Humanitarian Aid for Education: Why It Matters and Why More is Needed

1) Progress in getting all children and adolescents into school is being held back by conflict

The proportion of out of school children in war zones has grown from 30% to 36% since 2000. There are now 34 million out of school children and adolescents living in conflict-affected countries.

These children are more than twice as likely to be out of school as those in other countries. Adolescents are two thirds more likely to be out of school.

Children are 30% less likely to complete primary if they’re in a conflict affected countries. They’re half as less likely to complete lower secondary.

2) Conflict exacerbates already existing inequalities

The poorest children are twice as likely to be out of school in conflict countries as the poorest elsewhere.

Girls are almost two and a half times more likely to be out of school if they live in a conflict affected country than those living in peace.

Adolescent girls are almost 90% more likely to be out of secondary school than young women in other countries.

3) Ineffective aid systems are leaving people in need falling through the cracks

Conflicts are now lasting longer, and traditional humanitarian assistance needs to adjust. Countries with long-term crises are receiving less than half the amount of development aid than others.

Humanitarian aid answered only 36% of education’s request for funds in 2014, compared to an average of 60% for other sectors. Development aid is similarly failing to prioritize education in conflict settings with just 10% of aid disbursed to the education sector in 2013.

Funding for education from humanitarian pooled funding mechanisms is small: just 3% went to the education sector, while 25% went to health between 2010 and 2014.

Many funds for education go to school feeding projects. In Sudan, school feeding took up 71% of the funding it received for education in 2014.

4) Crisis appeals aren’t working: Millions go without learning opportunities

In 2013, 21 million people in conflict countries were identified as needing education support; 8 million of these were targeted in appeal documents.

With the majority of appeal requests left unmet, only 3 million – 15% of the total - actually received humanitarian assistance once funding was distributed. This left 18 million without help from humanitarian assistance under the appeal process.

Some crises are prioritised over others especially if they have higher media visibility: Just 4% of the 342 appeals between 2000-2014 received over half of available humanitarian aid for education.

5) The target for ‘at least 4%’ of humanitarian aid for education is grossly insufficient and in need of revision.

In 2014, education received only 2% of humanitarian aid; half the minimum 4% target advocated in 2011.

Had the 4% target been met in 2013, it would still have left 15.5 million children and youth without any humanitarian assistance.

In 2013, the DRC would have needed 8% of humanitarian aid to reach all children and youth targeted in the appeals.

In 2013, 4% of humanitarian aid would have left over 4 million children and youth in Afghanistan, nearly 1.6 million in Syria, and almost 3 million in Sudan without humanitarian support.

6) The EFA GMR proposes a new target for education in emergencies that ensures a minimum level of investment for every child and adolescent.

After accounting for projected domestic spending, a minimum of US$38 per child and US$113 per adolescent is needed to ensure all children and adolescents in conflict countries can go to school. This equates to a total funding gap of US$2.3 billion; ten times what was given in humanitarian aid to education in 2014.

Responsibility for filling this gap must not solely lie with humanitarian actors; development aid donors also need to play their part to ensure that all those in need are being reached.

7) What can we do to ensure children and young people in conflict receive an education?

1. There must be a consistent and objective education needs assessment to truly understand the requirements of children and adolescents in conflict.

2. There should be better connections between humanitarian and development financing: The World Humanitarian Summit in July 2016 together with the High-Level Panel on Humanitarian Financing formed in May this year represent opportunities to make the architecture of humanitarian funding more relevant and realistic.

3. The $2.3 billion funding gap for education in conflict urgently needs to be filled. This is ten times what education receives from humanitarian aid at present.

4. Any new global emergency education fund should ensure that resources for education in crises are additional, flexible and predictable. Funding must be aligned to need. It should work closely with the Global Partnership for Education and the Global Education Cluster.
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