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Abstract
The Commonwealth Teacher Recruitment Protocol was adopted by Commonwealth Ministers of Education in 2004. It provides a framework for managing teacher migration to maximise mutual benefits to countries and minimise negative effects. However, recent studies revealed the inadequacy of data about teacher migration for effective planning and policy-making. This is particularly true of education in difficult circumstances.

In response, the Commonwealth Secretariat and UNESCO-IICBA jointly held the Sixth Commonwealth Research Symposium on Teacher Mobility, Recruitment and Migration in Addis Ababa in June 2011 and examined the implementation of the protocol and the relevance of its principles to education in emergencies. It aimed to answer how refugee teachers could best be managed so that their rights were protected, their impact on the destination country was beneficial, and they were enabled to improve educational quality and access. It explored systemic and structural issues as well as good practice, and identified future research directions. Ongoing quantitative and qualitative research was presented by field-based practitioners as well as educational managers and academics. In addition to making recommendations to policy-makers developing strategies for managing teacher migration, it provided more general lessons for the development of teacher recruitment protocols outside the Commonwealth’s.

Based on papers presented at the Symposium and a review of the literature, this paper asks what the issues affecting forced migrant teachers are compared to voluntary migrant teachers, and what policies are necessary to ensure their welfare. Noting the research gaps around the role and status of refugee teachers in emergencies, it is found that teachers are significantly under-represented in the refugee population. By analysing the reasons why this is so, and finding gaps in the existing policy environment and legislative framework, the paper attempts to determine the connections between the issues refugee teachers face, the protection of their rights, and the contribution they are able to make towards increasing access to and quality of education. To exemplify how these issues play out on the ground, the paper describes a case study of Sudanese refugees in Uganda. Following a review of how the learning from the application of the CTRP might be applied to efforts to improve institutional frameworks for the management of teachers in emergencies, the paper concludes with recommendations for policy-makers aimed at protecting the professional role and status of teachers forced to migrate and enhancing their ability to operate constructively in emergency conditions.
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Introduction
Access to education as a human right is confirmed by a number of declarations and conventions: the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights; the 1949 fourth Geneva Convention and its Protocol I and II; the 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees; the 1989 Convention on the Rights of the Child; and the 1998 Rome Statute, which mandates protection for educational institutions. The

1 This paper represents the opinions of the authors only and should not be taken as representing the position of any of their institutions.
2 The Symposium papers will shortly be published jointly by the Commonwealth Secretariat and UNESCO-IICBA.
1990 Jomtien World Conference on Education for All (EFA) and the 2000 Dakar World Education Forum reaffirmed that the right to education persists even in situations of armed conflict. The Dakar Framework for Action particularly included a commitment to:

meet the needs of education systems affected by conflict, natural calamities and instability and conduct educational programmes in ways that promote mutual understanding, peace and tolerance, and that help to prevent violence and conflict (World Education Forum, 2000: 9).

Since the 1996 note by the UN Secretary-General on the impact of armed conflict on children, which drew attention to the prevalent loss of this human right during conflict (Machel, 1996), progress has been made in advocating for and implementing effective programmes for education in emergencies (Machel, 2000; UNICEF, 2009). Education in emergencies has increasingly become seen as the “fourth pillar of humanitarian action” (Machel, 2001: 94) along with food, health, and shelter, and as a means of protection in itself (Nicolai and Triplehorn, 2003). However, recent reports highlight both the continued role and the changing nature of conflict in obstructing the achievement of the education Millennium Development Goals and EFA targets (UNICEF, 2009; UNESCO, 2011; World Bank, 2011).

Much of the literature surrounding education in emergencies focuses on the impact of armed conflict on children. Surprisingly little focuses explicitly on teachers, and yet it is often stated that the most important factor for a good quality education is the teacher (IIEP, 2006; NORAD, 2011). As a McKinsey report notes, “The quality of an education system cannot exceed the quality of its teachers” (Barber and Mourshed, 2007: 13). Papers submitted for the Sixth Commonwealth Research Symposium on Teacher Mobility, Recruitment and Migration, held on 8-9 June 2011 in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, suggested that there is very limited information on the role and status of teachers in emergencies, including teachers who are forced to migrate. Similarly, the Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE) has noted, in a review of literature on education in emergencies:

Resource Experts felt that issues related to teachers were under-researched. Specifically, informants called for more studies into teacher development and training, teacher competencies, teacher retention, teaching for psychosocial wellbeing, the benefits of teacher training/capacity building, the morale and compensation of teachers, teacher certification in difficult environments, teacher management in emergencies, and the identity of teachers (INEE, 2010b: 22).

