

***Inter-University Forced Migration Conference, Education Panel
Who Gets to Learn What? Challenges in the Field of Forced Migrant Education
February 12, 2005
9:00am***

Sarah Dryden-Peterson: Good Morning.

Welcome again, it's good to see you all this early.

First, a brief introduction of our preliminary Speaker Mr. Westy Egmont. Mr. Egmont has been involved in the Greater Boston Food Bank Network, as a pastor in Andover and is on the board of directors of the International Institute of Boston and is heavily involved in the refugee community in this area.

Mr. Egmont:

Good Morning—it's good to be here today and I hope you all enjoyed yesterday.

Thank you to all those on the organizing committee — fantastic work.

This is a remarkable student achievement for you and all who are able to benefit from your product.

Comments: In summary of yesterday, it is a good to take time to think about a third phase of development and economic development which includes neighborliness and listening hard to those we are serving. These are important ways in which we can ensure that the livelihoods of refugees are at the center of any resettlement program.

I am struck by quality of students at Fletcher and in the field. But, the biggest threat to all of us is *Arrogance*. There is no larger threat than thinking “Been there, done that,” and that “I know the answer.” We work very much on the edges of our own self-righteousness. It is Important to think about these vital issues with humility. Because, we do not know the answers.

The closer you get to the issues, the more you realize you do *not* know and we should be humbled by the complexity of what we have tried to do with our lives. In reality, it is very, very difficult to do good. Good and evil are so closely related. The attempt to do good is always closely followed by evil—for instance: in helping meet the immediate needs of people in a refugee camp, we may create dependence in the long term, rather than self-sufficiency and sustainability. It's hard to come to terms with how hard it is to do good. For example: In New Hampshire, the resettlement of the Somali Bantus is largely considered to be one of the most successful resettlement operations. The goal has been to put people in communities of at least 250 so that they can create community. But, recently in New Hampshire, 35 children have been found to have elevated lead levels. This has been all over the news. Recently, the local government and resettlement agencies decided to stop letting people from arriving. People in Public Health and together with us decided it was unsafe not because of the Bantus' lead levels, but because the community is in angst. This is about to destroy largest, most successful resettlement in area b/c of elevated lead levels in people who are malnourished and starving. Here, are we making policy around what is good for refugees? This raises questions: Is it better

to bring refugees here or leave them in the desert of Kenya? I think it is better to do something, but we have to make this decision. It is hard to do good.

People are of different minds, take resettlement of refugees from Vietnam. Initially, the system emphasized education first and stressed language as most important. In 1996 a new philosophy was adopted in refugee resettlement: Work First. At first I found this preposterous, but since then we've all been humbled by the fact that it has worked. Now, people are averaging 4 months to employable. They take pride in being the bread-giver of the family, and this has promoted unity, community, and provided an incentive to learn language. The results are spectacular despite the inability to make a good decision. I say we make "Data Free Decisions". Since there is not data, we make decisions based on a hunch. This is very hard to do.

Now, we need to think about what we want as a long term result and shift our emphasis from being welfare oriented (our resources are going away—little money means everything is even harder to do) but instead ask how do we use the few dollars we have to serve the most people in the best way? We need to end the welfare mindset. Our job is not to be the harbor, but rather the investor in these clients who have tremendous assets. Quoting Michael Sheridan of Washington University, "During the coming decades it is likely that there will be a transformation and new emphasis on development rather than maintenance and a focus on people and active citizenship." That said, IDA (Individual Development Accounts) are of a particular and growing importance. Welfare is perceived as safety net. IDA enables asset development for a poor person who does not have the means, through either money or day to day security, to bank on their future. IDA's provide Matched incomes, in other words: Save a dollar = receive a dollar. There are several organizations doing this including Bridges to Business (just for refugees), micro-loan programs, Savings for Success (which is teaching financial literacy and enabling people who've been here for even just 3 years to buy homes) and others.

