidelines should be prepared and disseminated to schools, setting out what the Safe Schools Declaration should mean in practice, channels of recourse and the key factors for them to consider in planning how to react to or mitigate the effects of further conflict (MLT).

Call to Action 2: Strengthen prevention and response at school level

- **Benchmark 2.1 – Key violence prevention strategies are embedded in curriculum-based activities for children.** South Sudan has introduced a new curriculum containing content on life skills, violence and safe behaviour and equal relationships, but the relevant content first needs to be translated into syllabi, learning materials and classroom activities (ST). An effective roll-out is also unlikely to be achieved without a greater allocation of resources at the state level to ensure that schools and teachers are equipped with the necessary training, skills and materials (MLT). Development partners could play a role in this and such materials should contain clear linkages between teacher training schema and classroom practices and be available to both registered and volunteer teachers. In the longer term, assessment systems should also reflect key violence prevention strategies to mitigate the effects of teachers teaching to the test (MLT).
- **Benchmark 2.2 – Child safeguarding principles and procedures are in place in schools, inclusive of codes of conduct, and safe recruitment standards.** This benchmark consisted of four components and recommendations aligned to these include:
 - **National guidelines to establish safe and confidential reporting mechanisms** – Child safeguarding and protection currently takes place on an ad hoc basis within South Sudan’s schools. To address this, there is a need to develop explicit user-centred guidelines for schools on how to create step-by-step, efficient and confidential procedures for responding to school-based violence in accordance with the applicable legislation and Teachers Code of Conduct (ST). Such guidelines should: outline confidential reporting mechanisms for students at the school level; identify a focal person within each state education office and school to respond to protection incidents; specify different mechanisms and procedures for dealing with different types of incident (for example, depending on the nature of the violence or the identity of the perpetrator) and their repercussions; and identify coordinated state referral pathways with clearly defined responsibilities for key bodies such as the MoGEI, MGCSW, the Ministries of Health, Justice and Internal Affairs. Such guidelines should be clear and concise for printing and dissemination to all schools at minimum cost; available in all relevant languages; and written for delivery via a school-based training modality so that all teachers can participate. In addition to this, capacity building should be undertaken to train state actors across sectors on issues including monitoring and enforcement (MLT), and a national helpline should also be established for children to report violence, with details shared through school assemblies or radio programmes (MLT).
 - **Norms and standards of ethical behaviour in Teachers Code of Conduct** – Given inconsistencies around its use and availability in South Sudan, the Teachers Code of Conduct should be harmonised and updated to explicitly include a strict prohibition on corporal punishment and other violence against children (ST). Such code, or a summarised form, should then be printed and disseminated to all schools to ensure that they are using the same version across the country (ST). A simple poster or painted sign setting out the key expectations on teachers should also be shared with schools for display in a prominent location (together with adhesive for affixing the poster to walls or paint for signs) (ST). In due course, state officers should monitor whether teachers are signing the code on an annual basis (MLT).
 - **Pre- and in-service training on obligations for child safeguarding and reporting/response** – The majority of teachers in South Sudan are currently untrained volunteers and state-level education offices lack the resources to pay staff, let alone train teachers. In such situation, strengthening teachers’ awareness and skills around

child safeguarding and violence reporting can best be addressed by ensuring that each school has at least one copy of the amended and summarised Teachers Code of Conduct (see above) (ST). Head teachers can then provide training to their staff, volunteers or not, at minimal extra cost (ST). If completed, school-based training on national guidelines to establish safe and confidential reporting mechanisms would also suffice. In the future, as the teaching workforce becomes more stable and formalised, such obligations must be incorporated into the teacher training curriculum, in parallel with efforts to build capacity in teacher training colleges (MLT).

- **Policies that regulate hiring of new teachers and staff and their transfer to ensure suitability for working with children** – The recruitment and deployment of professional teachers in South Sudan are managed through the Government, in which case any systems or databases that record their details to facilitate the payment of salaries should be reviewed and streamlined, and then updated to capture qualifications, information regarding signature of the Code of Conduct, and confirmed incidents of violence or other criminal offences (ST). Head teachers should also receive explicit guidance on how to conduct at least informal checks on all new teachers, including volunteers, to assess their suitability for working with children (ST). This could include liaising with the police, justice or social welfare sectors at state level and such guidance could be contained in a section or annex to the guidelines for establishing safe reporting mechanisms or the revised Teachers Code of Conduct (see above).
- **Benchmark 2.3 – Each school has at least one focal point who is capacitated to provide front-line mental health/psychosocial support to children experiencing violence.** Overall, many schools reported having identified one or two individuals, typically a male and a female teacher, to deal with violence. However but it seems these individuals have little or no professional training or capacity to provide specific front-line mental health or psychosocial support to children experiencing violence. It is even unclear whether such teachers are formally trained or volunteers. These teachers would benefit from concise and standardised guidance for performing this role (ST), and while the teaching workforce remains unstable and informal, some additional content on supporting children affected by violence should also be incorporated into the Teachers Code of Conduct to offer basic guidance to all teachers, with compliance enforced by head teachers (ST). As the workforce formalises, teacher training materials and curricula should be revised to include components on learners’ mental health and well-being (MLT).
- **Benchmark 2.4 – The physical environment in and around schools is safe and designed with the well-being of children in mind.** South Sudan appears to have appropriate national guidelines that address school safety but inadequate resources at the state and school levels to maintain buildings or ensure compliance. Some schools have also been forced by conflict to abandon their intended sites of operation. While the national context remains fragile, the MoGEI and state offices should develop memoranda of understanding with school PTAs, boards of governors (BOGs) and other community bodies to clarify responsibilities and expectations regarding the upkeep of school buildings (ST). When the situation stabilises and more funding is available, the MoGEI and state offices should then take greater responsibility in bringing all schools up to the appropriate standard (MLT).

Call to Action 3: Shift social norms and behaviour change

- **Benchmark 3.1 – There is wide dissemination and engagement with stakeholders to build knowledge and appreciation of child rights and laws prohibiting violence.** Although there are some small informal initiatives to engage with stakeholders, it would be helpful to provide concrete guidance and specific strategies that state actors and schools could implement (MLT). These would likely involve PTAs who already play an important role in the operation and management of schools. These strategies could be included in the national guidelines to establish safe and confidential reporting mechanisms (benchmark 2.2).
- **Benchmark 3.2 – Specific, evidence-informed interventions are researched and implemented, addressing social norms that drive key forms of violence and/or helping children manage risks.** There are several ad hoc activities underway, usually involving donors and possibly the Directorate of Planning and Budgeting’s Office of Research, but no clear guidelines or reference documents on social norm interventions that could be implemented. Details on specific effective strategies should first be collated and then evidence-informed interventions should be developed and provided to states and schools via the national guidelines on establishing safe and confidential reporting mechanisms (benchmark 2.2) (MLT). This process should involve the MGCSW and representation from school PTAs.
- **Benchmark 3.3 – Young people, parents, teachers and community members in and around schools are engaged and active on the topic of school violence.** There are some ad hoc initiatives underway, but it would be helpful to create a formal action plan for engaging parents and community members on issues of school violence (MLT). This should include clear roles and responsibilities, budget allocation, and concrete guidance and specific strategies for

schools and state actors to implement. It could also build on the success of ‘Sawa Shabaab’ to use the radio as a media for communicating key messages and building awareness (MLT).

Call to Action 4: Invest resources effectively

- **Benchmark 4.1 – Domestic resources have been allocated to support interventions and capacity building activities to prevent and respond to violence in schools.** As discussed in relation to benchmark 1.1, the GESP acknowledges the importance of children’s health and safety, but an explicit objective to prevent and reduce violence in schools would be much more powerful, targeted and effective to raise the issue as a priority (ST). Government, donor and private sector funding could then be consolidated through support for and alignment with this strategy and should include an increased flow of funds to the state and school levels (MLT).
- **Benchmark 4.2 – Development partners provide resources targeting national or subnational level to end violence in schools, investing in effective approaches.** The Government should aim to coordinate all donor/NGO activities to ensure a joined-up approach and sharing of lessons learnt (MLT). This could be done through collaboration between the MoGEI and the MGCSW. If an express GESP objective can be developed for reducing violence in schools against girls and boys, the MoGEI should ensure that all donor/NGO activities and funds are aligned and coordinated to support it.
- **Benchmark 4.3 – There is private sector engagement in the provision of financial and non-financial resources including technical support, expertise and advocacy towards ending violence in schools.** As discussed, if an explicit GESP objective can be developed for reducing violence in schools, the MoGEI, in conjunction with the MGCSW, should ensure that all private sector activities and funds are aligned and coordinated to support it (MLT). If and when funding to education and schools increases, they should also consider the role and contribution of PTAs (MLT).

Call to Action 5: Generate and use evidence

- **Benchmark 5.1 – Information and reporting of incidents allow for disaggregated baseline information and monitoring of trends and that reflect needs and gaps in the system.** At present, there is no structured or coordinated approach for capturing data on school violence in South Sudan. This could be addressed by expanding the country’s education management information system (EMIS) to record data on cases of violence and thereby monitor trends (ST). This could involve integration with any existing case management systems, although this would require careful design and implementation to ensure the confidentiality of information shared between ministries, specifically the MoGEI and the MGCSW. Related to this, the national guidelines for schools to create safe and confidential reporting systems (see benchmark 2.2) could include a mechanism for reporting incidents through the EMIS for aggregation and review at the state and national levels (MLT). Further, there is a need for the Government to strengthen the capacity of the MoGEI at the national and state levels to ensure the long-term sustainability of high-quality systems to monitor violence in schools (MLT).
- **Benchmark 5.2 – There is regular data collection on prevalence and forms of violence in schools using methods that follow high ethical standards.** Currently, any data collection regarding violence in South Sudan is ad hoc, driven by donors and/or conducted by the MGCSW at the state level. The MoGEI, in consultation with the MGCSW, the Office of Research and the Statistics Office, should consider participation in international or national school-based surveys, such as the Global Schools-Based Student Health Survey (MLT). Further, it could be valuable to conduct a comprehensive assessment of violence against children in schools, homes and communities to aid partners’ design of appropriate initiatives and responses, although this would require careful consideration of the various ethical issues to avoid doing harm and ensure proper safeguarding (MLT).
- **Benchmark 5.3 – Decisions on replication and scale-up of violence prevention initiatives are based on evaluations of trialed models and approaches.** To date, there have been several violence prevention-related initiatives undertaken by partner organisations like Save the Children, UNICEF and UNESCO, which have included rigorous assessment and evaluation. However, there is not presently resource or political appetite for the government to scale up such approaches. The MoGEI should nevertheless ensure that partners draw on existing findings when scaling any initiatives and include analyses of scalability in any evaluations going forward (MLT).

Overall, the recommendations suggest a pressing need for the availability of concise, user-friendly and multilingual documents for use at the school level by different stakeholders, head teachers, teachers including volunteers and counsellors, and the learners themselves. The development and dissemination of such materials to all schools in South Sudan should be a top priority to increase awareness of violence-related issues in the short term, with measures for enforcement and monitoring to follow as the system stabilises and greater funding becomes available.

1. Introduction

The 'Safe to Learn' (STL) Campaign is a global initiative that was launched at the Education World Forum in January 2019 in which core partners, including the Global Partnership to End Violence against Children, UNESCO, UNICEF, DFID and the UN Girls' Education Initiative (UNGEI), adopted a [Call to Action](#) that set out a five-point policy agenda to end all violence in schools by 2024. The action points in this agenda included:

1. **Implement policy and legislation:** National, regional and local governments develop, fund and enforce laws and policies that protect children from all forms of violence in and around schools, including online violence.
2. **Strengthen prevention and response at the school level:** School staff, students, and management committees provide safe and gender-sensitive learning environments for all children that promote positive discipline, child-centered teaching and protect and improve children's physical and mental wellbeing.
3. **Shift social norms and behaviour change:** Parents, teachers, children, local government and community leaders recognise the devastating impact of violence in schools and take action to promote positive social norms and gender equality to ensure schools are safe spaces for learning.
4. **Invest resources effectively:** Increased and better use of investments targeted at ending violence in schools.
5. **Generate and use evidence:** Countries and the international community generate and use evidence on how to effectively end violence in schools.

The Call to Action, which is set out in Annex 1, was translated into a set of benchmarks, which were developed in relation to international child rights frameworks, UN tools and minimum standards, and best practice from the field of child safeguarding. For each benchmark, there are national, sub-national/state and school-level 'checkpoints' or requirements that governments and the education sector should meet in order to achieve their accountabilities in ensuring that schools are safe and protective. These benchmarks and checkpoints formed the basis for a Diagnostic Tool that aimed to measure the degree to which governments were meeting these standards. This Diagnostic Tool was then used to conduct diagnostic exercises in five focal countries, including South Sudan, Uganda, Jordan, Pakistan and Nepal. The aims of these diagnostic exercises were to:

1. Gauge the degree to which governments were meeting the requirements set out by the STL benchmarks/checkpoints
2. Identify best practices, gaps and priority actions with governments in order to meet the STL benchmarks/checkpoints, and
3. Establish a baseline that will then demonstrate focal country progress from 2019 to 2024.

This report presents the results of the diagnostic exercise conducted in South Sudan from November 2019 to March 2020. It provides an overview of the context and policy landscape regarding violence in schools (a list of documents consulted is included in Annex 2), the methodology and salient findings from the diagnostic exercise, and a set of actions that can support the Government to meet the STL benchmarks and ensure that schools are safe, protective and enhance learning for all children.

2. Background

The 'revitalised' peace agreement signed by the government and opposition leaders in South Sudan in September 2019 did not end the fighting between government and various rebel forces. Parties to the conflict have committed serious abuses including indiscriminate attacks against civilians, aid workers, unlawful killings, beatings, arbitrary detentions, torture, sexual violence, the recruitment and use of child soldiers, looting and the destruction of property. Some of the abuses arguably constitute war crimes or crimes against humanity, and rape has been used as a weapon of war against women and girls. Different forces have vandalised, destroyed and looted schools, burned health facilities and occupied schools, health centres and churches, leaving civilians to flee into the bush for safety.

Education in South Sudan therefore takes place against a backdrop of political instability, a struggling economy, extreme poverty, ethnic and intercommunal tensions, food insecurity and environmental issues such as flooding. Despite the 2015 Agreement and formation of the transitional government in 2016, the conflict has persisted which has contributed to killings and the massive destruction of property, and created huge challenges in the delivery of education and humanitarian services. In terms of planning, such uncertainty creates challenges for policy development and implementation and, at the time of the study, the number of states in the country and the organisation of administrative structures had not yet been agreed.

According to a 2019 Humanitarian Needs Overview, 7.1 million people out of a total population of 11.4 million require humanitarian assistance; one out of three people have been displaced; five out of 10 children are out of school; levels of food insecurity have increased with six out of 10 people now facing food insecurity; health facilities are non-functional with one out of five facilities closed and those that remain open providing poor quality services; and, 66% of the population does not have access to safe and clean drinking water. Male adults and youths face particular risks and psychosocial harm from the armed conflict and insecurity as they are often the target for recruitment into armed forces or revenge killings. Women, children, people with disabilities and older persons also bear the impact of crisis. The situation has escalated mental and physical health issues over the years and the number of persons with disabilities is estimated to be 1.2 million – every tenth person in the population³.

Not only has conflict in South Sudan prevented children from growing up in a secure and peaceful environment conducive to their physical and emotional development, it has also significantly affected their ability to access basic services such as health, education, and basic nutrition. Children continue to face risks such as death, injury, hunger, disease, recruitment into armed forces or military groups, forced displacement and the loss of education opportunities.

2.1. Education in South Sudan

For many years up to and after independence, the education system in Sudan was managed by the central government and ruling Northern elites using Arabo-Islamism as the sole determinant for national unity. There were wide differences between North and South regarding the delivery and availability of education, with much greater resource allocation and better enrolment indicators among schools in the North. By contrast, in the South, only 7% of teachers were trained by proper teacher training colleges, 45% were completely untrained and female teachers made up only 7% of the teaching workforce. Schools lacked basic facilities like running water and latrines and only 12% of permanent classrooms were built with concrete, bricks or mud, with the remainder of classes taking place in the open air or under a tree⁴.

Over the years, the combination of conflict, widespread insecurity, economic pressure and food insecurity further worsened education across the country. The results of an Education Cluster Needs Assessment (2018) indicated that 21% of schools are non-functional with insecurity as the major cause. On average, schools lost 30 days of education during the year 2018, 50% of this interruption being due to insecurity. Fifteen percent of the schools assessed during

³ South Sudan Education Cluster Needs Overview, 2019; Save the Children (2018) Situation Analysis of Impact of Conflict on Children including the Grave Child Right Violation in South Sudan

⁴ Save the Children (2018) Situation Analysis of Impact of Conflict on Children including the Grave Child Rights Violation in South Sudan

the diagnostic exercise also reported having faced an attack on the school, teachers or pupils, such attacks ranging from theft to looting by armed forces or groups.

At the same time, food security continues to deteriorate and the surge in hunger has increased the population's reliance on humanitarian assistance in conflict stricken communities. This lack of food is a main reason for children dropping out or missing school as families prefer their children to seek livelihoods over education. Similarly, it is difficult for a child to focus on learning when he or she is experiencing the painful effects of chronic hunger. Traditional gender roles and cultural practices also impact disproportionately on the educational opportunities of girls in particular. Early and forced marriage cause many girls to drop out, whether as a result of pregnancy, motherhood or the need to attend to household duties⁵. Inadequate facilities at schools, specifically non-segregated latrines and limited options for menstrual hygiene likewise disrupt girls' attendance.

Economic instability has also affected teachers, giving rise to delays in their payment and a lack of incentives, which results in teacher demotivation and ultimately forces them to pursue other occupations to support their families. Indeed, many teachers in South Sudan's schools are volunteers. Other teachers have been directly affected by conflict and almost 43,000 teaching personnel and members of school management committees are estimated as being in need of humanitarian assistance⁶. Together, these factors undermine an already-fragile education system, where an estimated 2.7 million children are currently out of school and over 81,000 refugee children do not have adequate access to education, an increase of 11% from 2018⁷. Learners in Central Equatoria, Lakes, Unity, Upper Nile and western Bahr el Ghazal states appear particularly heavily affected.

Children and youths aged 3-18 represent an estimated 48% of the South Sudanese population, and continuous displacement and widespread conflict continue to put pressure on this vulnerable group. Barriers to education further expose these children to protection risks and during the first two quarters of 2018, incidences of grave violations were reported affecting 1,535 children, 42% of which were girls, ranging from killing and maiming, to abduction and recruitment into armed groups. Put in a broader context, children face a huge risk of missing opportunities to reach their potential. Schools are crucial for children's cognitive, social and emotional development and growth, and a lack of access to education services in safe and protective environments limits their future opportunities, putting them at risk of becoming an unskilled and illiterate generation. Furthermore, this lack of access to quality education potentially fuels new conflict with an estimated 19,000 children already recruited into armed groups as child soldiers⁸. The longer children remain out of school, the more likely it is that they will either be recruited into armed groups or join criminal gangs⁹.

More formally, the Transitional Constitution of 2011 recognises education, including the provision of compulsory, free primary education as a right, and in 2012 the National Legislative Assembly passed the General Education Act which stipulates primary education as being free and compulsory for all. As a result, nearly 1.3 million children enrolled in primary education, however, the resurgence of violence in South Sudan reversed many of the gains made in education since 2015. Specifically, many teachers did not receive their salaries on time, schools were damaged or closed for fears of insecurity, or became occupied by fighting forces or IDPs. In certain places, multiple schools share the same crowded facilities to enable learners to continue with their studies. Within the classroom, both teachers and learners still fear the consequences of perceived tribal or political allegiances while some students have reportedly been recruited by politically motivated criminal groups. With ongoing political uncertainties concerning the future administrative structure of South Sudan, some of these obstacles look likely to continue.

The MoGEI works as the central department to increase access to quality education and promote equity. Its activities include building institutional and human capacity at the central, state, county, Payams and school levels. The GESP, directed by the MoGEI, also lays down plans to provide comprehensive training for teachers and head teachers using the revised curriculum in the anticipation that head teachers will develop and implement safety plans in collaboration with PTAs and BOGs. The MoGEI similarly aims to work with partner NGOs to ensure that plans are in place for the

⁵ Factors influencing girl child dropout in primary schools in Terkeka County, <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/dc02/411d3f3b4d132a7a5fd6159f12611ab064d2.pdf>

⁶ South Sudan Education Cluster Strategy, 2019

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Save the Children (2018) Situation Analysis of Impact of Conflict on Children including the Grave Child Rights Violation in South Sudan

⁹ South Sudan Education Needs Overview, 2019

safety of learners both in school and on their way to and from school. Despite being marked as ‘zones of peace’, however, many schools continue to experience violence.

2.2. Violence in South Sudan

Violence is defined by the World Health Organisation (WHO) as ‘the intentional use of physical force or power, threatened or actual, against oneself, another person, or against a group or community, that either results in or has a high likelihood of resulting in injury, death, psychological harm, maldevelopment or deprivation.’¹⁰

Violence against children in South Sudan takes several main forms.

First, **physical violence** against boys and girls often occurs in the home (including PoC sites), the community, schools or as a result of armed conflict, which can give rise to injury, punishment, assault, maiming and killing. In various studies conducted, both men and women regard physical violence against girls and women in the home as a common form of violence. It may be related to perceived poor performance of housework or arriving home late, and physical violence is similarly linked to children leaving their homes to live on the streets. Corporal punishment as a form of discipline remains a daily experience for the majority of children in South Sudan despite the fact that it is now prohibited by legislation.

Sexual violence is a persistent and serious concern affecting boys, girls, men and women. Of reported cases, the majority of victims are women and girls, and although the full extent of sexual violence in the country is unknown, at least 25% of reported cases involve children¹¹. The conflict has exacerbated family violence, child forced and early marriage, GBV, sexual harassment, abuse and exploitation which are often rooted in societal attitudes and values.

Children in South Sudan may also be affected by **harmful practices** including cattle raiding, revenge killings, recruitment into armed or military groups and discrimination. In particular, discrimination against girls starts early and girls are less likely to be educated than boys. Even when girls do receive an education, they tend to leave school before completion to get married and half of the female population marries before reaching 18 years of age.

Children may experience different types of violence in a multitude of contexts, however, the diagnostic exercise and therefore this report focus primarily on violence conducted *in and around schools*. Physical violence and sexual abuse are more likely in these settings, but learners may also be exposed to psychological violence through bullying or degrading treatment perpetrated by teachers, volunteers and other school staff. Similarly, wider harmful cultural practices may adversely affect children’s ability to access and participate in education, but these are less likely to take place in schools and therefore are outside the primary focus of this report.

3. Methodology

3.1. Geographic coverage and school sampling

The sampling approach for the study drew respondents from across South Sudan which did not comprise of a nationally representative sample that would enable generalisability to other schools or areas across the country. Such a sample would have been beyond the objectives of the diagnostic exercise which aim to establish a baseline, the identification of gaps and good practices, and the agreement of priority actions with the relevant ministries. To create a baseline and ensure inclusiveness and coverage, the study divided the country into three regions following the colonial demarcations, being Greater Equatoria, Greater Bahr el Ghazal and Greater Upper Nile. In discussion with representatives from UNICEF and the MoGEI, a state was selected from each region on the basis that it contained one or more refugee communities, government schools, and private schools, both in rural and urban settings. Within each state, schools were then stratified by primary and secondary, and urban and rural, and then eight schools randomly sampled to make a total of 24 schools across the country. State schools also included one PoC or refugee-focused establishment, as well as one privately owned or run school. Table 2 provides a summary of the states and types of

¹⁰ https://www.who.int/violence_injury_prevention/violence/world_report/en/

¹¹ Save the Children (2018) Situation Analysis of Impact of Conflict on Children including Grave Child Rights Violation in South Sudan

schools that participated in the study while Annex 3 provides a more comprehensive sampling frame. School names and details of precise locations are not provided for reasons of protecting anonymity and confidentiality.

Table 2: Summary of final sample by region, state and school type

SCHOOL SELECTION AND DISTRIBUTION			
Area			School type and ownership
Regions	Former States	Location	
Greater Equatoria	Western Equatoria State	Yambio	4 Primary Schools (2 urban, 2 rural; 3 publicly owned, 1 refugee/PoC)
			4 Secondary Schools (2 urban, 2 rural; 2 publicly owned, 1 privately owned, 1 refugee/PoC)
Greater Bahr el Ghazal	Western Bahr el Ghazal State	Wau	4 Primary Schools (2 urban, 2 rural; 3 publicly owned, 1 refugee/PoC)
			4 Secondary Schools (2 urban, 2 rural; 3 publicly owned, 1 privately owned)
Greater Upper Nile	Upper Nile State	Malakal	4 Primary Schools (2 urban, 2 rural; 3 publicly owned, 1 refugee/PoC)
			4 Secondary Schools (2 urban, 2 rural; 2 publicly owned, 1 privately owned, 1 refugee/PoC)

3.2. Information collection process

Information collection for the study was undertaken using the Diagnostic Tool developed as part of the wider diagnostic exercise and structured around the five Calls to Action and corresponding STL benchmarks. The tool combined qualitative and quantitative methods and included a detailed desk review of documents, policies and reports concerning violence against children and in schools. A full list of the documents consulted is set out in Annex 2. In addition, face-to-face interviews and surveys were undertaken with stakeholders at all levels of the education system using bespoke instruments to elicit their responses. The different tools are included in Annex 4 and answers were recorded by hand or electronically where permission was granted.