The Commonwealth Secretariat has particular experience in teacher mobility, recruitment and migration, most notably in its development of the Commonwealth Teacher Recruitment Protocol (CTRP), which was adopted in 2004 by Commonwealth member states. This aims to balance the rights of teachers to migrate internationally against the need to protect the integrity of national education systems, and prevent the exploitation of scarce human resources in developing or low income countries (Commonwealth Secretariat, 2004).

The Protocol does not specifically address the issues surrounding teachers who are forced to migrate. However, many Commonwealth countries are directly affected by teachers crossing borders to escape open conflict or structural violence, with some countries affected by insecurity themselves. Recent examples include Somali refugees in Kenya, Congolese refugees in Rwanda, Zimbabwean refugees in South Africa and Botswana, Sudanese refugees in Uganda and Afghan refugees in Pakistan, which hosts the single largest refugee population in the world, approaching two million (UNHCR, 2011a). Refugees can constitute a sizable proportion of a country’s population – in the 1990s, refugees made up 10 per cent of the national population of Malawi – and a persistent one – refugees have comprised around half of the population of some northern provinces of Pakistan for over 20 years (Marfleet, 2006). Of course, refugees do not migrate only to neighbouring countries, but may seek sanctuary in any country. However, most refugee flow is from countries in the South to countries in the South, with developing countries hosting four-fifths of the world’s refugees – arguably those with the least capacity, financially and institutionally, to manage such flows – and most refugees do move to their neighbouring country (UNHCR, 2011b).

The original request for the Commonwealth Secretariat to develop ethical codes of conduct in the recruitment of teachers came from small states in the Caribbean, such as Barbados, Guyana, Jamaica
and Trinidad and Tobago, which were losing a large number of teachers through targeted recruitment. A subsequent consultation was then expanded to include other small states and poorer countries among the Commonwealth members. Following the consultation the Protocol was developed, being adopted by Commonwealth Ministers in 2004. Its principles are applicable to any country which faces similar problems concerning the loss of scarce teaching forces as a result of international recruitment, and therefore the CTRP has been recognised by UNESCO, the International Labour Organisation (ILO), the Organisation of American States (OAS), the African Union (AU) and Commonwealth Heads of Government as an example of international good practice in managing migration and development. The AU has further acknowledged that the CTRP could provide useful insights to start a continental framework to help enhance teacher mobility across Africa, and it is currently exploring the development of a Continental Code of Practice for the AU Second Decade of Education for Africa (African Union, 2006a). The development of an African Teacher Recruitment Protocol seeks to promote the benefits of teacher mobility and cross-border teacher recruitment within regions and beyond in response to emerging needs and changes in the teacher labour market in Africa (African Union, 2011).

As the scope of the target population and the issues that the CTRP covers are very large and general, this paper mainly discusses the research gap identified above, i.e., teachers forced to migrate due to conflict, and the applicability of the principles of the CTRP and other existing instruments to them. We will first provide some definitions of the major terms used in the context of this paper to explain the scope of this study.

**International migrant:** When a person changes their country of usual residence, they are considered to be an international migrant. International migrants can be categorised according to the duration of stay. A **short-term international migrant** is generally “a person who moves to a country other than that of his or her usual residence for a period of at least 3 months but less than a year (12 months)”, whereas a **long-term international migrant** is generally “a person who moves to a country other than that of his or her usual residence for a period of at least a year, so that the country of destination effectively becomes his or her new country of usual residence” (THP Foundation and UNESCO, 2008: 12). This paper is also concerned with the issues which affect an **international migrant with irregular status**, who is defined as a “person entering, traveling through or residing in a country without the necessary documents or permits” (THP Foundation and UNESCO, 2008: 14) due to emergencies.