Economic development is important and hard to do well. We have to be the bearers of hope. Don't surrender to the forces which are sometimes overwhelming. Somali Women speak in the *we* not the *I*. One woman's story: We fled the clan who killed my father. We bribed our way out by giving gold bracelets, crossed desert, a lion attacked my child, we were admitted to a camp in Kenya and the soldiers who gave food by day came and raped us at night. We've been waiting. Now families call but we don't know if we can help. We work, just like our husbands, all day long. But we love America. Whatever is, is better than what was. Now I say to you: We are the bearers of hope. Realize this responsibility. Give hope, reason to live. It is great to be here.

Note: There are brochures on the table with information on IIB programs: Torture treatment, International Women's day, and our trafficking program. I'll be happy to talk about these later.

Sarah Dryden-Peterson: Good Morning.

Welcome to panel on Education; "Who Gets to Learn What? Challenges in the Field of Forced Migrant Education."

I know we are all excited to hear what our panelists have to say.

Refugees see education of children as key to a better future regardless what form this education takes. But we also know the challenges are enormous. Our speakers today will follow the path

of development from the challenges that are presented in refugee camps, during repatriation, and during resettlement in America, to broader, guiding principles of refugee education.

Introductions:

Sarah Smith: Sarah will speak about challenges in Education programs for refugees in host countries. She currently works for the International Rescue Committee in NY, where she oversees education programs in 20 countries. She started her work in this field in 1996 with the Peace Corps in Namibia.

Eric Eversmann: Eric will address re-integration of refugees, speaking from his experience in Eritrea. Eric has worked for UNHCR in Eritrea, and UNICEF. He is a Fletcher graduate, and wrote his MALD on providing education in complex emergencies.

Asiya Ahmadi: Asiya works as a teacher and in refugee adjustment in the US, and has taught mathematics in Kabul University in Afghanistan, as well as in Iran and Turkmenistan. She is the head of ANJUMAN, an Afghan-American women's partnership in MA.

Dr. Dana Burde: Dr. Burde is an Associate Research Scholar in the War and Peace Studies Program and Program on Forced Migration and Health at Columbia University.

First Speaker: Sarah Smith

International Rescue Committee

Challenges in the Field of Forced Migration Education

I'm glad that the title of this panel is "Challenges" because there are many and we need to think with humility. Often, we don't have answers, we have challenges. We need to think about these challenges with humility.

I am going to talk about challenges in Refugee settings, focusing on the Refugee context—refugees in host countries or countries of first asylum.

I'll start with basic principles for forced migrants, then talk about the Refugee setting and some of its particular challenges: planning, the tension between doing medium and long term planning and responding in emergency setting, then challenges around certification and accreditation for teachers and students. I'll then present concluding points and questions for further thoughts.

Basic Principles:

It has taken a long time to agree that education should be part of the humanitarian response. Finally there is recognition that education is a crucial element that should happen immediately. Now, there is usually immediate provision of education. And there is a general agreement that it should be assured immediately alongside shelter and food. All individuals have a right to education and immediate provision of education is an essential element of humanitarian interventions. Education can protect against exploitation and harm and communicate life-saving messages. Education can also mitigate the effects of violence and trauma, offer structure, stability, and hope. Education builds skills and contributes to individual cognitive development and psychosocial well being.

In the field, many have thought about education as a development responsibility but now people are also thinking about it in emergency situations. Planning is important— we need to implement learning in emergency programs but also need to think about future. The future is often very uncertain. Education is part of the immediate response, but education is only partially successful if the future is not considered. What is the durable solution for refugees? Will they willingly repatriate, enter into new country, etc? The tendency of funding for programs is short term. Planning is often compromised by poor inter-agency and cross-border regional coordination. There are years of permanent systems in refugee settings, and planning a program thinking about the future may lead to permanence. If refugees are given a formal system of education then they may stay in refugee settings.

Challenges in Planning (generally planning for the future)

Certification and Accreditation.

We need to be planning from the beginning for certification and accreditation for both teachers and students.