Regarding participants, government officials and partners were interviewed at the national and state levels, and their responses were compared and triangulated with information collected from head teachers, deputy head teachers, class teachers (two male, two female) and students (two male, two female) in the selected schools. In this way, the study sought to ascertain not just which legislation, policies and guidance exist on paper, but also the extent to which they have been disseminated and implemented in practice. In terms of selection, national, state level, head teacher and deputy head teacher respondents were sampled purposively according to their role, while teachers and students were first stratified by gender and then randomly sampled. Table 3 below provides an overview of the different respondents while Annex 5 sets out the overarching Terms of Reference and Annex 6 shows the schedule of activities. Given the sampling approach, statistics provided throughout the report relate to the percentage of respondents *taking part in the diagnostic exercise only*, rather than a generalisation of responses across the country.

Table 3: Summary of respondents

Level	Respondent	Male	Female	Total
National	Government	2	1	3
	Partners	1	2	3
State	Government	7	2	9
School	Head Teachers/Deputy Head Teachers	24	0	24
	Teachers ¹²	71	25	96
	Students	48	48	96
Total		153	78	231

¹² Of all the teachers included in the study, 36% reported to be registered on government payroll. The others we assume to be privately paid or volunteers. 32% of the teachers said they have more than 5 years' experience.

3.3. Customisation of the tool to the South Sudan context

Since the Diagnostic Tool was developed at a global level, customisation was necessary before it could be used with respondents in South Sudan. As part of this process, the researcher attended a workshop in Kampala, Uganda, hosted by UNICEF and facilitated by Cambridge Education, which also included representation from the Government of South Sudan. During the workshop, participants came together to customise the tools for the context of South Sudan. Specific changes included using the correct language when referring to the administrative structure in South Sudan and checking the language for gender and conflict sensitivity given the background of the country. Statements, words or phrases that would invoke tension were reviewed, reworded or otherwise changed to minimise misunderstanding or confusion around expectations.

3.4 Ethical Issues

Capturing information or conducting research on sensitive topics such as violence and abuse raises certain ethical issues and risks that must be adequately addressed and mitigated to protect participants. Such issues are even more important where the data collection involves children or other vulnerable groups. The workshop in Kampala provided the researcher with an opportunity to discuss such risks with representatives from UNICEF and the Government of South Sudan and to agree suitable mitigation measures. The main issues and agreed responses were as follows:

- **Voluntary informed consent** – it was important that all participants, both adults and children, understood the purpose of the information collection, how their responses would be used and their rights throughout the exercise, for example, to withdraw at any point without giving reasons and without repercussions. To ensure such consent, each survey and interview was preceded by a short oral briefing describing the objective of the exercise, how the data would be processed and the participants' rights. The wording of each briefing was adapted to be clear and intelligible to the different types of respondents and was reviewed and agreed at the Kampala workshop. Adult participants were also asked to sign written forms, while head teachers provided consent *in loco parentis* for their students, who were then briefed on the exercise and thereafter invited to give their oral consent.
- **Doing no harm** – throughout the information collection, it was critical that participation in the exercise did not expose the participants to any harm, risks or unintended consequences. Specifically, the surveys and interviews avoided asking about particular incidences of violence that would identify perpetrators or give rise to unexpected repercussions. Central to this was the need for confidentiality and anonymity so that particular responses could not be traced back to individual participants. Such protections were emphasised at the start of each interview or survey, none of which recorded respondents' names. Participants could also elect to withhold details of their grade level and school if they wanted additional assurance that their data would be stored and handled with complete anonymity.
- **Safeguarding** – carefully balanced with the need for anonymity and confidentiality was the requirement to consider appropriate safeguarding in the event that the researcher discovered that one or more children faced an immediate threat of violence or abuse. To address this issue, the researcher adopted and followed a step-by-step safeguarding approach derived from UNICEF standards and adapted for this particular exercise.

3.5. Challenges/limitations

Several challenges and limitations affected the conduct of the exercise, which included:

- a. **Limited capacity to comprehend the tool at the primary level** – in the beginning, the student survey was targeted at pupils in Primary 6 and 7, however, after completion of the initial stage of the assessment, the research team noted that some primary respondents struggled to understand the purpose of the exercise and the questions. As a result, the final student sample comprised a mix of primary students who *could* understand and respond to the questions, as well as some students in Senior 2 and 3.
- b. **Security uncertainty** – in some of the areas where the study was conducted, respondents sometimes skipped their appointments due to uncertainties around security in their local environment.
- c. **Limited accessibility to some of the selected schools and participants** – due to distance, timing and security concerns, some of the selected schools had to be replaced. Pupils were also absent from some schools because of vacations. In Malakal, for example, it was not possible to survey students in two schools and although the

teachers and head teachers *could* be interviewed, the timing precluded the replacement of students because other schools in the area had also closed for the vacation.

4. Findings and Analysis

The STL Call to Action sets out a five-point agenda to end all violence in schools by 2024. This Diagnostic Exercise aimed to gauge the degree to which the Government in South Sudan has been able to meet the benchmarks that have been set out for each of the five Call to Action areas. As discussed previously, for each benchmark there are national, state and school-level 'checkpoints' or requirements that governments need to meet in order to achieve their accountabilities in ensuring that schools are safe and protective.

The following tables outline each of the STL benchmarks and assessments of the degree to which these have been achieved in South Sudan based on an analysis of the information collected during this Diagnostic Exercise. Each benchmark/checkpoint has been assessed based on the following measures: A: in place; B: partially in place; C: not in place. A discussion of the findings provides a rationale for each assessment.

4.1. Findings for Call to Action 1: Implement laws and policies

Table 4: Findings for Call to Action Benchmark 1 – Implementation of laws and policies

Item	Benchmark	National	Sub-national/State	School
1.1	The national government includes prevention of violence in and around schools as a specific strategy in education sector policies, plans and budgets.	Prevention of violence in and around schools is identified as a specific strategy in the national education sector policy or plan ¹³ .	The state authorities support the implementation of the national (or sub-national) plan or policy in schools.	School implements violence prevention activities in conformity with national or subnational objectives.
		Assessment		
		A = In place	B= Partially in place	B=Partially in place
<p>Discussion</p> <p>The General Education Strategic Plan (2018-2022) (GESP) recognizes the need to address violence and emphasizes the need to ensure the safety and security of learners. Within the strategies there is reference to a) sensitize communities on school-related gender-based violence, b) provide safe learning spaces c) promote schools as zones of peace. The MoGEI is also expected to advocate in collaboration with community leaders to ensure that schools occupied by armed forces or internally displaced persons (IDPs) are vacated and rehabilitated¹⁴. Related to this, the Child Act 2008 was developed to promote and protect the rights of children in South Sudan, and particularly prohibits mistreatment including corporal punishment. The nationalization and implementation of the Child Act and education policy is through the current Education Strategic Plan which is followed by the various MoGEI Directorates. The strategic plan also has allocated budget lines for the various priority sections to be implemented during its lifetime.</p> <p>The National Girls' Education Strategy has the vision to 'create safe and conducive learning environment for girls'. It recognises different forms of violence as a barrier to girls education and includes: strengthening the legal framework to protect girls in school; improvement of child-friendly school; and behavior change to support girls access and learning in school. However, it doesn't include specific focus on reducing violence against children or girls within it's strategies.</p> <p>Despite national level policies and guidelines to reduce and stop violence in schools, implementation at the state level is partial due to various factors. For example, in Upper Nile (Malakal), the director generals and other Ministry officials speak Arabic while all national policies are written in English. As a result, the majority of such documents are shelved and only accessed when either a partner or a researcher makes inquiries. In other states, the policies are lost, unavailable or not disseminated to schools and so implementation at the school level is minimal. Among the ministries, the MGCSW is the most active with state inspectors supported by partners (UNICEF, War Child, the Girls' Education South Sudan program (GESS)) who visit schools to implement their own agenda. Such visits nevertheless also provide the Ministry with an opportunity to check with head teachers and school management on the running of schools. Since most teachers in the schools are volunteers, the MoGEI appears to have limited power to enforce government policies or regulations that prevent violence. However, the MGCSW reaches out to schools where there have been extensive cases of abuse. These cases are handled by the Directorate of Gender at the state level and reported to the police or referred to hospitals. According to gender representatives in Wau, most of these cases are solved communally with the parents of the perpetrator paying the family of the victim.</p>				

¹³ See 'Guidelines for Education Sector Plan Preparation' (UNESCO, GPE 2015) or 'Guidelines for developing gender-responsive education sector plans' (GPE, UNGEI, UNICEF, 2017)

¹⁴ General Education Strategic Plan, 2018-2022

	<p>According to the schools that participated in the study, violence prevention activities are taking place, however, some of the schools reported their teachers observing aspects of the old Sudanese education system. Corporal punishment is still practiced in some schools although many teachers try not to be confrontational with learners. According to one NGO, violence in schools is not considered serious until someone is in a critical condition and needs medical attention. Many schools are also challenged by the lack of qualified teachers who can effectively contribute to the implementation of government policies, including the Education Strategic Plan. Many volunteer teachers are not professionally trained and, as a result, violence prevention policies, strategies or objectives exist formally but are not implemented at the school level.</p> <p>In terms of best practice, MoGEI and school respondents referred to the existence of a national drive for peace which has contributed to the reduction of violence in schools and in some schools where the study took place, students and teachers are being taught to embrace and appreciate each other as South Sudanese rather than on a tribal basis. This is enabled by having learners from different tribes study together and, despite the conflict in the country, schools are embracing unity and cooperation among students to encourage collaboration in resolving education challenges and problems faced at the school level.</p>			
1.2	<p>A. There is explicit prohibition of corporal punishment in schools, and policies are in place to support positive discipline and classroom management.¹⁵</p>	<p>Laws that prohibit corporal punishment include clear guidance on implementation, with a process for non-compliance.</p>	<p>State oversees implementation of law and details compliance measures.</p>	<p>School implements law or has an independent policy and there are repercussions for non-compliance.</p>
Assessment				
A = In place		B = Partially in place		B = Partially in place
<p>Discussion</p> <p>According to the Child Act 2008 section 21b, “no child shall be subjective to corporal punishment by chiefs, police, and teachers, prison guards in any place or institution including schools, prison and reformatories”. According to section 35, anyone who fails to comply with the Act commits an offence and shall upon conviction be sentenced to imprisonment for a term not exceeding six months or a fine or both. Meanwhile under subsection 34, it is the general duty of every member of the community who suspects that a child’s rights are being infringed to report the matter to the chief, social worker, local government official, police or public attorney who shall investigate and take appropriate action. In addition, section 20 of the General Education Act 2012 prohibits corporal punishment and ‘any teacher who contravenes this subsection is guilty of an offence and liable to punishment by law’. The Act further quotes article 17, section 1(f) of the Constitution which states that ‘children have a right to be free from corporal punishment and cruel and inhuman treatment by any person including parents, school administration and any other institutions’.</p> <p>Regarding implementation of these laws and related policies, the MoGEI at the state level works with the county education director, PTAs, the gender office and school administration, using activities and responses such as training teachers and warning and dismissing violators. The MoGEI also links with county level bodies to enforce the policies, which may also involve collaborating with other county level ministries. In total, 56% of state officials surveyed reported activities to implement these laws, compared to 22% who were unaware of such activities.</p> <p>Despite government and ministry representatives at both national and state levels insisting that corporal punishment is not practised, responses from schools provide evidence to the contrary. 86% of teachers surveyed were not aware of a policy that prohibits corporal punishment in South Sudan and a study by Save the Children indicated that learners still experience corporal punishment. Such partners often conduct visits to schools where corporal punishment is reportedly considered part of everyday life until a pupil needs medical attention.</p>				

¹⁵ See *Teaching without violence: prohibiting corporal punishment* (Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children 2019)

Comparing the findings across levels, there seems to be a broken link between the national offices, state, county and school levels regarding the implementation of laws and policies. After developing policies, the MoGEI at a national level does not have a direct connection to know about their implementation. The gap is due to several reasons. First, a lack of or limited dissemination of policies to both states and schools hinders and limits their knowledge and full understanding of which policies are to be implemented and how. Even at the national level, the research team requested some of these policies, guidelines and laws supposedly being implemented at schools but there was no central place where they could be found. The majority of the policies were accessed through NGO partners highlighting the access challenges around these documents that affect their implementation at the school level. Language is another main barrier that hinders policy implementation. English is the main language in South Sudan, and all policies generated in Juba by the Government are written in English. However, following the division of the country, there is a majority of the population that still speaks Arabic and other languages and as a result, groups in northern locations like Wau and Upper Nile struggle to implement policies written in English. Finally, the decentralised system combined with a lack of coordination and poor capacity among state ministries create challenges in the dissemination, implementation and monitoring of policies.

These findings point to the following recommendations:

- Although the Government of South Sudan has put various policies, laws and guidelines regarding corporal punishment in place, it is critical that the MoGEI takes further steps to ensure their comprehensive dissemination and enforcement. This should include a multi-sectoral approach with clear reporting lines and a mechanism to ensure implementation, with guidelines being written into state and county level development action plans to ensure government ownership in the longer term.
- The MoGEI needs to identify a means through which teachers and school management can be oriented to implement policies, laws and guidelines, such documents being available in English, Arabic and other key languages. In addition, dissemination should be supported by capacity building and orientation activities first at the state level, then in schools, to operationalise and ensure the implementation of the relevant laws and policies.

B.	Teacher training on positive discipline and classroom management is included in pre- and in-service training.	State ensures that teachers receive thorough training in techniques of classroom management.	Teachers have received training on positive discipline and classroom management in the last three years.
	Assessment		
	C = Not in place	C = Not in place	C = Not in place

Discussion
 At present, the majority of teachers in schools in South Sudan are untrained volunteers. As such, they have not received formalised or credential training on issues including positive discipline, child safeguarding or violence reporting and referral pathways. Typically, they instruct learners based their own personal experiences unless they have received training from an NGO or civil society group. They often lack the capacity and capability to effectively deliver quality lessons that lead to students’ effective understanding. Approximately 20% of teachers surveyed reported receiving training on these kinds of topics. At the national level, the government is responsible for developing curricula and providing training for registered teachers. At the time of the study, however, both the national and state governments were reportedly struggling to train staff, meet demand for teachers and maintain teaching staff in schools. Where possible, some states are trying to run schools through reliance on volunteer teachers, but they are generally unable to send teachers for the required training due to budgetary constraints. In addition, the conflict has destabilised the initial efforts to support teachers to go through formal training and as a result, states do not have the financial or human resource to ensure that teachers receive training on techniques of classroom management.

	Within schools, some volunteer teachers are selected to take part in orientations on either state or national policies that are developed and rolled out at the state level. Many have not undergone any training while the rest participate in refresher trainings by NGOs and partners like UNICEF, which often last less than a week.			
1.3	A. The roles and responsibilities of the Ministry of Education in response and referral to incidents of violence are clearly set out in the multi-sectoral national child protection policy framework.	A national policy framework, strategy or other system that outlines the role of the Ministry of Education as part of the national child protection system alongside other formal actors (Health, Social Welfare, Justice, Police) ¹⁶ .	There is state-level coordination of national policy framework and support for implementation in schools.	School follows national and/or State policy and coordinates with local authorities and other duty bearers.
		Assessment		
		B=Partially in place	B = Partially in place	B = Partially in place
<p>Discussion</p> <p>In South Sudan, there is a national Girl Child Protection Policy which sits under the custody of the MGCSW. The responsibility of the MoGEI regarding response to and referral of incidences of violence at the multi-sectoral level is stipulated in the Child Act 2008 and the General Education Act 2012, which quotes article 17, section 1(f) of the constitution of South Sudan.</p> <p>At the state level, there are clusters through which various sub-national authorities involved in the implementation of child protection and safeguarding policies, such as the MoGEI, MGCSW and the Ministries of Health, Justice and Internal Affairs, meet on a monthly basis. Within the states, clusters are coordinated by UN agencies or NGOs, which have actively created strong links between the MoGEI and other ministries, NGOs and UN agencies. In this regard, even though schools do not have individuals directly responsible for dealing with violence, head teachers through the Directorate of Gender are able to refer cases to various offices including the police. By way of roles within the collaboration, the MGCSW is often involved in assessing the situation, the Ministry of Health in treating the victim (if necessary) and the Ministry of Justice in enforcing the law, which may involve convicting the perpetrator depending on the magnitude of the violation. The MGCSW also has counsellors who offer psychosocial support and desks at police stations to deal with school-related and GBV. For IDP schools and those with refugee status, there is a complaint/protection office where all cases are reported and then referred to respective offices depending on the type of case concerned. These initiatives have been put in place by partners like the UN High Commissioner for Refugees, the International Organisation for Migration, UNICEF, UN Women, and NGOs to enable coordination between partners, ministries and schools in various parts of the country, although there does not appear to be any formal policy that dictates the establishment of this coordination at various levels. Indeed, in some states, this kind of coordination is absent due to limited resources and capacity, both human and financial.</p>				

¹⁶ These set out the mandated roles and responsibilities of state actors in the national child protection system. See section 2.1, UNESCO/UNWOMEN 2016 for a discussion of child protection systems

Where coordination between the MoGEI and other governmental institutions *does* take place at the state level, it is through two main means: a) the Council of Ministers where ministers from various ministries meet to present different issues and report on progress within their ministries; and b) cluster meetings which are organised on a monthly basis. Through cluster meetings, collaboration between the various ministries and organisations is enhanced, and this extends even to schools where the Ministry of Health works on vaccinations, and the MGCSW works with school management to handle gender and related cases, some which are referred to the police or justice system depending on their magnitude.

The majority of school actors were unaware of either national or state-level policies that facilitate cross-sectoral coordination at any level. In some states, the Director General takes it as a personal initiative to meet and interact with head teachers to encourage them and also update them on education and related matters.

In summary, at the national level, various directorates of the MoGEI indicated that policies are shared with both ministries at the state level and schools, although interactions with schools suggested that policies had not been disseminated and many schools were still unaware of some policies at the national level. Regarding coordination at the state and school level, meetings are organised by head teachers and other state ministry authorities as personal initiatives, rather than as government or policy requirements.

These findings point at the following recommendations:

- There is need to ensure effective policy dissemination, orientation and capacity building particularly at the state and school levels. Policies are available in some schools, but in others they have been lost or misplaced during the conflict. There is also the language issue of some teachers being unable to comprehend policies that are printed and presented in English.
- The MoGEI at state level needs to be empowered to enforce the implementation of education and related policies. In environments where it cannot provide salaries for teachers, the MoGEI is impeded from enforcing the implementation of policies effectively. As a result, it has resolved to encourage teachers to stay at schools without incentives, this has opened up laxity and lack of seriousness in some schools.

B.	The Ministry of Education has established a national child protection/safeguarding policy with the requirement that all sub-national authorities and schools under their purview develop their own localised policies. ¹⁷	The State authorities support the establishment of localised and coordinated school child protection policies and has identified one focal point with overseeing and responding to concerns.	School follows national policy or independently has established child safeguarding policies and procedures.
	Assessment		
	B = Partially in place	B = Partially in place	B = Partially in place

Discussion
At the national level, the MoGEI refers to the Girl Child Protection Policy under the MGCSW to guide its planning. This is the only national policy that exists at both national and subnational levels, however, its use, implementation and localisation has been affected by wider country uncertainties, such as South Sudan’s process of transition, undetermined number of states and unclear administrative structures. At the time of the study, subnational representatives in all ministries were

¹⁷ See UNICEF 2012; Keeping Children Safe 2014.

	<p>uncertain of pending changes to be affected as part of the peace negotiation process, and this uncertainty was hindering policy dissemination, adaptation and implementation at the subnational levels.</p> <p>The institutional structure in South Sudan requires that states implement policies from the national Government, and once implemented, these policies are localised to fit the context. During the time of the study, some states had gone ahead without knowledge of the national policy to establish in collaboration with NGOs their own guidelines setting standards for safeguarding and protecting children against violence. In Wau, for example, there is a state child emergency response line (122) through which the police respond immediately to child issues once dialled. In addition, schools in collaboration with the MoGEI have established PTAs which are regularly informed on school progress but also charged with monitoring child safety in schools. The school councils in some states have PTA representatives as chair and these are established to oversee the welfare of learners, although the focal point varies between schools. In some schools, head teachers, PTA representatives, male or female teachers are selected to act as focal persons for overseeing matters related to violence within schools, while in others student leaders are identified to oversee and manage violence responses in collaboration with teachers.</p> <p>Schools across the various states were divided with regard to policies on child welfare, protection and safeguarding. Some schools insisted following the Teachers Code of Conduct to guide them on how to deal with violence, while others referred to the Child Act and relied on the head teacher to set standards and procedures for handling violence. Although the ministries at the national level are charged with making child protection and safeguarding policies, states and schools have also set up their own standards on how to respond to incidences of violence in schools. Some of the school standards correspond with formal policies while others exist outside the policy requirements, and so there is no harmony between the policy and the schools implementing child protection policies.</p> <p>These findings point to the need to develop a harmonised child protection policy which is inclusive and addresses the needs of both boys and girls.</p>			
1.4	<p>The country has endorsed the Safe Schools Declaration and in situations of armed conflict is implementing the Guidelines for Protecting Schools and Universities from Military Use during Armed Conflict¹⁸.</p>	<p>The Guidelines for Protecting Schools and Universities from Military Use during Armed Conflict have been brought into domestic policy and operational frameworks as far as possible and appropriate.</p>	<p>The guidelines are widely disseminated by state authorities so that all parties engaged in conflict are aware of and able to abide by them.</p>	<p>School level plans in place to reduce risk of attacks, to respond quickly to risks, and to have a clear plan for safe school re-opening after attacks happen.</p>
Assessment				
B=Partially in place		C = Not in place	C = Not in place	
	<p>Discussion</p> <p>According to the MoGEI at the national level and implementing partners and NGOs, the Government of South Sudan has endorsed the Safe Schools Declaration. However, MoGEI personnel appear unclear what the declaration means or what it stands for. The closest idea they have is that ‘schools are zones of peace’ which was an initiative supported by USAID whereby a school checklist was developed to allow schools to become certified as ‘Zones of Peace’. To date, numerous schools have been certified as ‘Zones of Peace’ schools in South Sudan, although this conflicts with many schools’ experiences in reality. For the majority of schools in South Sudan, the reality remains distant to the Schools as Zones of Peace model, as many have been occupied by military personnel and IDPs, a far cry from what the Safe Schools Declaration is meant to represent.</p> <p>Due to demanding priorities, the Government of South Sudan is currently prioritising peace which is being managed at the national level. In recent days, the government at the national level has been working on the transitional government where both the national government and rebel groups can collaborate and</p>			

¹⁸ The Safe Schools Declaration is an inter-governmental political commitment that provides countries the opportunity to express support for protecting education from attack during times of armed conflict; the importance of the continuation of education during war; and the implementation of concrete measures to deter the military use of schools. See more details: <http://www.protectingeducation.org/safeschoolsdeclaration>

work together to form one government in an effort to bring back peace and reconciliation for South Sudan. As this happens, transitions in schools and other sectors may happen but probably at a later stage. According to one Director General, there are schools in South Sudan that are still occupied by the military and IDPs where education is not happening. Meanwhile, there is evidence to suggest the presence of soldiers in classrooms, sitting side by side with normal learners. In South Sudan, there are no guidelines that protect or guide the Government ministries on how to handle military interference with schools. The anticipation of the government was that it remains peaceful after transition from the North, however, the conflict between various parties arose as an emergency and schools were heavily impacted with many, particularly in Malakal, destroyed due to the conflict. As such, there is no policy or guidelines that protect schools in this sense. At the state level, one Director General mentioned engaging the Minister to bring the issue to the Council of Ministers where the Minister of Defence would be requested to move the military forces out of schools. In Wau, however, many of the schools visited during the study had moved out of the outskirts of Wau and were operating in the town due to conflict. For example, the Wau complex is hosting two schools operating within the same building. The majority of schools surveyed in South Sudan do not have any plan whatsoever in place to reduce the risk of attacks or respond in the event of attack. Various schools responded differently, the majority emphasising that they would send children home in the event of an attack while others felt it better to retain children in school until the conflict reduces. The majority of schools have no point of contact and all schools preferred contacting the police or parents in the event of an attack or conflict in schools. In passing years, schools had been devastated due to the lack of policies and guidelines to respond to similar situations. In the past where some schools were targeted, both teachers and students lost their lives and many now live in IDP camps as a result. Neither government at the national or state levels have a policy that addresses this kind of issue. Even though conflict in South Sudan seems under control due to ongoing negotiations, localities in the interior of the capital are still experiencing difficulties as a result of conflict between warring parties. In most of these locations, schools are either closed or moved to other localities for reasons of safety. In this regard, policies and mechanisms to ensure the safety of both learners and teachers are not functional. In Wau, all schools have moved and now operate from Wau town while in Malakal, some schools were heavily destroyed and as a result, there are only four operational secondary schools including one private school. Even though the Government of South Sudan states that they have endorsed the Safe School Declaration, the situation in schools, particularly those in the interior, is different with majority of them not functional due to the conflict. Nevertheless, there is still good will and commitment by donors, UN agencies, NGOs, and state ministries to ensure that schools continue to operate despite the volatile environment.