**Refugee:** Article 1 of the UN Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees as amended by the 1967 Protocol provides the definition of a refugee as:

> A person who owing to a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country; or who, not having a nationality and being outside the country of his former habitual residence as a result of such events, is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to return to it (cited in Shacknove, 1985: 275).

The concept of the refugee is mutable and contested, and is often dependent on the interests of the state (Marfleet, 2006). The term ‘refugee’ often implies forced migration, but the latter term is not legally grounded. ‘Refugee’ is also often used outside its specific legal context, for example in the term ‘economic refugee’, “which emerged in the media to suggest that economic reasons for fleeing may be sometimes as compelling as political ones” (THP Foundation and UNESCO, 2008: 17), although they may not be emergency or life-threatening. The argument to consider this case as that of a refugee rests on the fact that “access to resources is denied on a discriminatory basis” (ibid: 17).

---

3 There is no single definition of a small state agreed by the international community, but population size is often used as a criterion. Definitions thus range from 1.5 million (World Bank) to 4.5 million (Commonwealth Secretariat). See further information in Briguglio, Persaud and Stern (2006).

4 For further information, see the Commonwealth Secretariat website: [http://www.thecommonwealth.org/Internal/190663/190781/project_examples/](http://www.thecommonwealth.org/Internal/190663/190781/project_examples/)
Forced and voluntary migration: Forced migration is defined as “migration in which an element of coercion predominates”, and it can be:

- conflict-induced, caused by persecution, torture or other human rights violations, poverty, natural or manmade disasters… Elements of choice and coercion can be overlapping but in the case of refugees and other displaced persons, compelling factors are decisive (THP Foundation and UNESCO, 2008: 29).

When the decision to leave a home country must be made urgently due to a life-threatening situation, it is fair to say that it is a forced decision, but even if the decision may take a longer time, as in the case of poverty, the decision can be either forced or voluntary.

In this paper, the term ‘forced migrant teacher’ is generally used to indicate a teacher migrating across a border to escape a life-threatening armed conflict, regardless of whether they have formal refugee status in accordance with the UNHCR Refugee Status Determination (RSD) process. It is recognised that very similar issues to those described here will affect teachers fleeing any other sort of emergency, such as a natural disaster, or indeed any form of migration which is prompted by a teacher’s inability to pursue a politically or economically sustainable lifestyle in their home country. In this paper, the term ‘refugee teacher’ assumes the teacher has been assigned refugees status through the RSD process. It is recognised that many forced migrant teachers may be waiting for their status determination, or may not have applied for it for a variety of reasons. Many of the issues presented in this paper will affect these teachers as much – or more – than those whose refugee status has been determined.

It would be wrong to assume that there are only ‘forced’ and ‘voluntary’ migrants, with a clear distinction between them. In reality, a teacher may elect to migrate in response to a long build-up of political repression, or a steady decline in their economic circumstances, either of which crosses a tipping point beyond which a teacher sees remaining as untenable. Lack of locally available jobs may spur a teacher to move abroad for employment. The reasons for migrating may be numerous for any one teacher, a complex interaction between ‘push’ and ‘pull’ factors, but in the end they may feel they have exhausted all other options.

Similarly, it is not only teachers who migrate involuntarily who are subject to vulnerability or insecurity in the destination community. Many of the above issues may affect voluntarily migrating teachers to a greater or lesser extent. Recruitment agencies, for example, may not always work for the best interests of migrant teachers. Host communities may be hostile; expectations, in terms of living accommodation, job profile, salary and status may not be met; culture shock and disorientation may occur; bureaucratic hurdles may prevent the recognition of qualifications; separation from family and home community may bring isolation and loneliness; and lack of familiarity with the legal context or dependency on a job for a visa may substantially reduce a migrant teacher’s ability to negotiate, as well as their exit options. Teachers who migrate voluntarily may also be subject to absent or weak contracts, which are then not enforced; their physical security may be at risk due to lack of knowledge of their surroundings; and they may lack the privileges which local teachers enjoy. Both forced and voluntary migrants need to undergo a process of adaptation, and both have the same end need: survival.