They want to walk away with credit, be able to say they have a certificate, training, degree. It is possible to develop programs with training and curriculum, but if no one recognizes this afterwards, it is useless. We need to have a way of showing what they have learned but also a way of using this in the future.

Curricula and examinations should be recognized by authorities and “face both ways” - meaning that they face both the refugee host country curriculum and also the home country or country of origin curriculum. The difficulty is that we never know the future...refugees may say they want to go home, but we never know whether that certification will be best or most relevant for them in the future.

I believe certification should reflect what refugees want. Programs that introduce new curricula or teacher training should be compatible with authorized curricula.

A not-so successful example: Bangladesh. Rohingya Refugees. For years these refugees ran their own education programs. Today ask teenager what type of education they have---they'll say they have a camp education. Or a teacher will have camp teacher-training, but there is uncertainty and fear on their part as to what happens next. If they go home will they be able to integrate back into school? Will teachers be able to get jobs? They want a certificate, credit for what they've done. Unfortunately they don't have that. In Bangladesh there is not great regional planning and collaboration. The Bangladeshi Government is nervous about ensuring that refugees have certificates and get credit. Myanmar is unwilling to recognize or give certification/accreditation. Another failure in this example is that there has been little international pressure on governments to make this a priority. Additionally, this is a small refugee population in a protracted camp setting.

A better example: Guinea. International Rescue Committee has been working there since 1991. A more hopeful example with similar challenges. The Sierra Leone Minister of education was not recognizing IRC curriculum and certificates. But, there has been progress recently. Planning with and involvement of the Liberian ministry of education in teacher training certification, and collaboration with the Guinean ministry of education so students have option to integrate into Guinean schools, and the West Africa Examinations Council is offering student certification.

What have we learned from these examples? Questions: Why was it successful in Guinea and not Bangladesh? I don't have a lot of good answers. I believe that planning needs to start from the beginning, and that certification and accreditation need to be considered from the beginning, not just in the middle. Think about future, although it is uncertain. We need to make every effort to ensure that local, regional and inter-agency coordination take place to ensure student and teacher certification and accreditation. We need to listen to refugee communities, who must be active participants in planning, implementing, monitoring, and evaluating education programs. Programs must start from them (refugees) and what they hope for the future.

Finally, two questions:

- 1) What conditions are needed for effective, local, regional and inter-agency collaboration and cooperation?
- 2) What incentives do governments and the international community need to ensure this collaboration and planning for the future?

[Applause]

Second Speaker

Eric Eversmann

Education Reintegration for Returning Refugees

Eritrea 2002-2004

Hello. Thank you. I just want to say that it is a wonderful experience to be on other side of the auditorium and a privilege to be back here. It's remarkable how well organized this is. There is definitely something special about Fletcher Students.

I am going to talk about my experience in Eritrea working as an education specialist for UNHCR. This was my first time alone as an education person there, and this is my first opportunity to present what we were doing to other people. I will present this as a limited case and am anxious for reactions.

Outline: I will give some context, an education program overview, and finally raise issues for discussion.

1) Map of Eritrea: Shares long borders w/. Sudan and Ethiopia

1961-1992: 30 year war of independence from Ethiopia during which many refugees went to Sudan.

1993: Referendum established Eritrean independence

1998-2000: Eritrean-Ethiopian border war

May 2001: UNHCR and the Government of Eritrea begin assisted repatriation. From May 2001 to May 2002, 50,000 participate in assisted repatriation, 97% to 3 districts in Gash Barka. In the next 2 years 25,000 more returned.

Population Impact Figures: Three counties: Goluj, Haykta, Teseney...range of refugee population in community was from 10-100% returnees. This was a huge jump in population in just 1 year.