Summary of findings for Benchmark 1

This section has provided an overview of the findings from the document review and field research surrounding Benchmark 1 of the STL Call to Action.

a. Summary of best practices and/or positive findings

- There are state level cluster meetings where subnational bodies involved in the implementation of child protection and safeguarding policies, not least MoGEI, MGCSW and the Ministries of Health, Justice and Internal Affairs meet on the monthly basis.
- There is resilience to continue education in the middle of raging conflict and uncertainty and, despite extremely low salaries and a lack of incentives, teachers in some schools are committed to ensure the continuity of education. In some cases, where salaries (or incentives in the case of volunteer teachers) are delayed or not paid, these teachers survive on the good will of parents and any incentives that come from the head teachers.

- Schools and education have been embraced as part of community initiatives whereby parents and other members of the community actively support schools. Even though incentives for both learners and teachers do not amount to funding, PTAs and individual parents in some schools are voluntarily providing support to teachers, particularly those coming from other locations in the country. In Malakal, teachers from Bor have been provided with accommodation and other non-monetary support and are encouraged by the community to continue teaching at their schools. This has acted as a motivation for teachers who continue supporting the schools in the locality due to the good will of the community and the local authority in the area.
 - Many professional teachers have been replaced with volunteers after many teachers left schools for reasons of conflict and insecurity, while others lost their lives. Although not ideal for reasons of long-term continuity, school teaching by volunteers serving their community has helped to minimise disruptions to children's learning. The volunteer teachers in most schools in the states are community members with at least senior level of education. Despite low levels of monthly remuneration through NGOs and partner organisations, such teachers are driven by the desire to serve their community and not by the financial incentives that comes with teaching.
 - Several major donors provide some incentives to keep schools running. For example, DFID and the EU IMPACT programme have established an initiative where teachers are encouraged by receiving incentives (\$40 per month, such figure being recommended by the National Education Cluster) to supplement their government salary and keep them in schools. The incentives provided are way more than the government salary and this has enabled some teachers registered under this programme to continue teaching in various schools.
- b. *Summary of gaps for each benchmark indicator*
- There is limited capacity among qualified and volunteer teachers to effectively implement safe school and learning policies, for example, the use of positive discipline. Many teachers who are currently teaching in schools are volunteers and not on the government payroll. As means to earn income for themselves, most of these teachers are not always in school and have a limited understanding of the government policies that are required to be implemented, not least around child protection and safeguarding.
 - The lack of incentives and delayed salaries for teachers forces many of them to seek alternative sources of income. As a result, teachers often leave school during school hours neglecting lessons and learners, which poses risks to learners if conflict breaks out while the responsible teacher is not in school.
 - There continues to be ongoing occupation of schools by military forces in some locations. During the conflict (2013, 2016) some schools were occupied by the military who have not since left. In some cases, the schools have either closed or moved to another school where two schools are forced to share facilities. Respondents in Greater Bahr el Ghazal, for example, mentioned three occupied schools, while some schools have been destroyed or occupied by displace populations in Equatoria and Greater Upper Nile.
 - South Sudan remains an insecure and volatile environment, with some parts of the country still experiencing conflict. This has not only hindered the effective implementation of policies but stopped some schools from operating altogether.
 - There has been limited dissemination and a lack of policies that guide schools on violence prevention and child safeguarding. Although the Child Act is in place, it is not understood by implementers at the school level and there is a lack of clarification on the roles and responsibility of national level ministries to oversee implementation. Due to issues around the dissemination of such policies, including the use of English documents rather than translations into Arabic and other languages, school representatives at the grass roots level are often unaware of the policies and do not implement or enforce them.
- c. *Overview of ways the Government (with the support of development partners) could/should address gaps for each benchmark indicator*
- **Benchmark 1.1 – Prevention of violence in and around schools is identified as a specific strategy in the national education sector policy or plan.** The GESP recognises the importance of children's health and safety but without explicitly acknowledging the risks learners face once inside their schools. An explicit objective within the GESP to prevent and reduce violence within schools (ST), accompanied by strategies, key performance indicators and budgets for its implementation and enforcement (MLT), would be much more powerful and effective. Such an objective should include specific strategies for developing a clear, concise and user-centred summary

in English, Arabic and other relevant languages to be printed and disseminated nationally to states and schools (ST), and then incorporated into orientations and training programmes for teachers and other education actors (MLT). Government and donor funding could be consolidated through support for or alignment with this strategy.

- **Benchmark 1.2 – There is explicit prohibition of corporal punishment in schools, and policies are in place to support positive discipline and classroom management.** There are clear laws in place prohibiting corporal punishment in schools, but better dissemination and enforcement of these laws and monitoring of schools' compliance is needed. Improved dissemination could be achieved through the preparation and printing of simple and visual posters in all appropriate languages, which could be distributed to schools for posting in prominent public spaces (ST). Since states have limited resource and capacity to support enforcement, communities, PTAs, school management committees, boards of governors and schools should have intermediate processes and protocols to hold teachers to account. This could be supported through increased use of radio programmes and content, again in the major national languages (MLT). The national level MoGEI should create a central, ideally online, repository for documents relating to child protection and safeguarding (MLT), and also develop and disseminate short guidance documents for teachers, including temporary volunteers, on how best to manage their classrooms without violence or corporal punishment (ST), backed up by training, wherever possible (MLT).
- **Benchmark 1.3 – The roles and responsibilities of the Ministry of Education in response and referral to incidents of violence are clearly set out in a multi-sectoral national child protection policy framework.** The Girl Child Protection Policy is a laudable step towards a multi-sectoral child protection and safeguarding framework but its scope should be revisited and expanded to cover all children, both male and female (ST). In terms of implementation and enforcement, the relevant sectors should come together under a formal institutional coordination and referral framework involving the MoGEI, the MGCSW, the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Internal Affairs and any other relevant ministries, to develop practical, consistent, harmonised and multilingual guidelines for coordinating actions, sharing information and otherwise minimising variation between states to ensure that the victim's needs are put first (MLT). Such guidelines should be written into state and county level development action plans with clearly defined targets and responsibilities to ensure that ownership sits with the Government in the longer term (MLT). Once prepared, they should also be summarised into a shorter, user-centred document in all main languages for printing and dissemination to schools for compliance by volunteers as well as registered teachers (MLT).
- **Benchmark 1.4 – The country has endorsed the Safe Schools Declaration and in situations of armed conflict is implementing the Guidelines for Protecting Schools and Universities from Military Use during Armed Conflict.** At present, few stakeholders are aware of South Sudan's endorsement of the Safe Schools Declaration and many schools remain directly and heavily impacted by the ongoing conflict. The GCPEA, the global partnership behind the Safe Schools Declaration, has collected examples of concrete measures to protect students and teachers from attack and schools and universities from attack and military use, which can serve as inspiration to fellow states and other stakeholders. MoGEI could review these examples, or directly draw on GCPEA for support, to develop a strategic and appropriate approach to facilitate the removal of all military personnel from school buildings and classrooms (ST). Thereafter, some short and simple guidelines should be prepared and disseminated to schools, setting out what the Safe Schools Declaration should mean in practice, channels of recourse and the key factors for them to consider in planning how to react to or mitigate the effects of further conflict (MLT).

4.2. Findings for Call to Action 2: Strengthen prevention and response at school level

Table 5: Findings for Call to Action Benchmark 2 – Strengthening prevention and response at school level

Item	Benchmark	National	Sub-national/State	School
2.1	Key violence prevention strategies are embedded in curriculum-based activities for children¹⁹.	National curriculum includes age appropriate approaches that (i) develop life skills, (ii) teach children about violence and safe behaviour, (iii) challenge social and cultural norms and promote equal relationships.	State supervises and assures information and curriculum is implemented in schools.	Schools deliver formal school syllabi that includes life skills, safe behaviour, and equal relationships.
Assessment				
		B= Partially in place	B = Partially in place	C = Not in place
<p>Discussion</p> <p>South Sudan is currently rolling out a new curriculum framework to replace the previous curriculum, which development partners described as ‘teacher-oriented’. Some central schools have already adopted the curriculum while others are shifting towards adoption more slowly. The new curriculum is broad and inclusive, having been developed based on the cultural and environmental context and experience of South Sudan. In the new curriculum, life skills, violence and safe behaviour, and the promotion of inclusion of marginalised groups are captured through curriculum values and principles²⁰.</p> <p>As part of improving learners’ life skills, the new curriculum considers integrating both information and communication technology and technical and vocational education and training from early childhood development to Primary 8. These elements are meant to enable learners to acquire skills for future use. As cross cutting issues, the curriculum also intends to introduce environmental awareness and sustainability, peace education and life skills. In particular, peace education is deemed important while some aspects of life skills will be introduced for the personal development of learners, establishing the following as key principles:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. A culture of excellence that supports innovation, creativity, continuous improvement and effectiveness; b. An environment of empowerment that promotes independence, individual learning, critical thinking, problem solving and emotional intelligence. <p>The new national curriculum is still in framework form at this stage and has not yet been comprehensively broken down to give detail regarding the magnitude or scope of consideration for each aspect of the above topics. From the framework, components relating to life skills, violence and safe behaviour have been given priority in light of the conflict-affected context of the country. The inclusion of marginalised groups and gender equitable relationships are applied across the whole curriculum as the framework has been developed with a focus on both male and female learners.</p> <p>Regarding violence in schools, the curriculum identified the following as part of the key values that needs to be observed during its implementation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. <i>peace and tolerance</i> – as part of the core values, peace and tolerance are among the aspects which this curriculum aims to bring out and which will be practised at the school level to address the issue of violence in schools; 				

¹⁹ Section 3, WHO 2019, Schools-based Violence Prevention: A Practical Handbook. This links to Benchmark 3.2 and 5.3

²⁰ Curriculum Framework, South Sudan

	<p>b. <i>compassion and social justice</i> - these are other core values which will be practised at the school level to particularly raise the voice of marginalised groups at all levels.</p> <p>According to respondents, the roll out of the new curriculum has been slow due to the political instability, insecurity and limited knowledge of the final structure of the national administrative system, including the number of states. Supervision at the state level mainly focuses on school structures with the MGCSW focused on gender and related violence in schools. Particular supervision by the MoGEI at state level ensures implementation has been minimal to date, not least due to the lack of budget to facilitate ministry activities at the state level.</p> <p>Responses from state representatives indicated that there is some teaching of these topics to children in schools. In total, a third of state representatives surveyed reported the curriculum being used to teach learners in primary and secondary school about life skills, 44% about violence and safe behaviour and 44% about the inclusion of marginalised groups. At the school level, however, there was less awareness of this content. 78% percent of learners surveyed were not aware of life skills being taught, although some indicated that such lessons were previously provided but have since stopped due to a lack of qualified teachers, while others suggested that such training is provided by NGOs rather than schools. Regarding violence and safe behaviour, 80% of learners surveyed were unaware of such training being provided in schools, and only 10% reported their schools promoting equality between all types of people.</p> <p>The conflict that heavily impacted schools in South Sudan also contributed to a high turnover of teachers and disruption to the implementation of the new curriculum. The advent of volunteer teachers in schools seemingly disoriented the normal procedure of activities and thus disorganised the proper channels for addressing learners' life skills, and teaching around violence, safe behaviour and the promotion of equality in schools. The latter is nevertheless being delivered through civic education which is provided to learners under the new curriculum and encourages peaceful co-existence between them.</p>			
2.2	<p>A. Child safeguarding principles and procedures are in place in schools, inclusive of codes of conduct, and safe recruitment standards²¹.</p>	<p>National guidelines detail process by which all schools respond to child protection concerns, including referral to services. The Ministry of Education has a focal point.</p>	<p>State has step-by-step procedures for schools to follow and has identified one focal point with overseeing and responding to concerns.</p>	<p>System for responding to child protection concerns is in place following State or central guidelines, or school if no policy. School has focal point with responsibility for responding to protection incidents.</p>
Assessment				
B = Partially in place		B = Partially in place	B = Partially in place	B = Partially in place
<p>Discussion</p> <p>Regarding the establishment of safe and confidential reporting and response mechanisms, both state ministry officials and school administration referred to the Teachers' Code of Conduct which provides the greatest direction for managing violence and promoting safety in schools. Such stakeholders also referred to documents such as the Child Act and the General Education Act by way of guidelines for developing school rules and regulations, which are then shared with teachers and students, for example during assembly.</p> <p>At the national level, the MoGEI has directorates which provide focal points for each section e.g. the Directorate for Gender and Child Welfare which is responsible for gender and related issues, as well as child violence, the Directorate of Planning and Budgeting responsible for policies, funds and allocation, and</p>				

²¹ See UNICEF 2012; Keeping Children Safe 2014; UNGEI 2108. This links to benchmark 1.3 above.

the Directorate for Capacity Building and Service Delivery responsible for capacity strengthening among teachers and overall human resources at the school level. Such directorates at the national level provide focal points for issues from states and schools at various levels within the country.

At the state level, the Director General is the overall focal point where all issues are referred before reaching the Minister and the Office of the Director General works with all state ministry level offices to harmonise issues coming before the Minister. The MoGEI also collaborates with partner organisations (NGOs, UN agencies and other ministries) which could also provide focal points in responding to violence. In cases of extreme violence beyond the Ministry’s capacity, such cases are reported to the police and sometimes referred to the Ministry of Justice, while extreme medical cases are referred to hospitals which then collaborate with the MGCSW, the police and the Ministry of Justice. However, there are not state-level procedures for schools to identify one focal point to oversee and respond to concerns, rather the state gives schools the liberty to identify and select individuals, committees or school representatives to act as their own focal points.

At the school level, many schools have established leadership through students, teachers, PTAs and clubs that engage learners but also help with monitoring and handling cases of violence. In various schools and even at the state level, there is not a specific policy to address this process, but each school has guidelines and school regulations which are reportedly shared with learners during assembly every morning and with parents at the opening and closing of schools. These regulations are meant to protect learners and provide guidance for teachers and school administration on how to respond to cases of violence and punish violators. In addition to this, schools in all states teach respect, peace and reconciliation in school lessons and encourage parents to take part in the PTA and to talk to their children on matters related to violence and conflict.

Schools reported specific mechanisms to protect learners and respond to violence. In many schools, disciplinary committees have been set up to oversee and directly respond to violence, with issues beyond this committee being forwarded to head teachers who then decide whether to refer the issue to the state MoGEI. At both the primary and secondary levels, many schools have selected boy and girl learners who are the first respondents to conflict or violence in schools. These representatives work with teachers on duty and head teachers to ensure the safety of all learners. In addition, schools select teachers to be on duty on a weekly basis to oversee and handle cases within the schools. The head teacher and deputy offices are available to handle more complicated cases beyond the students’ or teachers’ capacity to handle, while the MGCSW collaborates with teachers and head teachers to handle cases of GBV or other cases beyond their capacity. The gender representatives from the Ministry also report directly to the Director General and collaborate with the respective gender desks of the police, NGOs and the Ministry of Justice.

Despite the existence of these systems, only 15% of learners surveyed were aware of their school having a step-by-step process for responding to reports of violence and only 5% knew about confidential reporting procedures. In practice, students described reporting cases to teachers on duty while those in PoC sites or camps confirmed reporting cases to camp management or teachers depending on who is nearer. Students also reported the following procedure: Student → School Prefect (Head boy/girl) → Teachers → Deputy head teacher → Head teacher → Ministry representative (Gender/Inspector/Director General). However, a lack of confidential reporting procedures subjects some students to violence as they become targets for bullies or violence, which may also take place outside of school and involve wider criminal groups, such as ‘Niggers’, drug users or cartels. Policies should protect learners in these broader contexts too.

B.	National guidelines clearly outline norms and standards of ethical behaviour to be included in Teacher Codes of Conduct.	Codes of conduct required for all staff including State and Schools. State/sub-national authorities ensure compliance of Codes of Conduct in schools.	School has Code of Conduct that is publicly posted and requires all teachers to understand and comply; Ramifications for violations are proscribed and enforced; Requires
-----------	--	---	---

			written signatures by all staff; includes Codes of behaviour for students.
	Assessment		
	B = Partially in place	B = Partially in place	B = Partially in place
<p>Discussion</p> <p>MoGEI has issued the ‘South Sudan Teachers Professional Code of Conduct’. Anti-violence is included in part IV number 4.9 which sets out that ‘the teacher shall not carry to class dangerous items like guns, grenades, arrows unless cleared by the school authority’ and more generic wording in part VI number 6.3 which requires that ‘the teacher shall observe the laws of South Sudan particularly in matters of sex, marriage and parenthood and at all times set a good example to children’. However, there is no explicit reference to preventing children from all forms of violence. Regarding disciplinary action, the head teacher who is responsible for implementing the Teachers Code of Conduct can suspend a teacher who violates the code for a period of one (1) month. Thereafter, they can inform the sub-committee on discipline which will investigate the matter and make a ruling. The decision of the BOG or school management committee about a violator is final and the highest disciplinary action that schools can take in response to violations of the Teachers Code of Conduct is to relieve the teacher of his or her duties. In section X number 10.4, ‘Breach of the code of conduct may lead to any or a combination of any of the following: expulsion, suspension from school or complete withdrawal of teacher’s certificate.’ Regarding compliance, section X numbers 10.1 and 10.2 state that ‘each teacher is required to sign an undertaking to adhere to the rules and regulations as laid down in this document and, it is the duty of every teacher to observe and respect this code and to report any breach of the code to the appropriate authorities’. More generally, the Teachers Code of Conduct provides guidelines to teachers on how to handle learners, colleagues and the community but does not explicitly direct them not to practise corporal punishment.</p> <p>In addition, there is the South Sudan Teachers Code of Conduct for Emergency Situation, which was developed by MoGEI with support from UNICEF. This supplementary Code is more explicit in terms of child rights and safeguarding, and prohibits the use of physical punishment, shaming or humiliation in schools. However, there appears to be lack of clarity on which Code of Conduct to use. It may be better to harmonise one Code of Conduct that includes prohibition of violence and is also relevant for emergency settings.</p> <p>At the state level, the MoGEI reported having taken the initiative to distribute the Code of Conduct to various schools and occasionally organise meetings in collaboration with partner NGOs to encourage teachers to adhere to the Code of Conduct. However, following the conflict, many professional teachers have been replaced by volunteers in schools and since they are not on the payroll, the state ministries have limited authority over them. Introducing policies or increasing demands on volunteers teaching out of good will could risk pushing them away, leaving schools and classrooms unstaffed. Nevertheless, the MGCSW at the state level takes initiative to visit schools and collect details of violations, especially related to gender, which are then reported to the Director General who may take action and thereby increase pressure on teachers to comply with the Code of Conduct.</p> <p>In schools, the headteachers are responsible for enforcing the implementation of the Teachers Code of Conduct, but there appear to be different versions in different parts of the country. In Wau and Malakal, for example, there are schools using the old Sudanese Code of Conduct while in Equatoria, teachers in both primary and secondary schools did not have ready access to copies that could be verified. Although the Code of Conduct exists in South Sudan, full dissemination and ownership by schools remains incomplete and many teachers still use the old Sudan Code to run and manage their schools. Among the schools that participated in the exercise, only two had the Code of Conduct posted on the wall for public viewing, one of which was in Arabic. In some of the schools, the head teacher was in possession of the Code, but the majority of schools did not have copies at the time of the assessment. Some mentioned having lost copies of the Code of Conduct during the conflict when school equipment and other materials were destroyed.</p>			

In regard to enforcement of the Code at the school level, the laws and actions in cases of violations appear silent and not widely known or disseminated. These are not written anywhere, and teachers are only warned and told of conditions for violation and punishment but no copies are available for them to review and remind themselves. More broadly, the constitution of South Sudan gives precedence to the customary court to take over laws and violations at the grassroots level. In light of this, violations of the Teachers Code of Conduct are not strictly punishable, instead the issues are often settled between families. For example, the pregnancy of a female student by a teacher is resolved between parents and community elders, and there is no strong enforcement mechanism that supersedes customary laws. Regarding signatures, teachers have not signed the Code of Conduct since it is not readily available in schools, and so they adhere to directives provided by the head teacher.

Due to budget limitations and continuous conflict in various parts of the country, the MoGEI's capacity to supervise and ensure implementation of the Code is minimal and many schools remain closed. Often, school invigilators and supervisors have to tag along with NGOs to visit schools as the MoGEI does not have a stable budget to support supervisory activities. Similarly, teachers' capacity (especially in primary schools) to comprehensively embrace and implement the Teachers Code of Conduct is minimal.

C.	The establishment of safe and confidential reporting mechanisms for students is mandated for all schools. There is a working, accessible national reporting mechanism such as a national child helpline.	State supports schools in implementation of reporting mechanism and ensure availability of support mechanisms. It has its own mechanism for response when reports are elevated.	Students are aware of and use reporting mechanism to report experiences of violence. It is linked to support services and includes a monitoring system for reporting and accountability.
	Assessment		
	C = Not in place	C = Not in place	C = Not in place

Discussion

At present, there does not appear to be any mechanism in South Sudan regarding the establishment of safe and confidential processes for reporting and responding to violence in schools. The Teachers Code of Conduct provides some guidance on working with students, but the majority of schools mentioned reporting directly to teachers, the deputy or head teacher. As a result, the processes are not confidential and vary between schools. Where the issue is beyond the school's capacity, the Office of the Director General at state level is then contacted to direct the issue to the police or another ministry, or to raise the concern to the national level. However, most issues raised by schools are handled at the school or state level. Reporting may also be done through the school prefects, head girl or boy who have been instituted by the schools to oversee and respond to cases of violence within the school.

Regarding a national helpline, some schools in Wau reported 112 as the state helpline that students can call to get help from the police. In other states, such as Equatoria and the Upper Nile regions, there is no helpline for students to contact when seeking help. Similarly, at the national level, MoGEI officials were not aware of any line established to facilitate help for students over and above the general help line (777, 999) provided in Juba to help the general public, but not learners or children specifically. In total, only 5% of learners surveyed reported awareness of a national child help line to call to report cases of violence.

In terms of monitoring cases of violence, some schools keep records and occasionally report them to the Director General at the state level, although such cases are not kept or tracked through a system. Sensitive issues like abuse of children by teachers, pregnancies and forced marriage are not shared as these are considered cultural and are managed and handled at the school and community level. Overall, although the MoGEI in South Sudan is responsible for the overall development and implementation of policies that govern human resources in schools, in practice the limited capacity and available financial resources to monitor and track

implementation at the state and school levels mean that, for the most part, school management committees, PTAs and communities usually play the greatest role in the decision making processes and matters relating to violence. POCs, unlike government schools, are regularly monitored and supported by UN agencies such as WHO-health, UNICEF-education, UNHCR-counseling services. Emergency response offices may be able to respond to cases of violence however this was not discussed by schools in the survey.

D.	National pre- and in-service training for school staff includes their obligations on child safeguarding, including reporting and response obligations.	State authorities ensure that teachers receive pre- or in-service training on their obligations on child safeguarding, including reporting and response obligations.	All schools staff receive pre- or in-service training on their obligations on child safeguarding, including reporting and response obligations. Staff are adequately trained to prevent re-victimisation of children and are knowledgeable about the referral pathway in place in the locality.
-----------	--	--	---

Assessment

B =Partially in place

C = Not in place

C = Not in place

Discussion

At the national level, there is some, albeit not prominent, content in the pre-service teacher training curriculum regarding effective positive discipline, nonviolent classroom management strategies and teachers’ obligations on child safeguarding. MoGEI respondents were however less clear regarding training on violence reporting and response referral pathways for states and schools, with awareness being indicated by only 50% of participants in the exercise. Although government policies expect teachers to be knowledgeable on referral pathways and the prevention of the re-victimisation of children, South Sudan is heavily impacted by the limited number of teacher training institutions. In addition to this, many teachers who were professionally trained have since moved to camps or PoC sites for safety reasons, or left teaching to run personal businesses. This leaves schools to be run by volunteers who have not received professional training and do not know about child safeguarding or violence reporting obligations. For teachers that remain, referral services in South Sudan are practically non-existent and even though teachers would like to provide such services, the systems and means are simply not in place.