However, to consider the two extremes of the continuum, a teacher fleeing sudden onset conflict – or an earthquake – clearly has different needs to a teacher moving abroad in a considered and well-prepared effort to maximise their earning potential or to seek new horizons or professional development opportunities. Whilst remaining cognisant of the continuum of coercion which is the background to many migrants’ – forced and unforced – decision to leave their home, there are differences in how the principles of the CTRP might be applied to those teachers escaping life-threatening conflict and those making a considered decision to move in order to maximise their utility, at which the CTRP is generally aimed. Perhaps the most striking difference is the lack of the formal and informal institutional frameworks which usually guide migration, such as information mechanisms, recruitment agencies, support offered by friends and relations, previously negotiated and agreed contracts, teacher organisations or a position within an official body: many refugee teachers will find themselves working for an NGO rather than a government, with different working culture, remuneration, and professional expectations. At the grassroots level, these insecurities and
uncertainties are unlikely to result in motivated, committed teachers. Of course, experiences will vary across a wide spectrum, and many refugee teachers may have had opportunity to prepare or may be quickly integrated into host communities. But, on the whole, the increased vulnerability of forced migrant teachers is an issue deserving of a robust policy response (Penson, 2011a and b).

Conflict affected countries: There is no single accepted definition of a conflict affected country, and the definitions that do exist are often nebulous, contested and problematic (Bengtsson, 2011). While recognising that people may be forced to flee from any form of organised violence, and that the issues raised by flight are not necessarily connected to the reason for and type of violence, we use the definition used by the Education for All Global Monitoring Report 2011 (GMR), as a country in which there is “‘contested incompatibility’ over government and/or territory where the use of armed force is involved, and where one of the parties to the conflict is the state”5 (UNESCO, 2011:138). The EFA GMR identifies a conflict affected country as: “any country with 1,000 or more battle-related deaths over 1999-2008” and “any country with more than 200 battle-related deaths in any one year between 2006 and 2008” (UNESCO, 2011:138). According to these criteria, there were 35 countries affected by conflict between 1999 and 2008. Half (17 countries) of them were in sub-Saharan Africa. On average, sub-Saharan Africa had the largest number (20) of episodes of conflicts, although the average length of conflict was relatively short (nine years) compared to other regions, such as 45 years in Latin America and the Caribbean and 31 years in East Asia and the Pacific. It seems conflicts occur more frequently in low income (20 episodes) and low/middle income (23 episodes) countries than in upper middle income (5 episodes) countries.

It is recognised that there are limitations in comparing conflict affected countries with other countries in assessing educational indicators, due to the different characteristics of conflict, such as intensity, duration and geographic spread. There is no strong correlation between the level of teacher qualifications, economic wealth and conflict. For example, the Democratic Republic of the Congo is categorised as a conflicted-affected country (which we assume may have disrupted the education investment), with low Gross Domestic Product per capita (Purchasing Power Parity) of $319 USD (which arguably can affect spending on education). This indicates that there is a huge variation among the conflict affected countries (see Table 1) and interventions must be designed according to context and need.

Table 1. Trained Teachers and GDP per capita (PPP) in Conflict Affected Countries in sub-Saharan Africa6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Trained Primary Teachers 2009 (%)</th>
<th>GDP per capita (PPP) 2010 US$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Republic of the Congo</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côte d’Ivoire</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1,701</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 This definition is based on that of the Uppsala Conflict Data Programme: http://www.pcr.uu.se/research/ucdp/definitions/.

Whilst forced migrant teachers may have migrated in order to escape insecurity, they may still live and work under emergency conditions. There is a continuum of fragility and vulnerability which the word ‘emergency’ tends to eclipse, by acting both as a cover-all, and by being conceived as the point beyond which ‘normality’ has been replaced by an altered state. In reality, host countries may suffer very similar conditions to source countries, and, where the children taught are refugees too, they have the same needs as children in the emergency itself. As refugee camps – or other, more informal channels through which migrant teachers might find themselves teaching in refugee communities – often stand alongside formal state provision of education in host countries, rather than integrated into the system, emergency conditions can be said to follow teachers into the host country, in the sense of the expectation of transience, a potential lack of security, and uncertain status: all features of the emergency situation. So, while this paper differentiates between education in emergencies and teachers migrating from emergencies (concentrating on the latter), it recognises that situations are fluid, and refugees may even continually cross borders back and forth as conditions and contingencies permit.