Our Goal was Sustainable Reintegration—defined as follows:

1. Initial reinsertion assistance
2. Immediate reintegration assistance
 - livelihoods support (commercial infrastructure, agricultural training, access to social services, health, education, and water)
3. Linking long term and short term
4. Education Program
 - Meets needs of returnees and their communities through programs
 - All takes place in long-term outlook

Many needs were caused by the repatriation

Needed:

- Changes to ministry of education policy and standards—open enrollment for refugees, waiver for fees.
- Expansion of existing education system to accommodate new population, maintain level of access and quality.

A specific Example: In one community, they needed 41 new classrooms, 41 teachers, 679 desks, and 3,000 text books over the course of a couple of months. But, what did they get: [shows two photos. First photo: several dilapidated shacks. Second Photo: school built over a year, costing 40K]

Other needs are particular to the returnees:

- Correspondence between the two systems of education. Need to pay attention to where they were and in Eritrea, when school began, etc.
- Curriculum, schedules, organization,
- Largest Concern: English Language. In Eritrea students learn English in primary school and are expected to be proficient and be taught in English for secondary school. In Sudan, school is taught in Arabic and students only learn English in high school. This presented problems for older students repatriating—they couldn't just jump back into classes at their original level.

Poverty: Needs for additional subsidies

Supplies to grade school students

Stipends for high school students

Waiver for school fees

Education Activities:

- Advocacy on behalf of returnees
- Construction of and supply of new buildings, makeshift temporary classrooms, water and sanitation services, teacher recruitment and training, strengthening of the local education officers, English tutoring, Increase in girls' participation, Community participation

Examples:

Focus on Adulis Secondary School

As stated above: repatriation and rejoining school was fine for students in younger grades, but in secondary school this was much more difficult. Either students had to go back to 3rd grade or drop out. To change this we set up an Arabic Secondary school. But, to do this, had to translate

curriculum into Arabic, hire and train new teachers, and this all lead to a discussion as to whether students should be receiving any subsidies. Originally, the government policy was that no stipends at all were given for secondary school. And I agreed with this. At least at first. This decision was made, but the Sudanese Government used the fact that the government would not give subsidies to secondary school students as a way of broadcasting the failure and incompetence of the Eritrean Government and a reason why Eritreans should not go home.

Topics for Discussion:

- Ability to work through and the challenge of working through the Government
- Difference in roles in refugee and returnee situations. (Mr. Eversmann's role was superintendent of education, but ultimately the Government made decisions as to what would and would not happen and set policy standards.) What do you do in refugee camp where there is potentially a wide degree of programs and then refugees repatriate and the home-country government is only willing to provide a small subset of these programs? What can you do to change this? This raises the question of Standards as well as technical and policy questions.

-There are Difficult Distinctions that must be made

1) Relief, recovery, and development. Different people have different definitions of the words and different attitudes. The Eritrean government, for example sees everything as development. At the same time, some organizations are particular. For instance one was willing to pay for a construction of a school (seen as relief or recovery) but not for a fence around the school as it saw this as development.

2) Returnee, host, and other "communities." Who is the host, who reaps the benefit? We are forced to define these terms; we are told we need to use these terms.

[Applause]

Third Speaker:

Asiya Ahmadi

Lynn English High + ANJUMAN

From Afghanistan, graduated from Kabul University in 1980.

Currently works as a math teacher, sitting for master degree, teaching ESL.

Refugee and immigrant students arrive with enormous experience and all are faced with new language, culture and challenge of integrating into a new educational system.

Some have had many traumatic experiences. Some youngsters never had any school in their life and this may be the case for their parents too.

This creates huge differences in refugees' abilities to adapt.

For example: Afghanistan before 1978-- boys and girls had basic access to education, but this depended on where one lived. Small towns maybe only basic, But major cities had great education histories. There one experienced new languages, such as Russian, Arabic, and English.

In 1995 when the Taliban took over power, they closed educational facilities for girls, and no women could be working outside the home. Middle schools had to close as primary teachers had been women. Now you can imagine that what happened to education in Afghanistan. It

virtually leveled to zero for a period of 7 years. Today, refugees reflect this range...informal to formal.