At the state level, the MoGEI reported ensuring that teachers receive in-service training on their obligations regarding child safeguarding and reporting and responding to violence. In western Equatoria, the pre- and in-service training is carried out at Solidarity College while in other states training is reinforced by the provision of guidelines on the management, protection and safeguarding of children. More broadly, however, responses from state level participants indicated that budgetary constraints massively limit their ability to pay salaries, let alone implement planned activities. In which case, the claims that state level MoGEI staff ensure such training takes place may represent aspirational or desirable responses, rather than the reality of activities in practice.

Among schools, various respondents reported that some staff were adequately trained to prevent the re-victimisation of children and had knowledge about referral pathways, notwithstanding the unavailability of such systems in many states. Learners in both primary and secondary schools believed that teachers in South Sudan had received training on classroom management and obligations regarding the protection of children and were trained and capable of carrying out their obligations. 36% of students surveyed further considered their teachers to have received training on reporting and responding to violence, although learners also mentioned the high ratio of pupils to teachers, limiting their ability to provide the required attention to every child.

E.	There are national policies that regulate hiring of new teachers and staff and their transfer to ensure suitability for working with children.	States implement the policy requiring background checks when recruiting or transferring teachers.	School follows or has individualised methods to vet staff to ensure their suitability for working with children; it requests new hires or States to report previous convictions or reasons for transfer.	
	Assessment			
	C = Not in place	C = Not in place	C = Not in place	
<p>Discussion</p> <p>There are no regulations in South Sudan that guide states or schools on how to conduct background checks before hiring teachers to assess their suitability for working with children. The MoGEI at both national and state levels reported conducting checks to verify teachers’ qualifications but not their backgrounds. Teachers in South Sudan are also posted to schools by the Government, which provides limited opportunities to conduct background checks. According to one official at the national MoGEI, “In South Sudan, there are no guidelines to ensure teachers who are dismissed for bad behaviour are not simply transferred to another schools. The movement of teachers in South Sudan is not controlled and there is not a system or a policy to monitor teachers’ behaviour and or movement as thus, teachers dismissed from one school often move to another to continue teaching often in another state or region.”</p> <p>At the state level, the MoGEI often checks teachers’ qualifications and sometimes contacts referees mainly to ascertain his or her qualifications. However, now that the majority of teachers are volunteers, it is hard to trace their background in the absence of an appropriate vetting system. In addition, there are no guidelines or policies from the Government that direct the process of checking teachers.</p> <p>Within primary and secondary schools, there are no established methods to vet staff to ensure their suitability for working with children. Instead, schools rely on the qualifications of staff to work, evidenced by showing the various qualification papers and experience. With no stable government salaries and a majority of staff being volunteers, it is difficult for both schools and state ministries to vet staff, rather the ministries and school administration encourage capable individuals from the community to participate in school activities and support wherever possible to fill the gaps caused by missing teachers.</p> <p>As a new country that achieved independence just nine years ago, many systems in South Sudan are not yet established or functional. Both primary and secondary schools lack sufficient qualified teachers and despite the MoGEI being in charge of registering and transferring of teachers, many schools have gaps, pupil-teacher ratios are high and there are not enough teachers to provide education services. In cases of the conviction of a teacher where he or she is transferred to another school or suspended or expelled, the school has to request more teachers from the MoGEI, which can take a long time. Also, depending on the magnitude of the teacher’s offence or violation, the issue may be resolved at the school or community level enabling the teacher to continue working at the school. In the case of transfers, some schools may request the previous school to provide a recommendation but this does not affect their deployment, as the MoGEI controls teachers’ deployment and, in the face of a scarcity of teachers, schools often scramble for the available few to support them. Primary schools in remote areas find it hard to attract teachers, as most prefer to be based in urban areas where they can access public services.</p>				
2.3	Each school has at least one focal point who is capacitated to provide front-line mental health/psychosocial support to children experiencing violence.	Ministry of Education has a training program or special curriculum for school counselors that includes children’s mental health and well-being; and has arrangement or referral procedures when	State has support mechanism for school counselors and refers to specialised services to assist schools when necessary.	School counselor is in the school and is capacitated to provide front-line mental health/psychosocial support to students; and has identified a referral source for range of specialized services

		a child or his/her family needs specialised services.		(mental health, medical, family services...)
		Assessment		
		C= Not in place	C = Not in place	C = Not in place
	<p>Discussion</p> <p>The teachers’ curriculum for a certificate and diploma authored by the University of Juba does not contain course content for counsellors in pre- or in-service training. Rather, the curriculum focuses primarily on core courses taught within the school, but not counselling. Regarding children’s mental health and wellbeing, schools and state ministries collaborate with health facilities on the ground but there appears to be no policy to guide or set up referral systems for schools. In South Sudan, there are no referral procedures within the school except for health facilities where a doctor or nurse can facilitate a referral once the student is admitted to hospital.</p> <p>Similarly, there are seemingly no professional counsellors that can provide comprehensive support for students experiencing violence. Only 15% of students surveyed reported awareness of school counsellors who aim to support children particularly affected by violence, with the vast majority being unaware of such service. Rather, learners reported schools having selected male and female teachers who act as counsellors and respond to students’ issues. In Wau, these teachers are considered wise to provide advice and respected for having broad experience of culture, country history and mastery of the local environment. Learners also rely on fellow trained students, advisors from the school and parents to provide counselling and psychosocial support.</p> <p>By contrast, in schools in PoC sites and refugee camps, humanitarian agencies have provided qualified counsellors through health facilities to provide comprehensive support to learners in this environment. Indeed, most students reporting awareness of counselling services came from PoC sites or camps. At government schools, there is nevertheless stigma attached to these services and their use is discouraged lest people be labelled as sick or considered victims, which can affect their education. In Western Equatoria, seeking counselling services from the hospital comes with stigma due to the high prevalence rates of HIV and so schools invite NGOs to come and provide support to these learners, although the service is not consistent or confidential. Although some South Sudanese schools do have counsellors that can provide much needed psychosocial or trauma support, overall, both primary and secondary schools are in dire need of counselling services. As a result of this, and learners’ continuing poor mental health, there is recurring conflict within schools and girls in particular may become exposed to additional risks where they seek counselling and support outside of schools.</p> <p>Despite the widespread lack of counselling services, students appear to collaborate with teachers to share their experiences of challenges facing them. The teachers in schools are the guides and facilitators who work with learners at different levels to address psychological and related issues in the absence of a professional counsellor.</p>			
2.4	The physical environment in and around schools is safe and designed with the well-being of children in mind ²² .	There are established national standards for school buildings and grounds that address student safety	The State authorities are aware of national standards and monitor improvements to schools’ physical environment.	School design reflect national guidelines. The community, students and staff have mapped unsafe areas and have identified solutions for these areas. Sanitary facilities are safe and secure, classroom architecture and design is gender-responsive, and

²² UNGEI 2018 Domain 7; WHO 2019 Section 6.

				students move freely to and from school.
		Assessment		
		B = Partially in place	C = Not in place	C = Not in place
	<p>Discussion</p> <p>The MoGEI has national guidelines that provide standards to ensure school buildings and grounds keep students safe. The majority of Directorate officers (67% of those surveyed) were largely aware of these policies but the challenge comes in their implementation. Many schools currently occupy colonial buildings and most structures do not meet the standards. The responsibility for maintaining and renovating structures often lies with the school as the MoGEI does not have an allocated budget line, but this leaves spaces unsafe and sanitary facilities inadequate. Insecurity in many areas of the country has also forced some schools to vacate their intended locations of operation.</p> <p>At the state level, a third of respondents reported full awareness of the national standards to monitor improvements to schools’ physical environment. Once again, however, the team is limited by budget restrictions and their role in monitoring schools is only made possible by joining partner organisations’ visits to inspect schools.</p> <p>At the school level, the majority of schools surveyed in the diagnostic exercise are hosted in old missionary buildings with depleted structures. Some are not fenced and lower classes take place under trees. One primary school in Wau is located in a former prison. The school administration has tried to put up semi-permanent structures to shelter learners during the rainy seasons, but these structures are made of common mud and the weight of water on an unprotected wall makes them crumble, thereby posing a danger to children. Similarly, insecurity has driven schools from the interior into towns forcing them to share structures, for example, one secondary school now hosts two or three other schools using the same structures due to scarcity. Regarding construction, the ownership of schools is not clear. In some locations, schools are labelled as ‘community schools’ and while the Government provides teachers and human resources, the community claims ownership and it is unclear whom the schools belong to, who is responsible for maintaining them and ensuring that structures and other facilities are up to standard.</p> <p>Nevertheless, there are some examples of schools, having been built by UN agencies that have followed construction guidelines, but generally schools across the country are reported to be poorly constructed.</p>			

Summary of findings for Benchmark 2

This section provides an overview of the findings from the document review and field research surrounding Benchmark 2 of the STL Call to Action.

a. Summary of best practices and/or positive findings

- There are examples of collaboration between the state government and NGOs to supervise and inspect schools.
- Communities make valuable contributions to support school administration, for example, through the PTA.
- There are national guidelines and standards for the construction of schools and the MoGEI is rolling out a new curriculum based on values that include peace, tolerance and respect for marginalised groups.

b. Summary of gaps for each benchmark indicator

- Insecurity limits the extent to which the Government and partners can access schools.
 - There is insufficient budget that would enable the Government to: construct or renovate schools to adhere to the existing standards; inspect schools to implement and enforce violence reporting mechanisms; and provide psychosocial support to children through designated school counsellors.
 - There are no mechanisms for vetting teachers to ensure that they are safe to work with children and despite the existence of a Teachers Code of Conduct, physical copies are rarely available to teachers in schools.
- c. *Overview of ways the Government (with the support of development partners) could/should address gaps for each benchmark indicator*
- **Benchmark 2.1 – Key violence prevention strategies are embedded in curriculum-based activities for children.** South Sudan has introduced a new curriculum containing content on life skills, violence and safe behaviour and equal relationships, but the relevant content first needs to be translated into syllabi, learning materials and classroom activities (ST). An effective roll-out is also unlikely to be achieved without a greater allocation of resources at the state level to ensure that schools and teachers are equipped with the necessary training, skills and materials (MLT). Development partners could play a role in this and such materials should contain clear linkages between teacher training schema and classroom practices and be available to both registered and volunteer teachers. In the longer term, assessment systems should also reflect key violence prevention strategies to mitigate the effects of teachers teaching to the test (MLT).
 - **Benchmark 2.2 – Child safeguarding principles and procedures are in place in schools, inclusive of codes of conduct, and safe recruitment standards.** This benchmark consisted of four components and recommendations aligned to these include:
 - **National guidelines to establish safe and confidential reporting mechanisms** – Child safeguarding and protection currently takes place on an ad hoc basis within South Sudan’s schools. To address this, there is a need to develop explicit user-centred guidelines for schools on how to create step-by-step, efficient and confidential procedures for responding to school-based violence in accordance with the applicable legislation and Teachers Code of Conduct (ST). Such guidelines should: outline confidential reporting mechanisms for students at the school level; identify a focal person within each state education office and school to respond to protection incidents; specify different mechanisms and procedures for dealing with different types of incident (for example, depending on the nature of the violence or the identity of the perpetrator) and their repercussions; and identify coordinated state referral pathways with clearly defined responsibilities for key bodies such as the MoGEI, MGCSW, the Ministries of Health, Justice and Internal Affairs. Such guidelines should be clear and concise for printing and dissemination to all schools at minimum cost; available in all relevant languages; and be written for delivery via a school-based training modality so that all teachers can participate. In addition to this, capacity building should be undertaken to train state actors across sectors on issues including monitoring and enforcement (MLT), and a national helpline should also be established for children to report violence, with details shared through school assemblies or radio programmes (MLT).
 - **Norms and standards of ethical behaviour in Teachers Code of Conduct** – Given inconsistencies around its use and availability in South Sudan, the Teachers Code of Conduct should be harmonised and updated to explicitly include a strict prohibition on corporal punishment and other violence against children (ST). Such Code, or a summarised form, should then be printed and disseminated to all schools to ensure that they are using the same version across the country (ST). A simple poster or painted sign setting out the key expectations on teachers should also be shared with schools for display in a prominent location (together with adhesive for affixing the poster to walls or paint for signs) (ST). In due course, state officers should monitor whether teachers are signing the Code on an annual basis (MLT).
 - **Pre- and in-service training on obligations for child safeguarding and reporting/response** – The majority of teachers in South Sudan are currently untrained volunteers and state-level education offices lack the resources to pay staff, let alone train teachers. In such situation, strengthening teachers’ awareness and skills around child safeguarding and violence reporting can best be addressed by ensuring that each school has at least one copy of the amended and summarised Teachers Code of Conduct (see above) (ST). Head teachers can then provide training to their staff, volunteers or not, at minimal extra cost (ST).

If completed, school-based training on national guidelines to establish safe and confidential reporting mechanisms would also suffice. In the future, as the teaching workforce becomes more stable and formalised, such obligations must be incorporated into the teacher training curriculum, in parallel with efforts to build capacity in teacher training colleges (MLT).

- **Policies that regulate hiring of new teachers and staff and their transfer to ensure suitability for working with children** – The recruitment and deployment of professional teachers in South Sudan are managed through the Government, in which case any systems or databases that record their details to facilitate the payment of salaries should be reviewed and streamlined, and then updated to capture qualifications, information regarding signature of the Code of Conduct, and confirmed incidents of violence or other criminal offences (ST). Head teachers should also receive explicit guidance on how to conduct at least informal checks on all new teachers, including volunteers, to assess their suitability for working with children (ST). This could include liaising with the police, justice or social welfare sectors at state level and such guidance could be contained in a section or annex to the guidelines for establishing safe reporting mechanisms or the revised Teachers Code of Conduct (see above).
- **Benchmark 2.3 – Each school has at least one focal point who is capacitated to provide front-line mental health/psychosocial support to children experiencing violence.** Overall, many schools reported having identified one or two individuals, typically a male and a female teacher, to deal with violence but it seems they have little or no professional training or capacity to provide specific front-line mental health or psychosocial support to children experiencing violence. It is even unclear whether such teachers are formally trained or volunteers. Such teachers would benefit from concise and standardised guidance for performing this role (ST), and while the teaching workforce remains unstable and informal, some additional content on supporting children affected by violence should also be incorporated into the Teachers Code of Conduct to offer at least basic guidance to all teachers, with compliance enforced by head teachers (ST). As the workforce formalises, teacher training materials and curricula should be revised to include components on learners’ mental health and well-being (MLT).
- **Benchmark 2.4 – The physical environment in and around schools is safe and designed with the well-being of children in mind.** South Sudan appears to have appropriate national guidelines that address school safety but inadequate resources at the state and school levels to maintain buildings or ensure compliance. Some schools have also been forced by conflict to abandon their intended sites of operation. While the national context remains fragile, the MoGEI and state offices should develop memoranda of understanding with school PTAs, boards of governors (BOGs) and other community bodies to clarify responsibilities and expectations regarding the upkeep of school buildings (ST). When the situation stabilises and more funding is available, the MoGEI and state offices should then take greater responsibility in bringing all schools up to the appropriate standard (MLT).

4.3. Findings for Call to Action 3: Shift social norms and behaviour change

Table 6: Findings for Call to Action Benchmark 3 – Shifting social norms and behaviour change

Item	Standard	National	Sub-National/State	School
3.1	There is wide dissemination and engagement with stakeholders to build knowledge and appreciation of child rights and laws prohibiting violence.	National government and policy supports the implementation of activities to disseminate information and engage stakeholders on child rights and	States support the implementation of activities to disseminate information and engage schools, community members/leaders on child rights	Schools support the implementation of activities to disseminate information and engage students, teachers, parents and community members on child rights and laws

		laws prohibiting violence at the national level.	and laws prohibiting violence at the State level.	prohibiting violence at the school level.
Assessment				
		B = Partially in place	C = Not in place	C = Not in place
<p>Discussion</p> <p>At the national level, there are laws that prohibit violence against children such as the Constitution and the Child Act 2008, however, there are no guidelines or policies providing strategies or direction on how to disseminate such information to schools and community members. The MoGEI has a website with open materials to access and review, and some policies and information are disseminated between ministries and by partners who often take the responsibility for sharing them with interested parties. The Ministry also works with various organisations that provide support to education programmes. Partner organisations like UNICEF, War Child Canada and INTERSOS support the Ministry in relation to engagement with stakeholders to build their knowledge and appreciation of child rights and laws prohibiting violence. UNICEF further provides short-term training for teachers and essential materials to schools to reduce the burden on learners and to encourage them to participate in schooling.</p> <p>The state MoGEI similarly reports supporting the implementation of activities to disseminate information to and engage with schools, community members and local leaders regarding child rights and laws against violence. The state office has been responsible for disseminating education-related policies to schools, which are then encouraged to customise them to the particular context. However, although the MoGEI supports this initiative at the state level, it does not have a stable budget to facilitate the printing and distribution of policies to various schools, with copies shared among several schools and actual implementation remaining limited.</p> <p>At the school level, schools are charged with engaging communities in matters relating to child rights through the PTAs, which also play an active role in the wider running of the schools. Dissemination remains minimal but, in some cases, takes place through school laws, guidelines and standards which are extracted from the national documents, issued to students upon admission, read to students during assembly every morning and shared with parents during the closing of schools. Such standards, where available, also guide the disciplinary committee on actions to take following incidences of violence, but in practice they have not reached all schools and many still practise corporal punishment and other forms of violence.</p>				
3.2	Specific, evidence-informed interventions are researched and implemented, addressing social norms that drive key forms of violence and/or helping children manage risks ²³ .	National policy supports the development and implementation of evidence-informed initiatives ²⁴ that address broad social norms that drive key forms of violence (e.g. bullying, digital safety, sexual abuse and exploitation, youth and gang violence).	States support the implementation and monitoring of initiatives in schools/communities that address social norms that drive key forms of violence.	Schools support the implementation and monitoring of initiatives in the school and surrounding community that address social norms that drive key forms of violence.

		Assessment		
		B = Partially in place	C = Not in place	C = Not in place
	<p>Discussion</p> <p>Aside from policies that prohibit violence, there are no national policies that provide guidance on implementing or researching interventions to address social norms surrounding violence. There is, nevertheless, at the national level an Office of Research that sits under the Directorate of Planning and Budgeting, which is responsible for leading research processes and helping the national level MoGEI make informed decisions relating to education.</p> <p>Partner organisations like Save the Children, UNICEF and GESS often play a lead role on specific evidence-informed interventions that are researched and implemented to address social norms on violence, working in collaboration with the MoGEI. UNICEF, in particular, is at the forefront, working with the Ministry in the development and distribution of policies, while other organisations like Mott MacDonald have staff based at the national level MoGEI to support the development and dissemination of policies at the government level.</p> <p>At the state ministry level, there is apparently support for the implementation of initiatives in schools and communities to address social norms that drive key forms of violence, which are typically carried out by the relevant PTA. There is also the MGCSW that visits schools and monitors how community and social processes affect learners. It then collaborates with various government offices to work to address particular norms that instigate or promote violence.</p> <p>At school level, student leadership (class monitors, head boys/girls) are appointed to report cases of violence from among learners. The PTA often supports the school administration in the implementation of policies to minimise violence but also learns from the school about such policies. Some schools have also developed standards that are shared with the community through leaders and learners to guide them on how to behave and respond to incidences of violence within and outside of school. Other schools have come up with rules and policies that best correspond to community practices and ensure that both teachers and members of the community respect learners and the school environment, which in some cases has helped girls to actively participate without intimidation.</p>			
3.3	Young people, parents, teachers and community members in and around schools are engaged and active on the topic of school violence.	Ministry of Education supports national, contextualised communication initiatives to raise awareness on violence in schools.	State level strategy for implementation of media, arts, or other awareness raising activities	Extra-curricular or community-based arts, drama, print documents, or other activities that promote awareness at the school and for parents and families
		Assessment		
		B = Partially in place	B = Partially in place	B = Partially in place
	<p>Discussion</p> <p>In South Sudan, violence is considered part of the conflict and, as part of the peace process, there have been initiatives by various partners that engage students and communities in dialogue and action against violence. At the national level, there is a radio programme aired country wide called 'Sawa Shabaab' that particularly focuses on youth and encourages them towards dialogue, cooperation and unity instead of violence. Beyond Government, organisations like 'Safe to Play' and programmes like UNICEF's 'Safe to Learn' are other initiatives that are addressing violence.</p> <p>At the state level, support is provided to schools through policies, security and planning where needed. The state does not directly engage in these activities except through schools, counties/Payams or communities, however, the GBV desk actively visits schools to ensure cases of violence are addressed according to the law.</p> <p>At the school level, awareness is being raised through efforts by NGOs, teachers and school administration to minimise violence. All schools also encourage learners to participate in key initiatives including traditional music, drama, arts and crafts, trainings, radio shows, games and sports as ways of addressing differences to</p>			

minimise violence. These activities are often organised by the schools to give learners opportunities to engage with students from different tribes and other backgrounds.

Overall, there are no policies but programmes and initiatives use shows, plays, trainings, arts and crafts to highlight the diversity of South Sudan and encourage the spirit of cooperation and acceptance despite differences in culture, skin color, language and ways of life. Given South Sudan's background of violence, the country at different levels has put in place systems that create awareness about conflict and violence. Schools have developed rules for their governance that also provide direction in the event of any violation. Communities also participate through the PTA, which actively engages in school decisions and contributes to the prevention of violence by enforcing school rules within both the school and the community.

Summary of findings for Benchmark 3

This section has provided an overview of the findings from the document review and field research surrounding Benchmark 3 of the STL Call to Action.

a. Summary of best practices and/or positive findings

- Partner organisations and PTAs are supporting schools to implement activities, sometimes in accordance with guidance from the state, to raise awareness around violence prevention and child safeguarding.
- NGOs in collaboration with the MoGEI disseminate the various government policies making them easier to access.
- Staff at the state and school management levels are open and willing to adapt government policies that provides clear direction for education and violence-reduction strategies.

b. Summary of gaps for each benchmark indicator

- At both national and state level, there is no existing policy that guides the dissemination process or procedure in relation to raising awareness of violence reduction.
- In the majority of schools visited, the school administration and teachers were unaware of any existing government policies produced by the MoGEI regarding child protection and safeguarding to be implemented by schools.
- There is a lack of resources to print and provide the relevant policies to the right people.
- There is also a language barrier with policies printed in English being incomprehensible for speakers of Arabic and other languages.

c. Overview of ways the Government (with the support of development partners) could/should address gaps for each benchmark indicator

- **Benchmark 3.1 – There is wide dissemination and engagement with stakeholders to build knowledge and appreciation of child rights and laws prohibiting violence.** Although there are some small informal initiatives to engage with stakeholders, it would be helpful to provide concrete guidance and specific strategies that state actors and schools could implement (MLT). These would likely involve PTAs who already play an important role in the operation and management of schools. These strategies could be included in the national guidelines to establish safe and confidential reporting mechanisms (Benchmark 2.2).
- **Benchmark 3.2 – Specific, evidence-informed interventions are researched and implemented, addressing social norms that drive key forms of violence and/or helping children manage risks.** There are several ad hoc activities underway, usually involving donors and possibly the Directorate of Planning and Budgeting's

Office of Research, but no clear guidelines or reference documents on social norm interventions that could be implemented. Details on specific effective strategies should first be collated and then evidence-informed interventions should be developed and provided to states and schools via the national guidelines on establishing safe and confidential reporting mechanisms (Benchmark 2.2) (MLT). This process should involve the MGCSW and representation from school PTAs.

- **Benchmark 3.3 – Young people, parents, teachers and community members in and around schools are engaged and active on the topic of school violence.** There are some ad hoc initiatives underway, but it would be helpful to create a formal action plan for engaging parents and community members on issues of school violence (MLT). This should include clear roles and responsibilities, budget allocation, and concrete guidance and specific strategies for schools and state actors to implement. It could also build on the success of ‘Sawa Shabaab’ to use the radio as a media for communicating key messages and building awareness (MLT).