The number of refugees had been declining in recent years. However, recent political upheaval in North Africa and the increase in food insecurity in East Africa have contributed to a 15 year high in the number of refugees in the world, with over half of them children under 18 in need of education (UNHCR, 2011a), and the number displaced by conflict and environmental stress is expected to increase in the coming years (Marfleet, 2006; Clark, 2008; Gamlen, 2010; Thomas-Hope, 2011). It is generally acknowledged that conflict can significantly reduce the number of teachers available in the affected region, including refugee camps (IIEP, 2010a). Reasons for this include: schooling being regarded as political and teachers, therefore, being targeted; the absence of authorities, meaning education structures and systems can change rapidly, with salaries no longer being paid; infrastructure possibly being unsafe or insecure; and other opportunities in the economy opening for educated professionals.

The potential resource for refugee receiving countries which migrant teachers represent, however, seems to be ill-recognised, or at least recognised in markedly different ways. Countries can seem ill-prepared to cope with refugees or other migrants, resulting in reactive measures which may infringe the rights of people who move, and consequently sub-optimal outcomes (Betts and Kaytaz, 2009). Even where one agency, such as an education ministry, within a country might welcome the influx of well-qualified and experienced teachers, the bureaucratic requirements of other agencies, such as ministries of immigration or labour, might make the efficient utilisation of teachers problematic, resulting in uncertainty and stress for the teachers, and lost opportunities for the education system (Manik, 2011). Where population flows across a border create stresses on extant systems, it should be remembered that teachers are a potential benefit in alleviating some of those stresses. Whilst NGOs have a tradition of using the teacher pool as workers (Penson and Tomlinson, 2009), the degree to which official structures are set up to maximise the potential offered by refugee teachers varies (Betts in Chanda, 2010). Teachers do not disappear in an emergency, unless killed or wounded. They move, or drop their identity as a teacher. The question is, with such a net global shortage of trained education professionals\(^7\), how can the contribution to education these teachers make be protected, maintained and maximised?

Whilst it is known that teachers are under-represented in refugee camps (Sesnan, 2011), it is not always clear what happens to teachers once they have crossed borders, in terms of their professional and legal status, or their role in contributing to the provision of education to those affected by emergency. And whilst guidance exists for practitioners in emergencies for the recruitment and training of teachers, such as the UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP) Guidebook for Planning Education in Emergencies and Reconstruction and the INEE Minimum Standards for Education Handbook (Sphere Project, 2011), policy advice for host governments dealing with an influx of teachers from insecure situations is harder to find. There is therefore a need

\(^7\) Not all countries need to increase their number of teachers, but among the 207 countries that reported teacher data for 2008, it is estimated that 99 countries will need at least 1.9 million extra teachers between 2008 and 2015 to meet the Universal Primary Education (UPE) goals. More than half of them – 1,056,000 – are in sub-Saharan Africa (UIS, 2010).
to investigate the issues facing refugee teachers and to review the policy responses which would best maximise the protection of their interests and those of the education systems in which they find themselves.

The Sixth Commonwealth Research Symposium mentioned above took as one of its themes the provision of high-quality inclusive education in difficult circumstances, including the role and status of refugee teachers and the issues surrounding the forced migration of teachers. Two questions it sought to address were: (i) What are the needs of forced migrant teachers compared to voluntary migrant teachers? and (ii) What policies are necessary to ensure the welfare of refugee teachers and to create an enabling environment for them to teach? The present paper aims to summarise the relevant research presented on this theme at the Symposium, to summarise the subsequent discussions, and to serve as a starting point for further debate on the issue of what happens to teachers ‘the other side of the border’ in an emergency. The paper reviews the literature, and confirms the relative neglect of the role and status of refugee teachers in emergencies. It then presents a case study of Southern Sudanese refugees in Uganda, and describes some of the issues facing teachers and the impact of them on educational service provision in emergency contexts. An analysis of the possible application of the principles of the CTRP in education in emergencies is then presented, along with suggested future actions. The paper then sets out more generally the issues which forced migrant teachers may face, before concluding with suggestions for policy recommendations.