I am going to answer the questions given for this panel:

1) Address the challenge that I face in becoming an accredited teacher in this country

Attended school in 1970s and early 1980s when girls had good access. I learned British English for 5 years, received a Bachelor's in mathematics—a universal subject.

Forced to migrate to Iran, able to teach in Tehran high schools for 10 years.

In 1993 I returned to Afghanistan and taught math at the University of Teran.

In 1995 I was forced out of job when the Taliban took over, taught my own children and others until migrating to Turkmenistan in 1999.

In US hoped to be math teacher, but Afghan degree and Iranian +Teranian experience was insufficient. I was hired to help with refugee assimilation, and teach ESL in Chelsea. Then I started teaching math for ESL, and gradually became familiar with the system and certification requirements for math teachers.

I studied for 2 years at night and on weekends, at same time learning more math terminology, and I enjoyed it. During preparation taught ESL to students in all kinds of subjects.

2) Discuss the difficulties that refugee students have to adapting to the system.

Can divide refugees into three groups:

1) No formal school. (ages 15-20), parents illiterate in their own language. These students suffer the greatest shock. All is new and they have a particularly hard time adapting to the culture and educational system. This is a hard time for students, but also teachers. Will take 6-7 months to start to understand schedule, teachers, food they can eat. In 2002 bilingual programs were eliminated in MA making it more difficult. There is a large distance between them and higher education.

2) Those who have some intermediate experience---for Afghani refugees, perhaps they had some education in Pakistani schools etc. It is better for them, but still challenging. Takes 1-2 years to fully adapt to new cultural environment.

3) African refugees or former Soviet refugees. Most attended schools and have high literacy, math, science backgrounds, despite lack of English knowledge...only a few months in immersion classes and then they join regular classes. Most are college bound.

Of all these categories, Afghan girls are most eager to learn and go on to college. This reflects the fact that they were deprived of this, and are eager to succeed. The US provides them with great opportunities.

3) What kind of assistance is available, not available?

Experience in Chelsea: Boston University has summer school opportunities, Boston field trips, Harvard has English classes for immigrants, Harvard Med Students have mentored refugees, International Institute also provides support, and job training. All of these have had a very positive influence.

4) Talk about ANJUMAN...organization that is was established w/ work and help of American women (w/ Afghani women)

2001 started to establish association – it started after Sep 11. ANJUMAN means *cooperation*. Our goal: to address concerns and needs of women who arrive from Afghanistan. Help them be self-sufficient, preserve traditions, bonds, promote cultural awareness in Boston community. Help women and children recover from war and deprivation. Afghan refugee communities become computer literate. ANJUMAN has assisted with language and cultural training, driving instruction, going back to school. We tutor help women who have not gone to school, even with how to deal with illness and care for children. We partner with church groups and others for discussions about the future of Afghanistan. Gather on cultural days to keep culture, traditions, language, for future generations.

[Applause]

Competing Paradigms for Managing Refugee Education

Dana Burde Ph.D.

Associate Research Scholar

Institute of War and Peace Studies

First, I want to say that I am generally impressed with Fletcher and the organization of this conference. Thank you.

Give academic overview of these problems, questions. Before I get into the overview, I'll give a brief history of the development of this field in more detail. Then I'll talk about the paradigms that we are facing and ways in which we can think about these issues differently. Finally I'll give some policy recommendations.

Both Sarah and Eric mentioned that education has traditionally been thought of as a development function, so excluded from emergency/refugee operations. There are still some examples of slow integration of education into the crisis field.

1960-1980s divide really prevalent between relief and development.

1980s continuing concept—from relief to reconstruction, leading to development

1990s, some examples of ways in which organizations addressed issues: Washington group on “Rapid Education” replicates relief. Here, the language is important. Emphasis is on RAPID education, as if it is also a crisis, or something to be dealt with quickly and with urgency.

Mahel wrote “The Impact of Armed Conflict on Children” – that was the first study to put education on the map.