4.4. Findings for Call to Action 4: Invest resources effectively

Table 7: Findings for Call to Action Benchmark 4 – Investing resources effectively

Item	Standard	National	Sub-national/State	School
4.1	Domestic resources have been allocated to <i>support interventions and capacity building activities to prevent and respond</i> to violence in schools.	Educational system budget includes costed strategies for violence prevention and response, adequate resourcing and reflections in budgets.	State receives and allocates resources for violence prevention and response.	School receives earmarked budget for violence prevention and response.
Assessment				
		C= Not in place	C = Not in place	C = Not in place
<p>Discussion</p> <p>At the national level, respondents indicated that the education budget is allocated according to priorities but inadequate overall. Priority areas include human resources, staff costs and incentives (1%), use of goods and services (11%), transfers to subnational structures (59%) and capital expenditure (29%), but not specific items for violence prevention and response initiatives²⁵. Despite a budget allocation increase to over 9% of total national budget during the 2018/2019 fiscal year, spending on the sector has remained low, particularly when adjusted for hyperinflation due to the country’s sharp fall in real GDP. Although violence exists in schools, school managers and head teachers are considered capable of handling such issues without a major budget line allocation, and where incidents exceed the school’s capacity, the MoGEI is expected to collaborate with the police to address the issue. Only the gender budget contains some aspects of violence prevention and response interventions mainly because the MGCSW has a strong focus on GBV. Other respondents indicated that remaining ministries including the Ministry of Planning and Budgeting do not have budgets for violence prevention, with 83% of ministry respondents highlighting the lack of budget because violence is not considered a priority. Directorates’ budgets are based on their plans but since funding from the Government is not enough, the MoGEI spends the available income on the most pressing needs only.</p>				

²⁵ UNICEF (2019) Education budget brief, South Sudan

	<p>At the state level, officials report that the ministry budget is not physical and that despite allocation, the MoGEI at a state level does not get to see the money allocated to education activities. As such, the state ministry has no budget for other aspects of education, let alone violence prevention. Due to budget constraints, state ministry staff often report to the office in the morning but by noon the offices are closed because there is no funding to support activities. To maintain links with schools, state ministry staff have to attach themselves to NGOs working in the area and travel together to the different schools. Overall, the state MoGEI is reportedly almost nonfunctional due to a lack of budget to implement school and other education-related activities.</p> <p>Schools similarly do not receive any budget or funding from the MoGEI. The only funding that comes from the Government regarding school concerns are incentives for registered teachers. These incentives are also inconsistent and so many teachers have opted out of the teaching profession. In private schools, learners' families pay for education, and contributions in primary schools are used to pay teachers and help to run the school, but otherwise there is no budget allocation to support school funding.</p> <p>Given these constraints, teachers in some government schools have been recruited by the community to teach their children. These teachers are paid by through the PTA, with the community mobilising itself to offer incentives in terms of food, clothing and sometimes money as a way of appreciating the teachers' service at the school. In some schools, all members of teaching staff are recruited by the community through the PTA, however some schools' reliance on PTAs for funding also risks excluding those children whose families cannot afford to pay fees or contributions, or even purchase school uniforms.</p>			
4.2	<p><i>Development partners</i> provide resources targeting <i>national or subnational level</i> to end violence in schools, investing in effective approaches.</p>	<p>Development partners provide targeted funds, technical assistance, and programme through implementing partners for prevention and response to violence in schools.</p>	<p>State coordinates, monitors and reports on use of targeted resources.</p>	<p>School access targeted resources for prevention and response to violence.</p>
Assessment				
A = In place		B = Partially in place		B = Partially in place
	<p>Discussion</p> <p>In South Sudan, there are specific organisations like Save the Children, UNICEF, UNESCO, Plan International, the WFP, War Child and INTERSOS that work with schools and on issues of GBV. As part of their programme activities, some have budget lines allocated towards addressing different types of violence particularly in schools, communities and other social setups. Some organisations provide direct support to schools and the MoGEI, such as GESS, which has an allocated member of staff at the national MoGEI with responsibility for overseeing activities particularly related to GESS. UNICEF also has staff based at the MoGEI who support with reporting and advising on overall activity implementation at the school, state and national levels.</p> <p>At the state level, the MoGEI does not have a stable budget for implementing activities and relies heavily on partner organisations to support supervision, teacher training, and the development and distribution of policies at the state level. The MoGEI also collaborates with NGOs to plan for various education-related activities, not least monitoring security in various parts of the state. In terms of coordinating, monitoring and reporting on the use of resources, the state MoGEI reports through two channels. First, the management team at the state level coordinates with each partner and, upon the implementation of activities, reports to the Minister who is in charge of reporting to the Council of Ministers on progress and steps made by schools. Second, the state ministry also reports to the Juba national MoGEI through reports and updates on progress and the overall use of allocated resources. During the implementation of activities at the state level, the MoGEI further coordinates with NGOs, other ministries, schools and communities to ensure their effective implementation of school activities.</p>			

	<p>At the school level, there are various development partner initiatives underway, although their relation to violence prevention is somewhat indirect. For example, the WFP facilitates a school feeding programme which provides food to some registered schools, while GESS gives a stipend to girls on a monthly basis to enable them to stay in school. There is also a capitation grant which is provided to students to enable them to function within schools, and UNICEF supplies learning materials to schools. Other kinds of support come from either individuals or specific organisations that work with schools to run a particular programme. Overall, the continuous conflict in South Sudan has meant that in some parts of the country, violence is considered part of everyday life or not violence until someone has been hospitalised or requires medical attention. In the meantime, the MoGEI is overwhelmed and unable to address all gaps, so prioritises the various needs according to demand. As a result, school violence is handled by other ministries or directorates, such as the MGCSW.</p>			
4.3	<p>There is private sector engagement in the provision of financial and non-financial resources including technical support, expertise and advocacy towards ending violence in schools.</p>	<p>Private philanthropy, foundations, Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), social impact investors, etc., provide targeted funds, technical assistance and programme through implementing partners for prevention and response to violence in schools.</p>	<p>State coordinates, monitors and reports on use of targeted resources.</p>	<p>Schools access targeted resources for prevention and response to violence.</p>
Assessment				
C= Not in place		C = Not in place		C = Not in place
<p>Discussion</p> <p>According to respondents' reports, no private philanthropy, foundations, faith-based organisations or other agencies have provided specific earmarked funds or technical assistance for the development and implementation of violence prevention initiatives in South Sudan. A representative from the MoGEI indicated that 'there could be private arrangements between schools and individuals or organisations though that is not known to the Ministry'.</p> <p>At the state level, one respondent reported that 'the budget allocated for the state ministry does not translate into money'. Although state ministries are allocated funds, they do not see or access the money in reality to be able to implement activities regarding violence. State officials further indicated that budget allocations to state ministries are minimal and they struggle to implement the targeted activities. Regarding monitoring and reporting, they provide activity and final programme reports to the national MoGEI, who carries out regular visits to verify reported activities in the states.</p> <p>Schools reported receiving services provided by the MoGEI and other stakeholders, such as teacher incentives, but not resources themselves. The UK Government in collaboration with the South Sudan Government at the state level issues incentives to teachers, however, this cannot be considered a resource available to the school and does not specifically relate to violence prevention. Rather, schools have to mobilise their own income through tuition fees or support from the community via the PTA.</p>				

Summary of findings for Benchmark 4

This section has provided an overview of the findings from the document review and field research surrounding Benchmark 4 of the STL Call to Action.

a. Summary of best practices and/or positive findings

- There is continuous support for schools from the community and PTAs. Despite the fact that schools do not have sufficient budgets, communities and PTAs in some areas are providing support to teachers from different schools. Incentives from the community allow teachers to work even though no direct payment comes from the Government to cover their salary.
- Schools show true resilience to function despite their limited resources. Due to limited budget lines, especially at the national level, limited or no funding goes to schools in various parts of the country. Despite this, schools have found a way to survive and continue operations with minimal or no government support.
- There are examples of successful collaboration with NGOs and other entities to support schools. Even without direct support from the government office, schools are able to collaborate with partners like UNICEF, UNESCO, War Child and others to receive required support to continue operations and keep learners in schools. Today, the WFP provides a school feeding programme in collaboration with the Government, which is supplemented by capitation grants and GESS stipends which help children attend school notwithstanding the support challenges.

b. Summary of gaps for each benchmark indicator

- There is limited national budget to ensure full implementation of school programmes and activities, let alone those relating to violence prevention. The conflict has destabilised various systems and consequently the Government has been unable to provide enough budget to allow sufficient funding for school operation or education initiatives. Heavy reliance on PTAs for school funding also risks excluding the poorest children whose parents may be unable or unwilling to pay PTA fees or contributions.
- There is a high dependency on partner organisations. In Malakal, for example, the state office has almost completely lost links with schools and depends almost entirely on partners to provide information required about schools. The high dependence on partners disempowers the Government and the sustainability of school programmes, leaving them vulnerable if a partner withdraws or ceases its activities.
- Poor monitoring and management further affect violence-related activities. From the state level to the school, monitoring mechanisms to track violence and related issues are weak. The MoGEI at state level and various schools do not have a streamlined mechanism or system to track issues of violence and so it remains a challenge to understand the trends of violence experienced in schools.

c. Overview of ways the Government (with the support of development partners) could/should address gaps for each benchmark indicator

- **Benchmark 4.1 – Domestic resources have been allocated to support interventions and capacity building activities to prevent and respond to violence in schools.** As discussed in relation to benchmark 1.1, the GESP acknowledges the importance of children’s health and safety, but an explicit objective to prevent and reduce violence in schools would be much more powerful, targeted and effective to raise the issue as a priority (ST). Government, donor and private sector funding could then be consolidated through support for and alignment with this strategy and should include an increased flow of funds to the state and school levels (MLT).
- **Benchmark 4.2 – Development partners provide resources targeting national or subnational level to end violence in schools, investing in effective approaches.** The Government should aim to coordinate all donor/NGO activities to ensure a joined-up approach and sharing of lessons learnt (MLT). This could be done through collaboration between the MoGEI and the MGCSW. If an express GESP objective can be developed for reducing violence in schools against girls and boys, the MoGEI should ensure that all donor/NGO activities and funds are aligned and coordinated to support it.
- **Benchmark 4.3 – There is private sector engagement in the provision of financial and non-financial resources including technical support, expertise and advocacy towards ending violence in schools.** As discussed, if an explicit GESP objective can be developed for reducing violence in schools, the MoGEI, in

conjunction with the MGCSW, should ensure that all private sector activities and funds are aligned and coordinated to support it (MLT). If and when funding to education and schools increases, they should also consider the role and contribution of PTAs (MLT).

4.5. Findings for Call to Action 5: Generate and use evidence

Table 8: Findings for Call to Action Benchmark 5 – Generating and using evidence

Item	Standard	Central	Sub-national/State	School
5.1	Information and reporting of incidents allow for disaggregated baseline information and monitoring of trends and that reflect needs and gaps in the system ²⁶ .	Central information system that records incidents and monitors trends, fed by State or local authorities.	State has record keeping of incidents occurring in schools.	Maintenance of confidential records about protection related incidents in the school.
Assessment				
		C = Not in place	B = Partially in place	C = Not in place
<p>Discussion</p> <p>The South Sudan MoGEI has a national education management information system (EMIS) which collects key school information but not details of violence-related incidents. The EMIS database disaggregates information by gender, but at present does not extend to record instances of violence against children and in schools. Nor is there a national policy or guideline that outlines protocols for how schools and states should confidentially log reports and responses to violence at schools.</p> <p>Through the MGCSW, states collect some records of incidences of violence that happen in schools. Head teachers are also mandated to report incidents to the Director General at the state level, however, the state does not yet have an established system to record and retain this information, much of which is verbal or kept in paper format.</p> <p>Within schools, 86% of teachers surveyed indicated that there is no confidential reporting or records about violence-related incidents in schools. Rather, schools use direct reporting systems (to monitors, teachers, head teachers) and efforts to maintain confidential records are minimal. The school management, learners and the PTA use school rules to protect against violence and punish violators, although schools may be required to report monthly, quarterly or when requested by the state office about violence and other emerging issues in schools. Overall, reporting is not confidential and anonymous, and learners reporting incidences of violence risk being re-targeted.</p> <p>More generally, many forms of violence are considered normal and often not reported, save where school rules are broken. Gender-based violence in particular is considered a private issue and, as such, it is frequently practised and rarely recorded or reported. As a result of this, many female learners are heavily impacted and consequently drop out. Nevertheless, communities have established their own systems to handle extreme types of violence, inside or outside of schools, with strict punishment for violators. The police and other government systems are sometimes involved in such cases and punishments for violence at any level often goes further than just a discussion or an agreement between families. For example, if someone is killed, the perpetrator is imprisoned and forced to pay for the lost life. These hefty punishments help to keep individuals remain disciplined and maintain the laws.</p>				

²⁶ UNESCO-UNWOMEN 2019 Global Guidance on addressing school-related gender-based violence, Section 2.6

5.2	There is regular data collection on prevalence and forms of violence in schools <i>using methods that follow high ethical standards</i> ²⁷ .	National Statistics Office and Ministry of Education monitor data on prevalence and forms of violence through regular participation in international school-based survey programmes (every 3-5 years).	State support implementation of school-based survey programmes.	Comprehensive questions on prevalence and forms of violence are included in regular school-based survey programmes.
Assessment				
C = Not in place		B = Partially in place		C = Not in place
<p>Discussion</p> <p>The national MoGEI typically collects school data on education indicators, such as enrolment, retention, and student performance, such data being disaggregated by gender. However, in conjunction with the Statistics Office, it captures some figures on the prevalence and forms of violence through a national system, although these data are not comprehensive. There is also the Office of Research which is responsible for identifying gaps in education and conducting research to be used by the Ministry to make informed decisions. Such Office is critical in that it leads all MoGEI research and is responsible for keeping and maintaining data at the national level.</p> <p>Other partners like UNICEF also collaborate with the MoGEI in carrying out assessments, reviews and evaluations of education programmes and activities. These are sometimes provided to the Ministry and used to guide the Ministry in making decisions or supporting the implementing partners to design new projects that respond to existing gaps in the education system. Typically, these assessments relate to more traditional education issues, such as enrolment and retention, but they may also include (gender-based) violence as sub-components.</p> <p>States in South Sudan provide support to the implementation of programmes from the national MoGEI office. At the state level, there is a partners' coordinator, an office established by the state ministry to facilitate both partners and government offices that want to carry out activities including data collection. The partners' coordinator is also responsible for guiding NGO partners and supporting different types of data collection processes at the state level. The MGCSW at the state level also visits schools regularly and engages both learners and staff on violence and related issues happening in schools. This was particularly evident in Wau and Western Equatoria where head teachers reported MGCSW data collection as part of reports to the Director General. The data collected by this office is however unofficial and there are queries concerning whether it can be relied upon for formal decision making.</p> <p>Different schools participate in different data collection processes and studies, often by partners though not specifically on violence-related issues. In some of the schools, a number of learners reported participating in surveys conducted by NGOs though not specifically on violence.</p> <p>In summary, the collection of data in South Sudan is mainly instigated by partners who use the data for their programming. Generally, there is not a standard mechanism in place to guide both the ministry and partners on collecting data at school levels about violence. The majority of data collected by partners regarding violence concerns GBV which typically targets communities with minimal attention on schools. As such, neither schools nor national level ministries are actively engaged in collecting violence-related data. At the state level however, there is the MGCSW, which regularly visits schools to monitor violence and gender-related cases, can link in other offices depending on the case and, in one state, supported the conviction of a violator within a court of law.</p>				
5.3	Decisions on replication and scale-up of violence prevention initiatives are based on	National Governments conduct robust monitoring and evaluations of	States support implementation, monitoring and evaluation activities for violence prevention	School support implementation, monitoring and evaluation activities for violence prevention

²⁷ Such as through the relevant modules of the Global Schools-Based Student Health Survey (GSHS)

evaluations of trialed models and approaches ²⁸ .	violence prevention initiatives in order to inform replication and scale-up.	initiatives to inform replication and scale-up.	initiatives to inform replication and scale-up.
	Assessment		
	C = Not in place	C= Not in place	C= Not in place
<p>Discussion</p> <p>The MoGEI conducts its monitoring following the annual plan of activities to be implemented, which is itself informed by the GESP. There may be some incidental monitoring of violence within schools, but it is not a main issue for the Ministry. Evaluation, on the other hand, is often done after the implementation of activities but again violence is not a critical priority for the Ministry and so any evaluation of violence-prevention or safeguarding initiatives to inform replication and scale-up is secondary and incidental. Partners like Save the Children have nevertheless undertaken assessments at various levels including in schools and have addressed violence and reported their findings. UNICEF and UNESCO have also conducted evaluations relating to GBV. As a result of these activities, Save the Children is coming up with projects that will be implemented at both the community and school levels to minimise violence, which will engage the MoGEI, but not as one of its own initiatives. The Ministry does, however, have a monitoring and evaluation policy which is used as a guideline to direct such work and thereby enhance accountability and transparency²⁹.</p> <p>At the state level, the MoGEI supports the implementation, monitoring and evaluation of activities for violence prevention but the Government does not have money to use these for learning or introducing its own policies to address violence. According to state respondents, the monitoring and evaluation of violence and related issues should originate from the national level and then come to them for implementation. If the national MoGEI does not prioritise violence, the state is unlikely to track violence-related data effectively as they will not be considered useful to end users.</p> <p>Within schools, head teachers reported supporting the implementation, monitoring and evaluation of violence-prevention and safeguarding activities through the rules and regulations set by the school.</p> <p>Overall, although violence is regularly experienced in South Sudan, there is no system established by the MoGEI to monitor and report cases of violence. The Ministry does have policies that prohibit various types of violence, but the issue is not a high enough priority to be considered among the other pressing gaps that the Ministry has to address.</p>			

Summary of findings for Benchmark 5

This section has provided an overview of the findings from the document review and field research surrounding Benchmark 5 of the STL Call to Action.

a. Summary of best practices and/or positive findings

- Although information relating to violence in schools is not comprehensively collected, there is evidence of some systems at the grass roots level that address violence and related issues, and which have put checks in place to ensure that violence is minimal. The MGCSW also undertakes some activities to capture data on violence against children, including in schools.

²⁸ See WHO 2019 Section 9

²⁹ Monitoring and evaluation policy, Ministry of General Education and Instruction

- Advocacy messages by the Government that circulate as part of the peace agenda and initiative have sought to reduce violence in various part of the country, thereby enabling people to live in harmony.
- The national level MoGEI has a monitoring and evaluation policy and an EMIS for capturing educational data that could together provide a framework for collecting violence-related data to support informed decision making.

b. Summary of gaps for each benchmark indicator

- There is currently limited capacity to effectively conduct high-quality monitoring and evaluation on violence and related education issues. Although the national MoGEI has a monitoring and evaluation policy, it does not have capacity (funds, human resources, tools, equipment or systems) to effectively conduct comprehensive monitoring and evaluation.
- There is uncertainty around the next steps for the Ministry after the formation of the unity government. Although the MoGEI and other ministries are currently functional as at the time of the exercise, the formation of the unity government between the current leadership and the opposition will lead to a transformation of the administrative structures including changes in the Ministry. In light of this, there is considerable uncertainty, for example whether to work with the 32+ states or wait for the national unity to collectively decide on the new way forward for the operation of the administrative systems. Along with this, some staff positions are temporary which may limit progress towards introducing longer-term change.

c. Overview of ways the Government (with the support of development partners) could/should address gaps for each benchmark indicator

- **Benchmark 5.1 – Information and reporting of incidents allow for disaggregated baseline information and monitoring of trends and that reflect needs and gaps in the system.** At present, there is no structured or coordinated approach for capturing data on school violence in South Sudan. This could, however, be addressed by expanding the country’s education management information system (EMIS) to record data on cases of violence and thereby monitor trends (ST). This could involve integration with any existing case management systems, although this would require careful design and implementation to ensure the confidentiality of information shared between ministries, specifically the MoGEI and the MGCSW. Related to this, the national guidelines for schools to create safe and confidential reporting systems (see benchmark 2.2) could include a mechanism for reporting incidents through the EMIS for aggregation and review at the state and national levels (MLT). Further, there is a need for the Government to strengthen the capacity of the MoGEI at the national and state levels to ensure the long-term sustainability of high-quality systems to monitor violence in schools (MLT).
- **Benchmark 5.2 – There is regular data collection on prevalence and forms of violence in schools using methods that follow high ethical standards.** Currently, any data collection regarding violence in South Sudan is ad hoc, driven by donors and/or conducted by the MGCSW at the state level. The MoGEI, in consultation with the MGCSW, the Office of Research and the Statistics Office, should consider participation in international or national school-based surveys, such as the Global Schools-Based Student Health Survey (MLT). Further, it could be valuable to conduct a comprehensive assessment of violence against children in schools, homes and communities to aid partners’ design of appropriate initiatives and responses, although this would require careful consideration of the various ethical issues to avoid doing harm and ensure proper safeguarding (MLT).
- **Benchmark 5.3 – Decisions on replication and scale-up of violence prevention initiatives are based on evaluations of trialed models and approaches.** To date, there have been several violence prevention-related initiatives undertaken by partner organisations like Save the Children, UNICEF and UNESCO, which have included rigorous assessment and evaluation. However, there is not presently resource or political appetite for the Government to scale up such approaches. The MoGEI should nevertheless ensure that partners draw on existing findings when scaling any initiatives and include analyses of scalability in any evaluations going forward (MLT).

5. Recommendations

The findings outlined above point to numerous key priorities and recommendations for the Government and other stakeholders to meet the benchmarks for the five STL Calls to Action. In each case, such recommendations must be considered within the wider context of South Sudan, not least the ongoing conflict, political uncertainty and extreme poverty. Indeed, these factors impact on the education system in major ways, for example, by creating instability in the teaching workforce and limiting the budget available for spending on education, particularly at the state and school levels. The feasibility and likely success of new initiatives will therefore depend, at least in part, on the extent to which some of the larger systemic factors have also been addressed. Each recommendation has also been categorised as being suitable for the short term (ST) or medium to long term (MLT), although these designations will again depend on changes in the wider environmental context.

Cutting across the benchmarks is needed to improve the flow of information between different levels of the education system, especially from the national to the state and school levels. In addition to the dissemination of physical documents, all efforts should be supplemented with training briefings or orientations wherever possible to strengthen the capacity of system actors to ensure an effective implementation. Similarly, teacher remuneration through salaries and incentives needs to be reviewed and regularised to make the profession more attractive and to stabilise the teaching workforce.

Call to Action 1: Implement laws and policies

- **Benchmark 1.1 – Prevention of violence in and around schools is identified as a specific strategy in the national education sector policy or plan.** The GESP recognises the importance of children’s health and safety but without explicitly acknowledging the risks learners face once inside their schools. An explicit objective within the GESP to prevent and reduce violence within schools (ST), accompanied by strategies, key performance indicators and budgets for its implementation and enforcement (MLT), would be much more powerful and effective. Such an objective should include specific strategies for developing a clear, concise and user-centred summary in English, Arabic and other relevant languages to be printed and disseminated nationally to states and schools (ST), and then incorporated into orientations and training programmes for teachers and other education actors (MLT). Government and donor funding could be consolidated through support for or alignment with this strategy.
- **Benchmark 1.2 – There is explicit prohibition of corporal punishment in schools, and policies are in place to support positive discipline and classroom management.** There are clear laws in place prohibiting corporal punishment in schools, but better dissemination and enforcement of these laws and monitoring of school compliance is needed. Improved dissemination could be achieved through the preparation and printing of simple and visual posters in all appropriate languages, which could be distributed to schools for posting in prominent public spaces (ST). Since states have limited resource and capacity to support enforcement, communities, PTAs, school management committees, boards of governors and schools should have intermediate processes and protocols to hold teachers to account. This could be supported through increased use of radio programmes and content, again in the major national languages (MLT). The national level MoGEI should create a central, ideally online, repository for documents relating to child protection and safeguarding (MLT), and also develop and disseminate short guidance documents for teachers, including temporary volunteers, on how best to manage their classrooms without violence or corporal punishment (ST), backed up by training, wherever possible (MLT).
- **Benchmark 1.3 – The roles and responsibilities of the Ministry of Education in response and referral to incidents of violence are clearly set out in a multi-sectoral national child protection policy framework.** The Girl Child Protection Policy is a laudable step towards a multi-sectoral child protection and safeguarding framework, but its scope should be revisited and expanded to cover all children, both male and female (ST). In terms of implementation and enforcement, the relevant sectors should come together under a formal institutional coordination and referral framework involving the MoGEI, the MGCSW, the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Internal Affairs and any other relevant ministries, to develop practical, consistent, harmonised and multilingual guidelines for coordinating actions, sharing information and otherwise minimising variation between states to ensure that the victim’s needs are put first (MLT). Such guidelines should be written into state and county level development action plans with clearly defined targets and responsibilities to ensure that ownership sits with the Government in the longer term (MLT). Once prepared, they should also be summarised into a shorter, user-centred document in all main languages for printing and dissemination to schools for compliance by volunteers as well as registered teachers (MLT).