Norwegian Refugee Council put education on the map. Started campaigning to include education as a crisis response and to use education as the fourth pillar of crisis relief.

In 1998 there was a conference to launch this concept.

Norwegians are really out in front. NORAD = organization on whose website it says

“Education is Job #1.” It's interesting to look at policies bilaterally, interesting to note the differences. NORAD is taking the lead. (Swedish organization) SEDA, CIDA (Canada) – these are both good places to look for funding. Other agencies are eager to catch up.

There's been a renewed interest in education in emergencies since September 11. German government recently came out with a paper to this effect. It will be released in English this month.

Turning points for development of education in this field...meaning people affected in all kinds of crises... but education is generally understood to address crises. Field changed dramatically since turn of millennium. Most important are advocacy tools between agencies.

Competing paradigms:

Started with a development paradigm. Many not getting education, not part of humanitarian response. What can we do? Use Human Rights Paradigm. Frame: no education access = denial of fundamental human rights. This is used to address lack of education in humanitarian context. Development paradigm is currently advocated by most educators and supporting by international frameworks. Education holds immediate development potential. Recognizes education as long term social development, emphasizes education content, community participation, collaboration w/ government officials, eye toward transition, and sustainability

Human Rights Paradigm

Any crises in any country as potential obstacles to children's right to receive education. Doesn't ghettoize education in crisis situations...quality and access is typical language used. Education is seen as a human right, and a key element in peace building strategies. Looks at education in a cultural context. Content not defined by differences in culture.

In order to put education on map, it is framed as a commodity to be provided on a large scale. Emergency seen as temporary circumstance for which education can be employed to provide protection (human rights language) to prevent human rights issues. Must note that I am now doing research on protection language. I am questioning the assumptions about whether or not education protects kids...refugee kids used to recruit child soldiers, given recent unfolding events in Congo w/humanitarian aid workers actively involved in abuse of children...schools are not necessarily safe places for kids... Are these places safe because of cognitive development or because kids are counted?

Educational activities are a stop-gap measure

Not a long-term program

Does not emphasize relationships with state institutions.

Integrating programs suggested. Need to eliminate the linear approach to development

It is difficult to make the change even though the need for change is recognized. Why, if we recognize we need to make a change, does the same thinking persist? Leader in this integrating approach is the World Bank. Management starts when peace agreement signed.

I'll leave you with:

Suggestions for combining paradigms at policy level.

Three things to keep in mind, three variables for when you go out and get into your jobs as policy makers.

1. What is the status of the population? Are they refugees, returnees? What is the political context, how does this affect the policy implications for the policy you advocate?

2. Status of the State: Failed state? Corruption level of government institutions?

3. Type of Crisis: Ethnic based, identity based? Religion, ideological, resource based, grievance based?

[Applause]

Sarah Dryden Peterson: Want to get in as many questions as possible in the short amount of time remaining. First I want to thank our speakers for their ideas and their questions.

First Guiding Questions: Points of speakers point to need to speak of intersection of these issues. What is the nexus of relief and development? How and where do agencies come together to collaborate? What can we learn from different kinds of contexts and how that has happened and may happen in other kinds of circumstances? What is integrated thinking? How do we integrate our thinking on these complex matters? Now let's take 3-4 questions at a time. Please use the microphones for questions.

- 1) Marty Schmidt: What is the potential for distance education opportunities? I worked in Thailand in a protracted refugee situation, and distance education was used. Is this a tool for providing a higher education tool that can be used? Is there potential for this? Are other people thinking about this?

Sarah Smith : Mixed experiences with distance education. It's a great opportunity. Some done in Afghanistan and Pakistan...piloting, distance education. One example where not very successful is in Namibia, sometimes for refugees who had fled as far as Cuba, they participated in distance education programs. But there were so many. From Cuba, to Tanzania, to South Africa. People were paying a lot of money for programs, getting certificates, but it became an industry, people paying a lot of money for mediocre or low quality programs. When there are so many different distance education programs they can be risky and counter productive. None of them recognized in the end because so many cropped up that in the end even the good ones were ignored.