- **Benchmark 1.4 – The country has endorsed the Safe Schools Declaration and in situations of armed conflict is implementing the Guidelines for Protecting Schools and Universities from Military Use during Armed Conflict.** At present, few stakeholders are aware of South Sudan’s endorsement of the Safe Schools Declaration and many schools remain directly and heavily impacted by the ongoing conflict. The Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack (GCPEA), the global partnership behind the Safe Schools Declaration, has collected examples of concrete measures to protect students and teachers from attack, and schools and universities from attack and military use, which can serve as inspiration to fellow states and other stakeholders. MoGEI could review these examples, or directly draw on GCPEA for support, to develop a strategic and appropriate approach to facilitate the removal of all military personnel from school buildings and classrooms (ST). Thereafter, some short and simple guidelines should be prepared and disseminated to schools, setting out what the Safe Schools Declaration should mean in practice, channels of recourse and the key factors for them to consider in planning how to react to or mitigate the effects of further conflict (MLT).

Call to Action 2: Strengthen prevention and response at school level

- **Benchmark 2.1 – Key violence prevention strategies are embedded in curriculum-based activities for children.** South Sudan has introduced a new curriculum containing content on life skills, violence and safe behaviour and equal relationships, but the relevant content first needs to be translated into syllabi, learning materials and classroom activities (ST). An effective roll-out is also unlikely to be achieved without a greater allocation of resources at the state level to ensure that schools and teachers are equipped with the necessary training, skills and materials (MLT). Development partners could play a role in this and such materials should contain clear linkages between teacher training schema and classroom practices and be available to both registered and volunteer teachers. In the longer term, assessment systems should also reflect key violence prevention strategies to mitigate the effects of teachers teaching to the test (MLT).
- **Benchmark 2.2 – Child safeguarding principles and procedures are in place in schools, inclusive of codes of conduct, and safe recruitment standards.** This benchmark consisted of four components and recommendations aligned to these include:
 - **National guidelines to establish safe and confidential reporting mechanisms** – Child safeguarding and protection currently takes place on an ad hoc basis within South Sudan’s schools. To address this, there is a need to develop explicit user-centred guidelines for schools on how to create step-by-step, efficient and confidential procedures for responding to school-based violence in accordance with the applicable legislation and Teachers Code of Conduct (ST). Such guidelines should: outline confidential reporting mechanisms for students at the school level; identify a focal person within each state education office and school to respond to protection incidents; specify different mechanisms and procedures for dealing with different types of incident (for example, depending on the nature of the violence or the identity of the perpetrator) and their repercussions; and identify coordinated state referral pathways with clearly defined responsibilities for key bodies such as the MoGEI, MGCSW, the Ministries of Health, Justice and Internal Affairs. Such guidelines should be clear and concise for printing and dissemination to all schools at minimum cost; available in all relevant languages; and be written for delivery via a school-based training modality so that all teachers can participate. In addition to this, capacity building should be undertaken to train state actors across sectors on issues including monitoring and enforcement (MLT), and a national helpline should also be established for children to report violence, with details shared through school assemblies or radio programmes (MLT).
 - **Norms and standards of ethical behaviour in Teachers Code of Conduct** – Given inconsistencies around its use and availability in South Sudan, the Teachers Code of Conduct should be harmonised and updated to explicitly include a strict prohibition on corporal punishment and other violence against children (ST). Such Code, or a summarised form, should then be printed and disseminated to all schools to ensure that they are using the same version across the country (ST). A simple poster or painted sign setting out the key expectations on teachers should also be shared with schools for display in a prominent location (together with adhesive for affixing the poster to walls or paint for signs) (ST). In due course, state officers should monitor whether teachers are signing the Code on an annual basis (MLT).
 - **Pre- and in-service training on obligations for child safeguarding and reporting/response** – The majority of teachers in South Sudan are currently untrained volunteers and state-level education offices lack the resources to pay staff, let alone train teachers. In such situation, strengthening teachers’ awareness and skills around child safeguarding and violence reporting can best be addressed by ensuring that each school has at least one copy of the amended and summarised Teachers Code of Conduct (see above) (ST). Head teachers can then

provide training to their staff, volunteers or not, at minimal extra cost (ST). If completed, school-based training on national guidelines to establish safe and confidential reporting mechanisms would also suffice. In the future, as the teaching workforce becomes more stable and formalised, such obligations must be incorporated into the teacher training curriculum, in parallel with efforts to build capacity in teacher training colleges (MLT).

- **Policies that regulate hiring of new teachers and staff and their transfer to ensure suitability for working with children** – The recruitment and deployment of professional teachers in South Sudan are managed through the Government, in which case any systems or databases that record their details to facilitate the payment of salaries should be reviewed and streamlined, and then updated to capture qualifications, information regarding signature of the Code of Conduct, and confirmed incidents of violence or other criminal offences (ST). Head teachers should also receive explicit guidance on how to conduct at least informal checks on all new teachers, including volunteers, to assess their suitability for working with children (ST). This could include liaising with the police, justice or social welfare sectors at state level and such guidance could be contained in a section or annex to the guidelines for establishing safe reporting mechanisms or the revised Teachers Code of Conduct (see above).
- **Benchmark 2.3 – Each school has at least one focal point who is capacitated to provide front-line mental health/psychosocial support to children experiencing violence.** Overall, many schools reported having identified one or two individuals, typically a male and a female teacher, to deal with violence but it seems they have little or no professional training or capacity to provide specific front-line mental health or psychosocial support to children experiencing violence. It is even unclear whether such teachers are formally trained or volunteers. Such teachers would benefit from concise and standardised guidance for performing this role (ST), and while the teaching workforce remains unstable and informal, some additional content on supporting children affected by violence should also be incorporated into the Teachers Code of Conduct to offer at least basic guidance to all teachers, with compliance enforced by head teachers (ST). As the workforce formalises, teacher training materials and curricula should be revised to include components on learners’ mental health and well-being (MLT).
- **Benchmark 2.4 – The physical environment in and around schools is safe and designed with the well-being of children in mind.** South Sudan appears to have appropriate national guidelines that address school safety but inadequate resources at the state and school levels to maintain buildings or ensure compliance. Some schools have also been forced by conflict to abandon their intended sites of operation. While the national context remains fragile, the MoGEI and state offices should develop memoranda of understanding with school PTAs, boards of governors (BOGs) and other community bodies to clarify responsibilities and expectations regarding the upkeep of school buildings (ST). When the situation stabilises and more funding is available, the MoGEI and state offices should then take greater responsibility in bringing all schools up to the appropriate standard (MLT).

Call to Action 3: Shift social norms and behaviour change

- **Benchmark 3.1 – There is wide dissemination and engagement with stakeholders to build knowledge and appreciation of child rights and laws prohibiting violence.** Although there are some small informal initiatives to engage with stakeholders, it would be helpful to provide concrete guidance and specific strategies that state actors and schools could implement (MLT). These would likely involve PTAs who already play an important role in the operation and management of schools. These strategies could be included in the national guidelines to establish safe and confidential reporting mechanisms (Benchmark 2.2).
- **Benchmark 3.2 – Specific, evidence-informed interventions are researched and implemented, addressing social norms that drive key forms of violence and/or helping children manage risks.** There are several ad hoc activities underway, usually involving donors and possibly the Directorate of Planning and Budgeting’s Office of Research, but no clear guidelines or reference documents on social norm interventions that could be implemented. Details on specific effective strategies should first be collated and then evidence-informed interventions should be developed and provided to states and schools via the national guidelines on establishing safe and confidential reporting mechanisms (Benchmark 2.2) (MLT). This process should involve the MGCSW and representation from school PTAs.
- **Benchmark 3.3 – Young people, parents, teachers and community members in and around schools are engaged and active on the topic of school violence.** There are some ad hoc initiatives underway but it would be helpful to create a formal action plan for engaging parents and community members on issues of school violence (MLT). This should include clear roles and responsibilities, budget allocation, and concrete guidance and specific strategies for schools and state actors to implement. It could also build on the success of ‘Sawa Shabaab’ to use the radio as a media for communicating key messages and building awareness (MLT).

Call to Action 4: Invest resources effectively

- **Benchmark 4.1 – Domestic resources have been allocated to support interventions and capacity building activities to prevent and respond to violence in schools.** As discussed in relation to benchmark 1.1, the GESP acknowledges the importance of children’s health and safety, but an explicit objective to prevent and reduce violence in schools would be much more powerful, targeted and effective to raise the issue as a priority (ST). Government, donor and private sector funding could then be consolidated through support for and alignment with this strategy and should include an increased flow of funds to the state and school levels (MLT).
- **Benchmark 4.2 – Development partners provide resources targeting national or subnational level to end violence in schools, investing in effective approaches.** The Government should aim to coordinate all donor/NGO activities to ensure a joined-up approach and sharing of lessons learnt (MLT). This could be done through collaboration between the MoGEI and the MGCSW. If an express GESP objective can be developed for reducing violence in schools against girls and boys, the MoGEI should ensure that all donor/NGO activities and funds are aligned and coordinated to support it.
- **Benchmark 4.3 – There is private sector engagement in the provision of financial and non-financial resources including technical support, expertise and advocacy towards ending violence in schools.** As discussed, if an explicit GESP objective can be developed for reducing violence in schools, the MoGEI, in conjunction with the MGCSW, should ensure that all private sector activities and funds are aligned and coordinated to support it (MLT). If and when funding to education and schools increases, they should also consider the role and contribution of PTAs (MLT).

Call to Action 5: Generate and use evidence

- **Benchmark 5.1 – Information and reporting of incidents allow for disaggregated baseline information and monitoring of trends and that reflect needs and gaps in the system.** At present, there is no structured or coordinated approach for capturing data on school violence in South Sudan. This could, however, be addressed by expanding the country’s education management information system (EMIS) to record data on cases of violence and thereby monitor trends (ST). This could involve integration with any existing case management systems, although this would require careful design and implementation to ensure the confidentiality of information shared between ministries, specifically the MoGEI and the MGCSW. Related to this, the national guidelines for schools to create safe and confidential reporting systems (see benchmark 2.2) could include a mechanism for reporting incidents through the EMIS for aggregation and review at the state and national levels (MLT). Further, there is a need for the Government to strengthen the capacity of the MoGEI at the national and state levels to ensure the long-term sustainability of high-quality systems to monitor violence in schools (MLT).
- **Benchmark 5.2 – There is regular data collection on prevalence and forms of violence in schools using methods that follow high ethical standards.** Currently, any data collection regarding violence in South Sudan is ad hoc, driven by donors and/or conducted by the MGCSW at the state level. The MoGEI, in consultation with the MGCSW, the Office of Research and the Statistics Office, should consider participation in international or national school-based surveys, such as the Global Schools-Based Student Health Survey (MLT). Further, it could be valuable to conduct a comprehensive assessment of violence against children in schools, homes and communities to aid partners’ design of appropriate initiatives and responses, although this would require careful consideration of the various ethical issues to avoid doing harm and ensure proper safeguarding (MLT).
- **Benchmark 5.3 – Decisions on replication and scale-up of violence prevention initiatives are based on evaluations of trialled models and approaches.** To date, there have been several violence prevention-related initiatives undertaken by partner organisations like Save the Children, UNICEF and UNESCO, which have included rigorous assessment and evaluation. However, there is not presently resource or political appetite for the Government to scale up such approaches. The MoGEI should nevertheless ensure that partners draw on existing findings when scaling any initiatives and include analyses of scalability in any evaluations going forward (MLT).

Overall, the recommendations suggest a pressing need for the availability of concise, user-friendly and multilingual documents for use at the school level by different stakeholders, not least head teachers, teachers including volunteers and counsellors, and the learners themselves. The development and dissemination of such materials to all schools in South Sudan should be a top priority to increase awareness of violence-related issues in the short term, with measures for enforcement and monitoring to follow as the system stabilises and greater funding becomes available.

6. Conclusion

Each year, an estimated 1 billion children worldwide experience some form of physical, sexual or psychological violence or neglect³⁰. Such victimisation early in life can have long-term impacts on education, health and wellbeing, and potentially lead to academic underachievement, complex emotional and social problems, and serious illnesses later in life. For these reasons, the Global Partnership to End Violence against Children and its partners launched the STL initiative to end violence against children in schools, and the STL diagnostic exercise to capture information on existing baseline practices.

Overall, the diagnostic exercise provided valuable insight on the state of current violence prevention and safeguarding efforts in South Sudan. To date, the country and its population have faced tremendous physical, social and psychological damage through the protracted conflict that has affected individuals, families and their communities. The education system has similarly been devastated with many schools closed or occupied, and teachers fleeing to PoC sites or refugee camps. There are, nevertheless, signs of good practice and resilience, demonstrating the commitment of parents and wider societies to educate their children as valuable citizens of the future.

Table 9 below summarises the status of each benchmark indicator and sub-indicator at the national, state and school levels. Regarding the first STL Call to Action, it shows that many of the necessary policies and legislative instruments are already at least partially in place at the national level, however these do not necessarily translate into awareness or implementation at the state or school levels. In particular, there appears to be limited coverage of positive discipline and classroom management in the teacher training curriculum, or appreciation of what the Safe Schools Declaration should mean in practice.

Across the other benchmarks and Calls to Action, there is a more consistent pattern of responses. Many of the measures to promote child protection and safeguarding, whether through referral processes in schools or initiatives to raise community awareness on the risks of child violence, are partially in place at the national level but again rarely operationalised at the state or school levels. These could highlight blockages in the dissemination of information to state offices and schools, and the need for strengthening capacity and budgeting at each level.

Within schools, communities and PTAs appear to play a key role in the delivery of their children's education, not least through the provision of incentives to volunteer teachers. On the one hand, this can increase local ownership and accountability to ensure the protection of all learners. However, in the absence of confidential reporting mechanisms, the involvement of PTAs in sensitive issues of child abuse and settlement could also risk undermining the integrity of the process, for example, based on the identities of the victim and the perpetrator. For this reason, notwithstanding the value of community engagement, more standardised approaches for handling instances of violence in schools would be worthwhile to ensure that victims' needs are prioritised. Similarly, the requirement for many parents to pay PTA fees could risk excluding children whose families cannot afford to make such contributions.

In some cases, there were differences between respondents, for example between teachers and students regarding their awareness of laws on the prohibition of corporal punishment in schools. A higher proportion of teachers might have reported knowledge of the laws in the interests of presenting themselves in a good light, even if they were unfamiliar with the legislation. Conversely, state or school level participants might have been incentivised to portray an unfavourable picture of their situation if they thought that it might attract increased funding or resource.

At present, there remains some ongoing political uncertainty in South Sudan, however, the MoGEI has enacted vital policies and introduced important reforms and initiatives such as the new curriculum. Partner organisations, UN agencies and NGOs also play important roles in these efforts, helping to ensure attendance and raise quality while also attending to issues of child protection, safeguarding and violence reduction. As a result, children are being taught to interact freely as schools have started to provide civic education and encourage the South Sudanese embrace each other as one people.

³⁰ School based violence prevention: a practical handbook (<https://www.who.int/publications-detail/school-based-violence-prevention-a-practical-handbook>)

Table 9: Summary table of Benchmark Indicator Status based on the Diagnostic Exercise

A = In place	B = Partially in place	C = Not in place
--------------	------------------------	------------------

Please note: The below assessments were based on the findings from the study. Discussion and rationale are provided in the report.

Call to Action	Benchmark Indicator	Sub-Indicator	National	State	School
1. Implement laws and policies	1.1 Prevention of violence in and around schools is identified as a specific strategy in the national education sector policy or plan.		A = In place	B = Partially in place	B = Partially in place
	1.2 There is explicit prohibition of corporal punishment in schools, and policies are in place to support positive discipline and classroom management.	Laws that prohibit corporal punishment are implemented and enforced.	A = In place	B = Partially in place	B = Partially in place
		Teacher training covers positive discipline and classroom management.	C = Not in place	C = Not in place	C = Not in place
	1.3 The roles and responsibilities of the Ministry of Education in response and referral to incidents of violence are clearly set out in a multi-sectoral national child protection policy framework.	A national and multi-sectoral policy framework outlines the role of key formal actors.	B = Partially in place	B = Partially in place	B = Partially in place
		The Ministry of Education has established a national child protection/safeguarding policy which is enforced.	B = Partially in place	B = Partially in place	B = Partially in place
	1.4 The country has endorsed the Safe Schools Declaration and in situations of armed conflict is implementing the Guidelines for Protecting Schools and Universities from Military Use during Armed Conflict.		B = Partially in place	C = Not in place	C = Not in place
2. Strengthen prevention and response at school level	2.1 Key violence prevention strategies are embedded in curriculum-based activities for children.		B = Partially in place	B = Partially in place	C = Not in place
	2.2 Child safeguarding principles and procedures are in place in schools, inclusive of codes of conduct, and safe recruitment standards.	National guidelines to establish safe and confidential reporting mechanisms.	B = Partially in place	B = Partially in place	B = Partially in place
		Norms and standards of ethical behaviour in Teachers Code of Conduct.	B = Partially in place	B = Partially in place	B = Partially in place
		Pre- and in-service training on obligations for child safeguarding and reporting/response.	B = Partially in place	C = Not in place	C = Not in place

		Policies that regulate hiring of new teachers and staff and their transfer to ensure suitability for working with children.	C = Not in place	C = Not in place	C = Not in place
	2.3	Each school has at least one focal point who is capacitated to provide front-line mental health/psychosocial support to children experiencing violence.	C = Not in place	C = Not in place	C = Not in place
	2.4	The physical environment in and around schools is safe and designed with the well-being of children in mind.	B = Partially in place	C = Not in place	C = Not in place
3. Shift social norms and behaviour change	3.1	There is wide dissemination and engagement with stakeholders to build knowledge and appreciation of child rights and laws prohibiting violence.	B = Partially in place	C = Not in place	C = Not in place
	3.2	Specific, evidence-informed interventions are researched and implemented, addressing social norms that drive key forms of violence and/or helping children manage risks.	B = Partially in place	C = Not in place	C = Not in place
	3.3	Young people, parents, teachers and community members in and around schools are engaged and active on the topic of school violence.	B = Partially in place	B = Partially in place	B = Partially in place
4. Invest resources effectively	4.1	Domestic resources have been allocated to support interventions and capacity building activities to prevent and respond to violence in schools.	C = Not in place	C = Not in place	C = Not in place
	4.2	Development partners provide resources targeting national or subnational level to end violence in schools, investing in effective approaches.	A = In place	B = Partially in place	B = Partially in place
	4.3	There is private sector engagement in the provision of financial and non-financial resources including technical support, expertise and advocacy towards ending violence in schools.	C = Not in place	C = Not in place	C = Not in place
5. Generate and use evidence	5.1	Information and reporting of incidents allow for disaggregated baseline information and monitoring of trends and that reflect needs and gaps in the system.	C = Not in place	B = Partially in place	C = Not in place
	5.2	There is regular data collection on prevalence and forms of violence in schools using methods that follow high ethical standards.	C = Not in place	B = Partially in place	C = Not in place
	5.3	Decisions on replication and scale-up of violence prevention initiatives are based on evaluations of trialed models and approaches.	C = Not in place	C = Not in place	C = Not in place

Annexes

Annex 1: Call to Action

Every child deserves to be safe and secure in school so that they can learn, grow and develop the skills and confidence they need to lead healthy and prosperous lives.

Schools have the potential to be transformative in promoting positive social norms and gender equality. But for too many girls and boys around the world, school is a place of violence and fear. Schools also provide a valuable entry point for working with families and communities to end violence against children more broadly. Physical, sexual and psychological violence in and around schools, including online, affects children and young people everywhere.

Violence is often a result of unequal gender and power dynamics. Girls and boys experience different forms of violence. Girls are more likely to experience psychological bullying, sexual violence and harassment; boys more likely to experience corporal punishment and physical violence; children who do not conform to gender norms or stereotypes are particularly vulnerable to violence and bullying. Children with disabilities are more than three times as likely as their peers to suffer physical violence in schools, and girls with disabilities are at up to three times greater risk of rape. In fragile, conflict and crisis contexts, students and staff face risks greater risks, such as targeted and indiscriminate attacks from the military or other groups.

Violence impedes learning and is detrimental to children's well-being. It decreases self-esteem, reduces attendance, lowers grades, leads many children to drop out of school altogether and can result in serious health issues. It also contributes to a destabilising cycle of violence where child victims are more likely to be perpetrators or victims later in life.

Whether sexual exploitation for grades, corporal punishment in the classroom or bullying and harassment, all forms of **violence in schools can and must be prevented.** It is both the right and the smart thing to do — morally, socially and economically — as it enhances a child's chances of staying in school, increases their ability to fulfil their potential and breaks the cycle of violence.

Together we can end violence in schools.

We must ensure that children's voices are heard, and they have the space to take action. Teachers, communities, governments and leaders must be accountable for prevention of and response to violence, and prioritise the individual needs and well-being of the child and everyone in the school community.

Ending violence in and around schools requires coordinated efforts at multiple levels.

We call upon partners to support national and sub-national governments:

Implement policy and legislation

National, regional and local governments develop and enforce laws and policies that protect children from all forms of violence in and around schools, including online.

- Ministries of education implement policies to improve systems, capacity, and skills to prevent and respond to violence in schools across the education system.
- National governments prohibit corporal punishment in schools and promote positive discipline.
- National governments establish multi-sectoral child-friendly response and referral mechanisms to support victims of violence in schools.

- National governments endorse and implement the Safe Schools Declaration and use the Guidelines for Protecting Schools and Universities from Military Use during Armed Conflict.

Strengthen prevention and response at the school level

School staff, students, and management committees provide safe and gender-sensitive learning environments for all children that promote positive discipline, child-centered teaching and protect and improve children's physical and mental wellbeing.

- School curricula are reviewed and strengthened to include effective approaches to preventing violence and promoting equality and respect.
- Safeguarding policies and procedures, such as codes of conduct, digital safety guidance, or violence reporting procedures are implemented and monitored in schools.
- Schools ensure the physical environment in and around schools is safe and designed with the well-being of all students in mind.

Shift social norms and behaviour change

Parents, teachers, children, local government and community leaders recognise the devastating impact of violence in schools and take action to promote positive social norms and gender equality to ensure schools are safe spaces for learning.

- Schools promote child-rights education and ensure children and teachers know their rights and respect the rights of others.
- Schools, parents and community leaders work together to promote non-violent behaviours and promote a safe school environment.
- Students, parents, caregivers, teachers and community members empower one another to speak up and take positive action against violence that they or their peers have experienced.

Invest resources effectively

Increased and better use of investments targeted at ending violence in schools.

- National Governments increase domestic resources to support people, programming, and processes to end violence in schools.
- Donors increase resources targeted at the country and global level to end violence in schools, investing in effective approaches.

- The Private Sector increases financial, technical and in-kind resources to end violence in schools.

Generate and use evidence

Countries and the international community generate and use evidence on how to effectively end violence in schools.

- Governments, schools and donors support the disaggregated data collection and monitoring of activities that prevent violence in schools.
- Donors and research partners increase investment in research and evaluation about interventions to prevent violence in schools (in particular longitudinal studies).
- Schools collect disaggregated data on incidents of violence in a safe and ethical manner to support targeted and better-quality interventions.

Annex 2: Document List

#	Document	Type	Source
1	Unified Curriculum for Teacher Education – June, 2014	Curriculum	MoGEI
2	Teachers Code of Conduct for Emergency Situation	Standards	MoGEI
3	Child Protection Sub-cluster Strategy, 2017-2018	Strategy	Protection cluster
4	South Sudan Minimum Standards for Education in Emergency	Standards	Education cluster
5	South Sudan Teachers Professional Code of Conduct, 2008	Standards	MoEST
6	Child Act, 2008	Legislation	Ministry of Legal Affairs and Constitutional Development
7	Education Needs Overview	Report	Education cluster
8	Education Cluster Strategy, 2019	Strategy	Education cluster
9	General Education Act, 2012	Legislation	MoGEI
10	Situation Analysis of Impact of Conflict on Children including the Grave Child Rights Violation in South Sudan	Report	Save the Children
11	National Education Census Booklet – 2018	Report	MoGEI
12	Education Cluster Assessment Report, 2018	Report	Education cluster
13	Global initiative on out of school children, South Sudan country study, 2018	Report	MoEST
14	Girls Education Act – CES, 2014	Legislation	MoEST (CES)
15	General Education Strategic plan, 2017 – 2022	Strategy	MoEST
16	General Education Act, 2012	Legislation	Ministry of Justice
17	Curriculum Framework for South Sudan	Curriculum	MoEST

18	Life Skill and Unit guidelines – Secondary School level	Guidelines	MoEST & MoCYS
19	Certificate and Diploma Curriculum in Primary Education	Curriculum	MoEST
20	Corporal Punishment of Children in South Sudan	Report	UNICEF
21	EMIS – Statistic Booklet, 2017	Guidelines	MoGEI
22	Preventing Gender-Based Violence in Schools	Policy	UNESCO
23	General Education Strategic Plan, 2012-2017	Strategy	MoGEI
24	South Sudan Girl Child Protection Policy	Policy	MGCSW
25	Education Budget Brief – South Sudan, 2019	Budget	UNICEF
26	The National Girls’ Education Strategy 2018-2022	Strategy	MoGEI
Documents seen in some schools but not accessed			
1	South Sudan National Policy on the Protection and Care of Children without Appropriate Parental Care	Policy	MGCSW
2	The National General Education Policy, 2017 – 2027	Policy	MoGEI
3	Safe School Policy	Policy	-
4	GBV Prevention and Response Manual	Guidelines	-
5	Handbook for South Sudan Payam Education Supervisors	Guidelines	MoGEI
6	Accelerated Learning Programme (ALP) Teachers Handbook	Guidelines	MoGEI
7	Life Skill and Peace Building Education Curriculum Guideline out of school/AES level	Guidelines	MoGEI
8	South Sudan Basic School Construction Standards and guidelines	Standards	MoGEI
9	Parents Teachers Association Training Manual	Guidelines	MoGEI in collaboration with USAID and Winrock -Room to Learn Project

10	School Governance Toolkit, Guide for School Management Committee and Board of Governors	Guidelines	MoGEI
Other key documents not accessed or unavailable			
1	Education Sector Plan	Strategy	-
2	National Child Protection Policy	Policy	-
3	Ministry of Education Guidelines to address Violence in Schools	Guidelines	-
4	Ministry of Education Standards/Guidelines for Creating Safe Environment in Schools	Guidelines	-
5	The National Pre-in-service Curricula	Curriculum	-
6	Policies on Safe Schools Declaration and/or Guidelines for Protecting Schools and Universities from Military Use during Armed Conflict	Policy	-

Annex 3: Sampling Frame

SCHOOL SELECTION AND DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOLS						
Area			Distribution by type and ownership			
Regions	Former States	School Location	Primary	Secondary	Type	Ownership
Greater Equatoria	Western Equatoria State	Yambio	1		Urban	Public
				1	Urban	Private
				1	Rural	Public
			1		Rural	Public
			1		Rural	Refugee/POC
				1	Rural	Refugee/POC
			1		Urban	Public
				1	Urban	Public
Greater Bahr el Ghazal	Western Bahr el Ghazal State	Wau		1	Urban	Public
				1	urban	Private
			1		Urban	Refugee/POC
				1	Rural	Public
			1		Urban	Public
			1		Rural	Public
			1		Rural	Public
				1	Rural	Public
Greater Upper Nile	Upper Nile State	Malakal	1		Rural	Refugee/POC
				1	Rural	Public
				1	Rural	Private
				1	Urban	Public
			1		Urban	Public
			1		Urban	Public
				1	Urban	Refugee/POC
			1		Rural	Public

Annex 4: Diagnostic Tools

Ministry/National Questionnaire

To be administered at the Ministry of Education and with relevant national level stakeholders. Please liaise with the UNICEF CO regarding the most appropriate ministry people to speak to (**ie., Director of Policy/Planning, Director of Teacher Development, Director of the Gender Unit – at a minimum, please speak to these directors**). Additional respondents include stakeholders from UN Agencies, INGOs, National NGOs working to reduce violence in schools (3-4 max).

Enumerator/researcher introduction:

Hello, my name is _____ and I am here today on behalf of UNICEF to carry out a study for the ‘Safe to Learn’ global initiative, which aims to measure the quality of national efforts to prevent and respond to violence in schools. I will be asking questions about whether certain standards, policies or practices exist, **but please note that this is not a test, either of you or of the government**. Rather, the results of this study are meant to *help* to provide a guide for how to make schools safer for learning. So please be honest with your answers.

The responses to this questionnaire are a three point scale where you will use (not aware/partially aware/fully aware) depending on the knowledge you have on a particular question being asked.

If you do not know about something, that is fine – just say (I am not aware) or you don’t know. If you are *partially* or *fully* aware of something that I ask you about, please feel free to explain. This interview is set to take approximately 40 minutes.

Your participation in this research is confidential and I will not take your name or share information about you. If you would not like me to note your position or name, please let me know. Your participation is voluntary. If you do not wish to answer a question or if you feel uncomfortable, we can stop the interview at any time. I have a consent form that explains this further. Please feel free to read this and sign.

With your permission, I could record some of your responses and take pictures of either documents, posters or any other fact that reinforces your responses and provides evidence of existing violence management systems. Please let me know if this is acceptable. I might also ask to take photographs of documents or materials (*indicated by **) where necessary at the end of the interview if this would be fine with you.

Do you have any questions and can we commence the interview now?

Again, there are no right or wrong responses, so please be honest with your answers.

Respondent’s organisation: _____

Respondent department: _____

Respondent’s position: _____

(Leave blank if respondent has asked for anonymity)

Recording consent: Y / N

Gender: F / M

Scale/Key:	1 No, not aware/ not achieved	2 Partially aware/ partially achieved	3 Yes, fully aware/ fully achieved
-------------------	---	---	--

Questions	1	2	3	Document Name	Provide respondent's further explanation or qualitative answer:
1. Is there an explicit objective/strategy/activity in the Education Sector Plan* that aims to prevent violence in schools?					
2. If so, is there a costed action plan* that supports the implementation of this objective?					
3. Is there an explicit law (that has been ratified by cabinet) to prohibit corporal punishment in schools?					
4. If so, does the law state specific protocols and sanction(s) if the law is broken?					
5. Does the MoE have a specific policy* that prohibits corporal punishment and other forms of violence in schools?					
6. Is there a National Child Protection policy, framework or action plan*?					

Questions	1	2	3	Document Name	Provide respondent's further explanation or qualitative answer:
7. If so, does it provide guidance to sub-national authorities (from education, health, social welfare, justice and police) and schools on their role and responsibilities regarding severe cases of violence?					
8. Are there any MoE policies or guidelines that require states/schools to adapt the National Child Protection Policy for local use and identify focal points to oversee responses to reports of violence at schools?					
9. Has an MoE officer been identified as a focal point to oversee implementation of the policy?					
10. Has the government explicitly endorsed the <i>Safe Schools Declaration</i> ?					
11. If so, are there any national policies or guidelines* that reference <i>the Guidelines for Protecting Schools and Universities from Military Use during Armed Conflict</i> ?					
12. Does the national curriculum include age appropriate approaches for all primary and secondary grades that:					
a) develop life skills,					
b) teach children about violence and safe behaviour,					
c) promote inclusion of marginalised groups and gender equitable relationships					
13. If so, please provide examples of how these topics are approached.					
14. Are there any national policies or guidelines* that provide guidance to states and schools on how to					

Questions	1	2	3	Document Name	Provide respondent's further explanation or qualitative answer:
establish safe and confidential reporting mechanisms for students to report violence?					
15. Is there a national child helpline that can be used for reporting violence?					
16. To what degree is it functioning? (ie., hours of operation, etc.)					
17. Are there any national policies or guidelines* that provide guidance on how states/schools should <i>respond</i> to reports of violence?					
18. Is there a National Code of Conduct* for all teachers and educational personnel?					
19. If so, does the Code of Conduct outline teacher standards regarding:					
a) zero-tolerance towards all forms of violence (ie., physical, psychological, sexual violence)					
b) disciplinary action if standards surrounding violence are not adhered to					
c) requirement of a every teacher to sign the Code of Conduct on an annual basis					
20. Were teachers involved in the development and/or revision of the Code of Conduct and its standards regarding violence?					
21. Are there any national policies or guidelines* that provide guidance to schools on how develop and implement a School Code of Conduct that outlines codes of behaviour for all members of the school community regarding physical, psychological, sexual violence?					

Questions	1	2	3	Document Name	Provide respondent's further explanation or qualitative answer:
b) If so, does it outline consequences for violations of the code and how these are enforced					
c) If so, is it publicly posted and disseminated so that all members of the school know and understand it					
d) If so, does it require all members of the school to comply and require all staff to sign it					
22. Are there any national policies or guidelines* that provide guidance to states and schools on how to conduct background checks before hiring teachers to assess their suitability for working with children?					
23. Are there any national policies or guidelines that provide guidance to states and schools on how to ensure that teachers who are dismissed for bad behaviour are not simply transferred to another school?					
24. Is there an explicit module or course content in the national pre-service teacher training curriculum on:					
a) effective positive discipline and non-violent classroom management strategies					
b) teacher obligations on child safeguarding and how to prevent revictimisation					
c) violence reporting and response referral pathways for states and schools					
25. Has there been in-service training for all primary/secondary school teachers on these topics?					
26. If so, how often has it been implemented and by who?					

Questions	1	2	3	Document Name	Provide respondent's further explanation or qualitative answer:
27. Is there an explicit module or course content in the pre-service training curricula for school counsellors on:					
a) Children's mental health and wellbeing					
b) referral procedures for when a child needs specialised services/care					
28. Are there any national policies or guidelines* that provide standards to ensure school buildings and grounds keep students safe, which include:					
a) a process for mapping unsafe areas					
b) standards to ensure sanitary facilities that are safe and secure					
c) standards for gender-responsive classroom design					
d) standards for school grounds that allow students move safely and freely to and from school					
29. Are there any national policies or guidelines* for states/schools on how to widely disseminate information to school and community members on:					
a) Child rights with regard to violence					
b) laws prohibiting violence against children					
30. If so, what are the suggested dissemination strategies?					
31. Are there any national policies or guidelines* that provide guidance on implementing/researching interventions addressing social norms (beliefs,					

Questions	1	2	3	Document Name	Provide respondent's further explanation or qualitative answer:
behaviours and practices) related to violence (like bullying and online harms, sexual abuse and exploitation, youth and gang violence)?					
32. If so, does the policy/guideline outline how the MoE should coordinate different actors who are researching/ implementing interventions so that knowledge is shared, disseminated and used more widely?					
33. Are there any national policies or guidelines* that outline communication for development initiatives (ie., media, arts, awareness and empowerment raising activities) to engage students, parents and communities in dialogue and action against violence?					
34. Does the education budget include a specific line for the development and implementation of violence prevention and response interventions?					
35. If so, are there any specific interventions or activities listed?					
36. Are there any additional budget lines/activities that address violence in schools?					
37. Have in-country donors provided specific funds or technical assistance for the development and implementation of violence prevention and response interventions?					
38. If so, what has been achieved to date?					
39. Are there any additional donor-funded programmes or interventions that target violence in schools?					

Questions	1	2	3	Document Name	Provide respondent's further explanation or qualitative answer:
40. Has the private sector (ie., private philanthropy, foundations, CSR, social impact investors, etc.,) provided specific funds or technical assistance for the development and implementation of violence prevention and response interventions?					
41. If so, what has been achieved to date?					
42. Are there any additional privately-funded programmes or interventions that target violence prevention in schools?					
43. Has the MoE developed and implemented a national system that collects data from States regarding violence-related incidents?					
44. Does the MoE consistently monitor violence-reporting data, look at trends and share analyses with states and schools?					
45. Are there any national policies or guidelines* that outline protocols for how schools and states should confidentially log reports and responses to violence at schools?					
46. Have the MoE and National Statistics Office collected data on the prevalence and forms of violence through a national or international school-based survey program every 3-5 years (such as the WHO Global Schools-Based Student Health Survey)?					
47. If so, what have been the results? If not, why?					
48. Has the MoE planned and conducted robust monitoring and evaluation of violence prevention					

Questions	1	2	3	Document Name	Provide respondent's further explanation or qualitative answer:
initiatives in order to inform replication and scale-up?					
49. If so, what were they and what was done? If not, why?					
50. Have there been any donor-funded evaluations conducted on violence prevention initiatives?					
51. If so, did these inform any decisions for replication or scale-up?					

District/State Officer Questionnaire

Please include the DEO/State Education Officer, District/State Inspector, District/State Gender Officer and District/State Focal Person for Violence (if a gender and violence focal person do not exist, please interview the first two officers and a third officer of relevance – minimum 3 interviewees).

Enumerator/researcher introduction:

Hello, my name is _____ and I am here today on behalf of UNICEF to carry out a study for the 'Safe to Learn' global initiative, which aims to measure the quality of national efforts to prevent and respond to violence in schools. I will be asking questions about whether certain standards, policies or practices exist, **but please note that this is not a test, either of you or of the government.** Rather, the results of this study are meant to *help* to provide a guide for how to make schools safer for learning. So please be honest with your answers.

The responses to this questionnaire are a three point scale where you will use (not aware/partially aware/fully aware) depending on the knowledge you have on a particular question being asked.

If you do not know about something, that is fine – just say (I am not aware) or you don't know. If you are *partially* or *fully* aware of something that I ask you about, please feel free to explain. This interview is set to take approximately 40 minutes.

Your participation in this research is confidential and I will not take your name or share information about you. If you would not like me to note your position or name, please let me know. Your participation is voluntary. If you do not wish to answer a question or if you feel uncomfortable, we can stop the interview at any time. I have a consent form that explains this further. Please feel free to read this and sign.

With your permission, I could record some of your responses and take pictures of either documents, posters or any other fact that reinforces your responses and provides evidence of existing violence management systems. Please let me know if this is acceptable. I might also ask to take photographs of documents or materials (*indicated by **) where necessary at the end of the interview if this would be fine with you.

Do you have any questions and can we commence the interview now?

Again, there are no right or wrong responses, so please be honest with your answers.

Scale/Key:	1 No, not aware/ not achieved	2 Partially aware/ partially achieved	3 Yes, fully aware/ fully achieved
-------------------	---	---	--

Respondent district/state: _____
Respondent's position: _____ (Leave blank if respondent has asked for anonymity)
Recording consent: Y / N
Gender: F / M

Questions	1	2	3	Document Name	Provide respondent's further explanation or qualitative answer:
1. Is there an objective/strategy/activity in the Education Sector Plan* that aims to prevent violence in schools?					
2. If there is an ESP objective to prevent violence, what are the roles and responsibilities of the state for its implementation?					
3. Is there an explicit law that prohibits corporal punishment in schools?					
4. If such a law exists, what are the protocols and sanction(s) if the law is broken?					
5. How does the state support implementation and enforcement of this law?					

Questions	1	2	3	Document Name	Provide respondent's further explanation or qualitative answer:
6. Does the MoE have a specific policy that prohibits corporal punishment in schools?					
7. If such a policy exists, how does the state support its implementation and enforcement?					
8. Is there a National Child Protection* policy, framework or action plan?					
9. If such a policy exists, how have you adapted it for use in your state?					
10. What are the roles and responsibilities of the state in implementing this policy, particularly regarding severe cases of violence at school?					
11. Is there a formal coordination mechanism between different sectors (like health, police, justice, social welfare) regarding severe cases of violence in school?					
12. Has a State Officer been identified as a focal point with responsibility for overseeing the State's response to reports of violence in schools?					
13. Has the government endorsed the <i>Safe Schools Declaration and Guidelines for Protecting Schools and Universities from Military Use during Armed Conflict</i> ?					
14. If so, how has the state disseminated the guidelines?					

Questions	1	2	3	Document Name	Provide respondent's further explanation or qualitative answer:
15. If there is conflict in the area, do you have a clear plan of action if conflict were to affect the schools in your state?					
16. Does the national curriculum teach children in all primary and secondary grades about:					
a) life skills (if so, please provide examples*)					
b) violence and safe behaviour (if so, please provide examples*)					
c) promoting inclusion of marginalised groups and gender equitable relationships (if so, please provide examples*)					
17. If any of these topics are in the curriculum, how does the State supervise and ensure that they are being implemented in schools?					
18. In your opinion, what percentage of schools in your State has confidential reporting procedures for students to report violence?					
19. What are these procedures?					
20. Are all students made aware of and encouraged to use these reporting procedures?					

Questions	1	2	3	Document Name	Provide respondent's further explanation or qualitative answer:
21. In your opinion, what percentage of schools in your State has a step-by-step process for how to respond to students' reports of violence?					
22. What is this step-by-step process?					
23. At the State level, does your office have step-by-step procedures to coordinate all sectors (education, health, social services, police, justice) to respond to escalated reports of violence from schools?					
24. In your opinion, what percentage of teachers in this State has read the National Teacher Code of Conduct within the past year?					
25. Is there a copy of the National Teacher Code of Conduct* at this State HQ? (If so, please take a picture of it).					
26. What percentage of teachers in this State has signed the National Teacher Code of Conduct in order to commit to it?					
27. What percentage of State officers has signed the Code of Conduct as well?					
28. How does the State ensure that teachers are complying with the Code of Conduct?					
29. Do you have a policy or procedure to conduct background checks before hiring teachers to assess their suitability for working with children? If so, where did this policy come from?					
30. Do you have a policy or procedure to ensure that if a teacher is dismissed for bad behaviour, they are not					

Questions	1	2	3	Document Name	Provide respondent's further explanation or qualitative answer:
simply transferred to another school? If so, where did this policy come from?					
31. Do you know if newly qualified teachers (less than 3 years' service) have received pre-service training on:					
a) effective positive discipline and non-violent classroom management strategies					
b) teacher obligations on child safeguarding and how to prevent revictimisation					
c) violence reporting and response referral pathways for states and schools					
32. Have regular teachers in your State received in-service training on any of these topics within the last 3 years? If so, which teachers and for which topics?					
33. What percentage of schools in your State has a designated School Counsellor to support children, particularly those experiencing violence?					
34. Have the designated School Counsellors received any training for this role? If so, from where?					
35. Does the state have a referral system for specialised services for children that schools and school counsellors can use?					
36. If so, can you give (an anonymised) example of how this has worked in the past?					

Questions	1	2	3	Document Name	Provide respondent's further explanation or qualitative answer:
37. Are there any national standards to ensure school buildings and grounds keep students safe, which include:					
a) a process for mapping unsafe areas					
b) standards to ensure sanitary facilities that are safe and secure					
c) standards for gender-responsive classroom design					
d) standards for school grounds that allow students move safely and freely to and from school					
38. Do State Inspectors monitor whether these standards are being met? If so, how?					
39. Have you ever been involved in disseminating information to students, teachers, parents and community members about:					
a) child rights regarding violence					
b) laws prohibiting violence against children					
40. If so, what have you disseminated, with whom and when?					
41. Have you ever been involved in interventions that address social norms (beliefs, behaviours and practices) surrounding certain types of violence (like bullying, online harms, sexual abuse, gang violence)?					
42. If so, what interventions have you implemented, with whom and when?					

Questions	1	2	3	Document Name	Provide respondent's further explanation or qualitative answer:
43. Have you ever been involved in awareness and/or empowerment raising activities that engage students, parents and communities in discussions and action against violence?					
44. If so, what interventions have you implemented, with whom and when?					
45. Has the State ever received government funding for violence prevention and response interventions? If so, what has been achieved?					
46. Has the State ever received any <i>donor</i> funds for violence prevention and response interventions? If so, which donors and what has been achieved?					
47. Has the State ever received any resources from private sector funders (like foundations, companies, churches, etc.,) for any violence prevention activities? If so, which funders and what has been achieved?					
48. What percentage of schools in your State has a policy or process for confidentially logging reports and responses to violence in the school?					
49. Do the schools share anonymised data or logbooks with the state?					
50. Is there someone at the State who analyses school-level data and shares it with the MoE and with schools?					
51. Has your State participated in any international data collection activities on the prevalence and forms of violence in school? If so, which ones, when and what have been the results?					

Questions	1	2	3	Document Name	Provide respondent's further explanation or qualitative answer:
52. Have you facilitated any other violence prevention initiatives, including the monitoring and evaluation for these? If so, which ones?					
53. Do you know if any evaluations of violence prevention interventions have informed decisions for replication or scale-up by the state or MoE? If so, which ones?					

Head Teacher/Deputy head Questionnaire

This tool is for the Head Teacher and Deputy Head teacher from each school.

Enumerator/researcher introduction:

Hello, my name is _____ and I am here today on behalf of UNICEF to carry out a study for the ‘Safe to Learn’ global initiative, which aims to measure the quality of national efforts to prevent and respond to violence in schools. I will be asking questions about whether certain standards, policies or practices exist, but please note that this is not a test, either of you or of your school. Rather, the results of this study are meant to *help* to provide a guide for how to make schools safer for learning. So please be honest with your answers.

The responses to this questionnaire are a three point scale where you will use (not aware/partially aware/fully aware) depending on the knowledge you have on a particular question being asked.

If you do not know about something, that is fine – just say (I am not aware) or you don’t know. If you are *partially* or *fully* aware of something that I ask you about, please feel free to explain. This interview is set to take approximately 40 minutes.

Your participation in this research is confidential and I will not take your name or share information about you. If you would not like me to note your position or name of your school, please let me know. Your participation is voluntary. If you do not wish to answer a question or if you feel uncomfortable, we can stop the interview at any time. I have a consent form that explains this further. Please feel free to read this and sign.

With your permission, I could record some of your responses and take pictures of either documents, posters or any other fact that reinforces your responses and provides evidence of an existing violence management system within the school. Please let me know if this is acceptable. I might also ask to take photographs of documents or materials (*indicated by **) where necessary at the end of the interview if this would be fine with you.

Do you have any questions and can we commence the interview now?

Again, there are no right or wrong responses, so please be honest with your answers.

Scale/Key:	1	2	3
	No, not aware/ not achieved	Partially aware/ partially achieved	Yes, fully aware/ fully achieved

School name: _____
Respondent’s position: _____
(Leave blank if respondent has asked for anonymity)
Recording consent: Y / N
Gender: F / M
Level of school: Primary / Secondary
Years as teacher: Under 5 / 5+
Teaching at school: Under 5 years / 5+ years
On government payroll: Y / N
Context: Rural / Urban / Peri-urban
Type of school: Government / Private / IDP / POC / Refugee / Other

Questions	1	2	3	Document Name	Provide respondent's further explanation or qualitative answer:
54. Is there a strategy or objective in the Ministry of Education's overall Sector Plan* that aims to prevent violence in schools?					
55. If there is an objective to prevent violence, what are the school's roles and responsibilities for implementation?					
56. Is there is an explicit law that prohibits corporal punishment in schools?					
57. If such a law exists, what are the protocols and sanction(s) if the law is broken?					
58. Does the MoE have a specific policy* that prohibits corporal punishment in schools?					
59. If such a policy exists, has it been disseminated and enforced in your school?					
60. Is there a national Child Protection policy, framework or action plan*?					

Questions	1	2	3	Document Name	Provide respondent's further explanation or qualitative answer:
61. If such a policy exists, what are your roles and responsibilities in implementing it, particularly regarding severe cases of violence at school?					
62. What are the roles and responsibilities of other sectors like health, police, justice and social welfare in addressing severe cases of violence in schools					
63. Has a teacher or any other person been identified as a focal point with responsibility for overseeing the school's response to reports of violence?					
64. If there is conflict in the area, do you have a clear plan of action if it affects your school?					
65. Are there specific lesson plans that aim to teach children about: a) life skills (if so, please provide examples of these lesson plans* and take a picture or acquire copy after the interview)					
b) violence and safe behaviour (if so, please provide examples of these lesson plans* and take a picture or acquire copy after the interview)					
c) promoting inclusion of marginalised groups and gender equitable relationships (if so, please provide examples of these lesson plans* and take a picture or acquire copy after the interview)					

Questions	1	2	3	Document Name	Provide respondent's further explanation or qualitative answer:
66. Are there extra-curricular activities that address these three topics? If so, what are these activities and where did they come from?					
67. At your school, are there any confidential reporting procedures for students to use if they see or experience violence? If so, what are these procedures?					
68. Are <i>all</i> students made aware of and encouraged to use procedures to report violence? If so, how?					
69. Does the school management have a step-by-step process for how to respond to students' reports of violence? If so, what are these?					
70. Did you develop these reporting and response procedures based on any national policies/guidelines or through an independent project or initiative? <i>(Get name of project/initiative)</i>					
71. Do you know if there is a functioning national child helpline for students to report cases of violence?					
72. In your opinion, what percentage of teachers at this school have read the National Teacher Code of Conduct within the past year?					