- 2) Maggie: On the topic of English language in Eritrea not Sudan, what about the opposite, where English is taught in refugee camps but not in home school? To what degree are refugees being thought of as resources—people with potential education who can serve as resources for their home country once they return?

Eric Eversmann: This is Important to recognize. But it is up to those on the receiving end. In Sudan, the Eritrean camps emphasized girls...up to those on the receiving end.

- 3) Chad Lewis. Concerned with culturally appropriate education. Concerning refugees and displaced people what effort is taken to consider training styles and what education is appropriate for refugee people? We don't always recognize that people in different

places need to learn differently things and learn differently. Perhaps need to address this, teach more culturally appropriately.

- 4) Karen Ross. In situations where refugees are repatriated and refugee situation is caused by ethnic conflict, and refugees return to situations with Failed states or only UNCHR or other organizations are working with the government...how and if are issues of education handled that may have cause or perpetuated the conflict...are changes in the curriculum made?
- 5) Mentioned ideals about students returning to Eritrea for education. In this case the ideal was 50 students per classroom but that this could never be reached. Was this policy really in their favor? In many places, like Kenya, enrollment typically much higher.
- 6) Anna Mill: Issues of resettlement and parental involvement: when parents have different levels of education, how do you encourage involvement?

Answers:

Eric Eversmann: There is a best way for teachers to behave in classrooms, despite backgrounds, but has been policy of organizations, that have advocated certain role of teachers...schools as safe space.

Issues that have caused problems: Need to look at what educational system did in the first place. To the extent that the education system was involved, this needs to be evaluated. What we've done with education as practitioners is to professionalize ourselves. How do you conduct education in crisis at the classroom level? Haven't done as well at engaging governments and policy makers in host countries to encourage them to be involved at making education better. Issues of curriculum are national policy issues. How we or can we make a next step within moving forward in our own organizations so that it is seen not only as a movement of young people on the ground, but a government issue too?

Government standards were the bane of my existence in Eritrea. Government had a development approach. Didn't like relief of recovery---seen as lesser quality. International community was creating institutions of lower quality than they would have accepted for their own populations. 50 students per classroom was a government policy. Classrooms were mixed. Refugee and host and returnees together. Standards as rigid as they were, set between organization (as many students as possible, quickly) and the Government of Eritrea (slowly, done correctly, work together we'll get there). Raised overriding tension

Asiya Ahmadi

Good point for parents of students who are educated or not educated. People who are not educated have own problems—can't even help themselves. Need translator at doctor or outside the home. Can't do much for selves. Lots of pressure on kids...kids sick because of lots of pressure, a lot of work for education. Families who have some basic education and are able to help children—children are very successful. My children in good hands—now in advanced classes. When we came, they didn't speak a word of English...senior and two 10th graders. Parents very important.

Sarah Smith. Discussion of Standards. Inter-agency Network for Minimum Standards. The result of a lot of work to address issues among having a standard of what can be expected in emergencies or crisis. Conference in Asia compiled into handbook for minimum standards modeled after SPHERE handbook. Discussion of differences between minimum standards for refugees and minimum standards for teacher-student ratios...many wanted absolute number...e.g.: 50 is most in classroom...but argument, maybe that is not attainable. Argument back and forth, in the end, that argument continued for all standards. How vague do we have to be to cover all contexts, how specific do we have to be? No number put for minimum standard. Also connected to Eric's point of need to engage, and think about the bigger picture and not just the sort of arbitrary groups that we've made of refugees or returnees and think about larger communities and government and actors.

Dr. Dana Burde

Huge effort and extremely important to quantify what we mean as a right to standards. SPERE Project...so that people would be able to claim their rights in humanitarian emergencies. Response –going to give standard for future.

[Wrap-up...coffee break...feel free to continue to talk more. Next session at 11:00]