Questions	1	2	3	Document Name	Provide respondent's further explanation or qualitative answer:
73. What percentage of teachers signed the National Teacher Code of Conduct* in order to commit to it? (Please take a picture if any have signed after the interview)					
74. Is there a School Code of Conduct that:					
a) outlines codes of behaviour for all members of the school community regarding physical, psychological, sexual violence					
b) outlines consequences for violations of the code and how these are enforced					
c) is publicly posted* and disseminated so that all members of the school know and understand it					
d) requires all members of the school to comply and requires all staff to sign it					
75. Do you have a policy or procedure to check if teachers have been in trouble with the police and are suitable for working with children? If so, where did the policy come from?					
76. Do you have a policy or procedure to ensure that if you dismiss a teacher for bad behaviour, they are not simply transferred to another school? If so, where did the policy come from?					
77. Do you know if newly qualified teachers (less than 3 years' service) have received pre-service training on:					
a) Practical and effective positive discipline and classroom management strategies					

Questions	1	2	3	Document Name	Provide respondent's further explanation or qualitative answer:
b) teacher obligations on child safeguarding and how to prevent revictimisation					
c) violence reporting and response referral pathways for districts and schools					
78. Have regular teachers received in-service training on any of these topics within the last 3 years? If so, which teachers and for which topics?					
79. Is there a designated School Counsellor who supports children, particularly those experiencing violence? If so, have they been trained and by who?					
80. Has a School Counsellor identified and disseminated contact numbers* for mental health, medical or family services, particularly for severe cases of violence? (if so, take a picture afterwards)					
81. Are there any policies* that provides standards to ensure school buildings and grounds keep students safe, which include:					
a) a process for mapping unsafe areas					
b) standards to ensure sanitary facilities are safe and secure					
c) Standards for gender-responsive classroom design					

Questions	1	2	3	Document Name	Provide respondent's further explanation or qualitative answer:
d) standards for school grounds that allow students move safely and freely to and from school					
82. Has your school met these standards? If so, can you describe or show how*?					
83. Have you helped your school disseminate information to students, teachers, parents and community members about:					
a) child rights with regard to violence					
b) laws prohibiting violence against children					
84. If so, what have you disseminated, with whom and when?					
85. Have you helped the school implement interventions that address social norms (beliefs, behaviours and practice) surrounding certain types of violence (like bullying, fighting, online harms, sexual abuse, gang violence)?					
86. If so, what interventions have you implemented, with whom and when?					
87. Have you helped the school implement awareness raising activities that engage students, parents and communities in discussions and action against violence?					

Questions	1	2	3	Document Name	Provide respondent's further explanation or qualitative answer:
88. If so, what interventions have you implemented, with whom and when?					
89. Has the school received any government funding for the implementation of any violence prevention and response interventions? If so, what was achieved?					
90. Has the school received any <i>donor</i> funds for the implementation of any violence prevention and response interventions? If so, which donors and what was achieved?					
91. Has the school received any resources from private sector funders (like foundations, companies, churches, etc.) for the implementation of any violence prevention interventions? If so, which funders and what was achieved?					
92. At your school, do you have a process for confidentially logging reports and responses to violence in the school? If so, did it come from a national policy or from an independent initiative? (Get name of project)					
93. Do you regularly monitor the logbook and share a summary of reports with district, teachers, SMC or parents?					

Questions	1	2	3	Document Name	Provide respondent's further explanation or qualitative answer:
94. Has your School participated in any data collection activities on the prevalence and forms of violence in schools? If so, which ones, when and what have been the results?					
95. Have you helped the school implement any other violence prevention initiatives? If so, which ones? If so, did you measure the impact it had on your school?					
96. 42. Did the district or the MoE use the outcomes of the violence prevention initiatives in your school to make any changes in other schools? If so, which ones?					

Teacher Questionnaire

Randomly select 2 female and 2 male teachers from any grade/subject (4 teachers in total).

Enumerator/researcher introduction:

Hello, my name is _____ and I am here today on behalf of UNICEF to carry out a study for the 'Safe to Learn' global initiative, which aims to measure the quality of national efforts to prevent and respond to violence in schools. I will be asking questions about whether certain standards, policies or practices exist, but please note that this is not a test, either of you or of your school. Rather, the results of this study are meant to *help* to provide a guide for how to make schools safer for learning. So please be honest with your answers.

The responses to this questionnaires is a three point scale where you will use (not aware/partially aware/fully aware) depending on the knowledge you have on a particular question being asked.

If you do not know about something, that is fine – just say (I am not aware) or you don't know. If you are *partially* or *fully* aware of something that I ask you about, please feel free to explain. This interview is set to take approximately 40 minutes.

Your participation in this research is confidential and I will not take your name or share information about you. If you would not like me to note your position or name of your school, please let me know. Your participation is voluntary. If you do not wish to answer a question or if you feel uncomfortable, we can stop the interview at any time. I have a consent form that explains this further. Please feel free to read this and sign.

Please note that I will not ask you about any examples of violence in the school, but if you provide such information, I may be legally required to report it to the school management.

With your permission, I could record some of your responses and take pictures of either documents, posters or any other fact that reinforces your responses and provides evidence of an existing violence management system within the school. Please let me know if this is acceptable. I might also ask to take photographs of documents or materials (*indicated by **) where necessary at the end of the interview if this would be fine with you.

Do you have any questions and can we commence the interview now?

Again, there are no right or wrong responses, so please be honest with your answers.

School name: _____
Respondent's position: _____
(Leave blank if respondent has asked for anonymity)
Recording consent: Y / N
Gender: F / M
Level of school:
<input type="checkbox"/> Primary /
<input type="checkbox"/> Secondary
Years as teacher: Under 5 / 5+
Teaching at school: Under 5 years / 5+ years
On government payroll: Y / N
Context: Rural / Urban / Peri-urban

Scale/Key:	1	2	3
	No, not aware/ not achieved	Partially aware/ partially achieved	Yes, fully aware/ fully achieved

Questions	1	2	3	Document Name	Provide respondent's further explanation or qualitative answer:
97. Is there a strategy or objective in the Ministry of Education's overall Sector Plan* that aims to prevent violence in schools?					

Questions	1	2	3	Document Name	Provide respondent's further explanation or qualitative answer:
98. If there is an objective to prevent violence, what are the school's roles and responsibilities for implementation?					
99. Is there is an explicit law that prohibits corporal punishment in schools?					
100. If such a law exists, what are the protocols and sanction(s) are if the law is broken?					
101. Does the MoE have a specific policy* that prohibits corporal punishment in schools?					
102. If such a policy exists, has it been disseminated and enforced in your school?					
103. Is there a national Child Protection policy, framework or action plan*?					
104. If such a policy exists, what are your roles and responsibilities as a teacher in implementing it, particularly regarding severe cases of violence at school?					

Questions	1	2	3	Document Name	Provide respondent's further explanation or qualitative answer:
105. What are the roles and responsibilities of other sectors like health, police, justice and social welfare in addressing severe cases of violence in schools					
106. Has a teacher or any other person been identified as a focal point with responsibility for overseeing the school's response to reports of violence?					
107. If there is conflict in the area, does your school have a clear plan of action if it affects your school?					
108. Are there specific lesson plans for each grade level that aim to teach children about:					
a) life skills (if so, please provide examples of these lesson plans* and take a picture or acquire copy after the interview)					
b) violence and safe behaviour (if so, please provide examples of these lesson plans* and take a picture or acquire copy after the interview)					
c) promoting inclusion of marginalised groups and gender equitable relationships (if so, please provide examples of these lesson plans* and take a picture or acquire after the interview)					
109. Are there extra-curricular activities that address these three topics? If so, what are these activities and where did they come from?					

Questions	1	2	3	Document Name	Provide respondent's further explanation or qualitative answer:
110. At your school, are there any confidential reporting procedures for students to use if they see or experience violence? If so, what are these procedures?					
111. Are <i>all</i> students made aware of and encouraged to use procedures to report violence? If so, how?					
112. Does the school management have a step-by-step process for how to respond to students' reports of violence? If so, what are these?					
113. Did your school develop these reporting and response procedures based on any national policies/guidelines or through an independent initiative? (<i>Get name of project/initiative</i>)					
114. Do you know if there is a functioning national child helpline for students to report cases of violence?					
115. Have you read and signed the National Teacher Code of Conduct within the past year?					
116. In your opinion, what percentage of teachers at this school have read and signed the National Teacher Code of Conduct* in order to commit to it? (Please take a picture if any have signed.)					

Questions	1	2	3	Document Name	Provide respondent's further explanation or qualitative answer:
117. Is there a School Code of Conduct that: a) outlines codes of behaviour for all members of the school community regarding physical, psychological, sexual violence					
b) outlines consequences for violations of the code and how these are enforced					
c) is publicly posted and disseminated so that all members of the school know and understand it					
d) requires all members of the school to comply and requires all staff to sign it					
118. Do you know if your school has a policy or procedure to check if teachers have been in trouble with the police and are suitable for working with children? If so, where did the policy come from?					
119. Do you know if your school has a policy or procedure to ensure that if a teacher is dismissed for bad behaviour, they are not simply transferred to another school? If so, where did the policy come from?					
120. Do you know if newly qualified teachers (less than 3 years' service) have received pre-service training on: d) Practical and effective positive discipline and classroom management strategies					
e) teacher obligations on child safeguarding and how to prevent revictimisation					
f) violence reporting and response referral pathways for districts and schools					

Questions	1	2	3	Document Name	Provide respondent's further explanation or qualitative answer:
121. Have regular teachers received in-service training on any of these topics within the last 3 years? If so, which teachers and for which topics?					
122. Is there a designated School Counsellor who supports children, particularly those experiencing violence? If so, have they been trained and by who?					
123. Has a School Counsellor identified and disseminated contact numbers for mental health, medical or family services, particularly for severe cases of violence? (if so, take a picture after the interview)					
124. With regard to your school buildings and school grounds do you feel that:					
e) Any unsafe areas have been identified and made more safe (verify by checking around)					
f) sanitary facilities are safe and secure, particularly for girls(verify)					
g) classrooms are arranged to encourage all students to participate, particularly girls					
h) students can move safely and freely to and from school					

Questions	1	2	3	Document Name	Provide respondent's further explanation or qualitative answer:
125. Have you helped your school disseminate information to students, teachers, parents and community members about: a) child rights with regard to violence					
b) laws prohibiting violence against children					
126. If so, what was disseminated, by whom and when?					
127. Has your school done anything that addresses social norms (beliefs, behaviours and practices) surrounding certain types of violence (like bullying, fighting, online harms, sexual abuse, gang violence)?					
128. If so, what interventions were implemented, by whom and when?					
129. Has your school done anything to raise awareness among students, parents and communities and/or discussed and/or taken action against violence?					
130. If so, what interventions were implemented, by whom and when?					

Questions	1	2	3	Document Name	Provide respondent's further explanation or qualitative answer:
131. Do you know if your school has received any government funding for the implementation of any violence prevention and response interventions? If so, what was achieved?					
132. Do you know if your school has received any <i>donor</i> funds for the implementation of any violence prevention and response interventions? If so, which donors and what was achieved?					
133. Do you know if your school has received any resources from private sector funders (like foundations, companies, churches, etc.,) for the implementation of any violence prevention interventions? If so, which funders and what was achieved?					
134. At your school, do you have a policy or process for confidentially logging reports and responses to violence in the school? If so, did it come from a national policy or from an independent initiative? (Get name of project)					
135. Does the Head Teacher regularly monitor the logbook and share a summary of reports with district, teachers, SMC or parents?					
136. Has your school participated in any data collection activities on the prevalence and forms of violence in schools? If so, which ones, when and what have been the results?					

Questions	1	2	3	Document Name	Provide respondent's further explanation or qualitative answer:
137. Has your school implemented any other violence prevention initiatives? If so, which ones? If so, did you measure the impact it had on your school?					
138. Did the district or the MoE use the outcomes of the violence prevention initiatives in your school to make any changes in other schools?					

Student Questionnaire

Randomly select two female and two male students (4 in total). For Primary level, aim to pick students from year 6 (upper primary) and in secondary from Secondary 2.

Enumerator/researcher introduction:

Hello, my name is _____ and I am here today on behalf of UNICEF to carry out a study for the 'Safe to Learn' global initiative, which aims to measure the quality of national efforts to reduce violence in schools. I will be asking questions about whether certain standards exist, **but please note that this is not a test, either of you or of your school.** Rather, the results of this study are meant to *help* provide a guide for how to make schools safer for learning. So please be honest with your answers.

The responses to this questionnaires is a three point scale where you will use (not aware/partially aware/fully aware) depending on the knowledge you have on a particular question being asked.

If you do not know about something, that is fine – just say (I am not aware) or you don't know. If you are *partially* or *fully* aware of something that I ask you about, please feel free to explain. This interview is set to take approximately 40 minutes.

Your participation in this research is confidential and I will not take your name or share information about you. If you would not like me to note your grade level or name of your school, Please let me know. Your participation is voluntary. If you do not wish to answer a question or if you feel uncomfortable, we can stop the interview at any time.

Please note that I will not ask you about any examples of violence towards yourself or another student, but if you provide such information, I may be legally required to report it to the school.

With your permission, I could record some of your responses and take pictures of either documents, posters or any other fact that reinforces your responses and provides evidence of an existing violence management system within the school. Please let me know if this is acceptable.

Do you have any questions and can we commence the interview now?

Again, there are no right or wrong responses, so please be honest with your answers.

Scale/Key:	1	2	3
	No, not aware/ not achieved	Partially aware/ partially achieved	Yes, fully aware/ fully achieved

School name: _____
 Respondent's grade: _____
 (Leave blank if respondent has asked for anonymity)
 Recording consent:
 Yes
 No
 Gender: F / M
 Level of school: Primary / Secondary
 Context: Rural / Urban / Peri-urban
 Type of school: Government / Private / IDP / POC / Refugee / Other

Questions	1	2	3	Document Name	Provide respondent's further explanation or qualitative answer:
139. Do you know if there are any laws/rules that prohibits physical punishment in schools, such as caning? <i>(use most understood for caning)</i>					
140. Do you think teachers at your school follows a law/rule that prevents physical punishment?					

Questions	1	2	3	Document Name	Provide respondent's further explanation or qualitative answer:
141. Have you had lessons in any grade where you learned about: d) life skills (if so, please provide examples of these lessons)					
e) violence and safe behaviour (if so, please provide examples of these lessons)					
f) promoting equality between all students/pupils (if so, please provide examples of these lessons)					
142. Are there extra-curricular activities that address these three topics? If so, what are these activities and where did they come from?					
143. Are there any confidential reporting procedures for students to use if they see or experience violence in this school? If so, what are they?					
144. Are all students made aware of and encouraged to use procedures to report violence in this school? If so, how?					

Questions	1	2	3	Document Name	Provide respondent's further explanation or qualitative answer:
145. Does the school management have a step-by-step process for how to respond to students' reports of violence? If so, do you know what this process is?					
146. Do you know if there is a national child helpline for students to report cases of violence? If so, do you know if it works?					
147. Are you aware that there is a National Teacher Code of Conduct that teachers should read and sign?					
148. Do you know if your school has a policy or procedure to check if teachers have been in trouble with the police and are suitable for working with children?					
149. Do you know if your school has a policy or procedure to ensure that if a teacher is dismissed for bad behaviour, they are not simply transferred to another school?					
150. Do you think any of your teachers have received training on: a) positive discipline and classroom management					

Questions	1	2	3	Document Name	Provide respondent's further explanation or qualitative answer:
b) teacher obligations on protecting children					
c) reporting and responding to violence in schools					
151. Is there a designated School Counsellor who supports children, particularly those experiencing violence?					
152. Has a School Counsellor or someone else in the school identified and shared contact numbers for mental health, medical or family services, particularly for severe cases of violence?					
153. With regard to your school buildings and school grounds do you feel that:					
i) Any unsafe areas have been identified and made more safe					
j) sanitary facilities are safe and secure, particularly for girls					
k) classrooms are arranged to encourage all students to participate, particularly girls					

Questions	1	2	3	Document Name	Provide respondent's further explanation or qualitative answer:
l) students can move safely and freely to and from school					
154. Does your school share information with students, teachers, parents and community members about child rights with regard to violence? If so, what was shared, by whom and when?					
155. Has your school shared information to students, teachers, parents and community members about laws prohibiting violence against children? If so, what was shared, by whom and when?					
156. Has your school done anything that addresses beliefs, behaviours and practices around certain types of violence (like bullying, online harms, sexual abuse, gang violence)?					
157. If so, what was done, by whom and when?					
158. Has your school done anything to raise awareness among students, parents and communities and/or discussed and/or taken action against violence?					

Questions	1	2	3	Document Name	Provide respondent's further explanation or qualitative answer:
159. If so, what was done, by whom and when?					
160. Has your school done any other violence prevention activities? If so, what were they and what was the activity called?					

Annex 5: Terms of Reference (TORs)

TITLE	Consultancy to conduct assessment of national efforts to prevent and respond to violence in schools, using the diagnostic tool
LOCATION OF ASSIGNMENT	South Sudan
LANGUAGE(S) REQUIRED	English and any regional languages relevant to the areas of work
TRAVELS	One multi-country workshop in Kampala In country field visits
DURATION OF CONTRACT	The duration of the consultancy from 11 November 2019 to 28 February 2019

Background

‘Safe to Learn’ is a global initiative dedicated to ending violence against children in and around schools. It was originally conceived by members of the Global Partnership to End Violence against Children: UNESCO, UNICEF, UK Department for International Development (DFID) and UNGEI. Governments, civil society organisations, communities, teachers, and children themselves all have a part to play in making schools safe – and all are invited to join Safe to Learn. With a vision of ending all violence against children in schools by 2024, the programmatic and advocacy objectives of Safe to Learn are set out in a five-point ‘Call to Action’:

1. **Implement policy and legislation:** National, regional and local governments develop, fund and enforce laws and policies that protect children from all forms of violence in and around schools, including online violence.
2. **Strengthen prevention and response at the school level:** School staff, students, and management committees provide safe and gender-sensitive learning environments for all children that promote positive discipline, child-centered teaching and protect and improve children’s physical and mental wellbeing.
3. **Shift social norms and behaviour change:** Parents, teachers, children, local government and community leaders recognise the devastating impact of violence in schools and take action to promote positive social norms and gender equality to ensure schools are safe spaces for learning.
4. **Invest resources effectively:** Increased and better use of investments targeted at ending violence in schools.
5. **Generate and use evidence:** Countries and the international community generate and use evidence on how to effectively end violence in schools.

As part of this initiative, a ‘Diagnostic Tool’ has been developed to inform country-level collective dialogue amongst Safe to Learn partners and with national counterparts. It aims to measure the quality of national efforts to prevent and respond to violence in and around schools against a standard. The standards are aligned with the Safe to Learn Call to Action, and were developed in relation to international child rights frameworks, United Nations guidance and minimum standards, and good practices from the field of child safeguarding. It sets out a series of checkpoints that constitute baseline requirements for National Governments and the education sector to meet their accountabilities in ensuring that schools are safe and protective. The focus is mainly on Ministry of General Education and Instruction (MoGEI), but also includes Ministry of Gender, Social Welfare and Religious Affairs and Ministry of Local government and other counterparts (Justice, Social welfare, etc).

Completion of this diagnostic tool would require, in stage 1, a focus on national level laws, policies, systems and processes, beginning with desk review of legal framework and policy environment along with interviews with MoGEI officials. The second stage would consist of the field review, involving selection of representative districts and schools.

The 'Diagnostic Tool' is to be used with reference to the Safe to Learn 'Programmatic Framework', a complementary guideline that uses the same benchmarks in order to define programmatic interventions.

UNICEF is undertaking national assessments using the 'Diagnostic Tool' concurrently in five countries and has contracted Cambridge Education to provide technical support to the exercise.

Purpose

To conduct a national assessment of measures in place to prevent and respond to violence in schools using a contextualised version the Diagnostic Tool.

The assessment will take place under the supervision of Cambridge Education and the UNICEF country office in partnership with the MoGEI. A Lead researcher will be guided in the assessment by Cambridge Education. This will include support to methodological development and national contextualisation of the tool, technical support, and quality control of results.

Work Assignment

Task 1. Participation in a multi-country planning workshop. The workshop will bring together the National Consultants from Focus Countries as well as other relevant technical resource people. It will be held in a convenient location, to be identified. The purpose will be to (i) train National Consultants on the questionnaires and methodology; (ii) refine the questionnaire and methodology through participatory exercise with National Consultants; and (iii) adapt the methodology and questionnaires to national contexts where necessary.

Deliverable 1: Finalised methodology and questionnaires that are adapted to the country context.

Task 2. National level desk review and key informant interviews. The Lead Researcher will review national level laws, policies, systems and processes, including relevant directives and regulations. Together they will identify relevant data sources on violence in schools, budget lines, monitoring and response systems, public education campaigns, national curriculum and professional training. This information will be obtained through internet searches, desk reviews of available literature and interviews with MoGEI officials. Consultations will be held with key UN Agencies, INGOs, National NGOs, the private sector, and others that are directly involved in addressing violence in schools. The Lead Researcher will then be responsible for the writing up and delivery of the following:

Deliverable 2(a): Submission of Desk review to international expert group (maximum 10 pages)

Deliverable 2(b): Submission of completed national level-questionnaire results and diagnostic assessment

Task 3. Field review. The Lead Researcher will work with MoGEI partners to randomly select schools within the sampling frame which is currently being finalised. Information will be collected through the use of the questionnaire, key informant interviews and review of documentary sources. The Lead Researcher will then be responsible for the writing up and delivery of the following:

Deliverable 3: Submission of completed district and school level questionnaire results and diagnostic assessment

Task 4. Report writing. The Lead researcher will draft a synthesis report that highlights major findings (maximum 30 pages) and the Lead Researcher will be responsible for the finalisation and delivery of the report that includes:

- national context of the education sector
- an overview of current forms of violence in and around schools,
- analysis of national policies and systems to address violence in schools
- overview of partner contributions, including UN, NGOs, the private sector, other relevant actors
- analysis of results of diagnostic exercise, including the identification of good practices, major gaps, and recommended priority interventions

Deliverable 4: Submission of synthesis report, incorporating summary of desk review and findings from diagnostic exercise (maximum 30 pages)

Task 5. Presentation at round table discussion. The Lead researcher will present the main findings and recommendations at a national round table meeting of key stakeholders; and facilitate a discussion of these findings in order to agree on priority interventions. The Lead Researcher will be responsible for the delivery of the following:

Deliverable 5(a): Powerpoint presentation of main findings from diagnostic exercise

Deliverable 5(b): Summary report from round table discussion (maximum 5 pages)

Deliverables and time-frame

Phase	Deliverable		Days allocated	Timeframe (TBC)
Planning workshop in Kampala	1	Finalised methodology and questionnaires that are adapted to the country context.	2	Week of 11 th November
National-level review	2(a)	Submission of Desk review to Cambridge Education (maximum 10 pages)	3	22 nd November
	2(b)	Submission of completed national level-questionnaire results and diagnostic assessment	5	
Field work	3	Deliverable 3: Submission of completed district and school level questionnaire results and diagnostic assessment	28	20 th December
Report writing	4	Deliverable 4: Submission of synthesis report, incorporating summary of desk review and findings from diagnostic exercise. (maximum 30 pages)	8	January?
Round Table	5(a)	Deliverable 5(a): Powerpoint presentation of main findings from diagnostic exercise	4	15 th January 2020
	5(b)	Deliverable 5(b): Summary report from round table discussion (maximum 5 pages)		

Payment schedule

30% on satisfactory submission of deliverable 2(a) and 2(b)

70% upon satisfactory submission of all remaining deliverables.

Reporting and supervision of the contract

The consultants will work under the direct supervision of Cambridge Education with support from the UNICEF country office when necessary. The researchers will receive ongoing oversight, guidance and support from Cambridge Education, and will be expected to maintain regular and proactive communications with the focal point of this group.

Person specification/expertise required

- Advanced university degree in social sciences or related fields.
- Lead Researcher: A senior consultant/researcher with a minimum of ten to fifteen years relevant professional work in social policy related field, with expertise in education and/or social welfare fields. Experience in providing policy advice to Governments required.
- Proven research skills and demonstrated experience in the area of conducting social research and surveys. Published work an asset.
- Good understanding and experience related to prevention and response to violence against children, including in schools.
- Knowledge and experience of UNICEF policies and programmes of cooperation an asset.
- Capacity to work independently yet with ability to share information, receive feedback and engage in dialogue with partners.
- Excellent analytical, communication, writing and editorial skills in English language. Working knowledge in another UN language an asset.

How to Apply

Applicants are requested to send their submissions to **Adam.Leach@camb-ed.com** by **18th September 2019**.

Applications must include:

- Cover letter
- CV
- Samples of previous related/similar work done
- Please indicate your ability, availability and daily/monthly rate. Applications submitted without a daily rate will not be considered.

Annex 6: Schedule of Activities

Safe to learn project implementation schedule

Phase	Deliverable	Description	Timeframe
Planning workshop in Kampala	1	Finalised methodology and questionnaires that are adapted to the country context.	Week of 11 th November, 2019
Field work	3	Deliverable 3: Submission of completed district and school level questionnaire results and diagnostic assessment	10 th January, 2020
National-level review	2(a)	Submission of Desk review to Cambridge Education (maximum 10 pages)	14 th March, 2020
	2(b)	Submission of completed national level-questionnaire results and diagnostic assessment	12 th February, 2020
Report writing	4	Deliverable 4: Submission of synthesis report, incorporating summary of desk review and findings from diagnostic exercise. (maximum 30 pages)	6 th March, 2019
Round Table	5(a)	Deliverable 5(a): PowerPoint presentation of main findings from diagnostic exercise	24 th March, 2020
	5(b)	Deliverable 5(b): Summary report from round table discussion (maximum 5 pages)	30 th March, 2020