Literature review and analysis

An emergency has been defined as “a condition which arises suddenly, and the capacity to cope is suddenly and unexpectedly overwhelmed by events” (Hernes, 2002: 2). Complex emergencies can include displacement of people across the borders of their country forcing them to become refugees and/or displacement of people within their own country (Sinclair, 2001). Two broad categories are those caused by natural disasters and those caused by human agency such as war, conflict or genocide. These are frequently considered ‘sudden onset’ situations; although the latter category may have been building up for some time, the actual outbreak of violence may suddenly cross a threshold beyond which mass migrations may commence or it becomes impossible for authorities to continue to provide services. A third category has been proposed by Obura (2003), where the emergency might be more or less preventable and/or predictable. She includes crop failure and famine because they may be cyclical or sometimes early warning systems may give notice. In all three categories, planning and preparation are key to successful responses (Buckland, 2005). This does not apply only to humanitarian agencies, but also to governments – which might be subject either to the emergency itself, or to an emergency in the region – so that policy and legislative frameworks are in place which proactively facilitate the provision of public services, or at least do not inhibit it.

Education was not traditionally perceived as a life-saving activity in emergency situations. This meant it was not considered as part of the immediate humanitarian response to an emergency in the same manner as food, water, sanitation, shelter and health (Sommers, 2005a). In addition to the trauma and disruption to their studies caused by the conflict, then, children could be left for several months without any structured activities. Since the Machel Report in 1996, however, a strong consensus has emerged that education should be considered a crucial element in emergencies because “it can help children, adolescents and the entire community to regain a sense of normality, address psychosocial needs and convey life-saving messages” (UNHCR, 2007: 16). Maintaining education is more than just business continuity. It can speed the transition of recovery.

A state is legally required to provide only basic education (Nicolai, 2003), (although the Convention on the Rights of the Child stipulates that the provision of early development and care is also an obligation placed on states (IIEP, 2006)). In times of emergency, where there is greater competition for scarcer resources, the provision of early years, secondary, tertiary and vocational education becomes a low priority. This is due partly to financial constraints (basic education is usually the cheapest form of education) and partly for structural reasons: secondary-age children may not have been to or completed primary school; secondary and tertiary teaching requires more highly-qualified teachers, who may be in short supply; and there is likely to be greater variation among students at secondary level, making curriculum planning and delivery more difficult (Buckland, 2005). Both these factors are influenced by policy: the pursuit of the millennium development goals, which focus on universal primary education, may have contributed to a sectoral imbalance in resource
allocation which is compounded by the emergency.

During conflict itself, intense insecurity can make school attendance unsafe. Even when education is provided, this may be offered only to certain age groups, or some children may not be able to attend due to economic or familial duties, often influenced by cultural practices, especially related to gender. And, while NGO-driven education provision may augment or replace state provision to some extent, capacity, resources or opportunity to provide a comprehensive education system are rarely available (Nicolai, 2003).

As conflict pushes people away to seek refuge either within their own state or across a border, stresses are placed on the provision of education where the migrants settle. In no country is the education system designed with sufficient headroom to be able to cope with a sudden influx of large numbers of students. There will be insufficient education infrastructure, books, teachers and resources; ethnic or other social or political tensions may migrate together with the refugees or arise between the migrants and the host community; countries will not suddenly be able to source and distribute extra funding. In addition to these material, social and economic issues, the legal status of the refugees may be unclear, not least to them. The ‘emergency’, then, is not only in that area or state directly affected by conflict, but frequently also in the territories in which refugees seek sanctuary. Institutions\(^8\) for determining the status of forced migrants may be as compromised by large influxes as education systems, adding to the uncertainty for teachers:

Despite the legal framework, which is both clear and objective, asylum systems set up to protect and safeguard the rights of refugees, procedures are often fraught with compromises necessitated by lack of resources and overburdened systems (UNHCR, undated: 1).

The term ‘education in emergencies’ refers to formal and non-formal education in situations where children lack access to their national and community educational system due to complex emergencies or natural disasters (Winthrop, 2006; WCRWC, 2007). Since conflicts can be of very long duration and may be chronic in nature, the term ‘education in emergencies’ refers:

not only to initial non-formal education programs, but also to the establishment of formal education programs during the conflict, as well as the eventual re-establishment of community and governmental educational structures in a post-conflict environment (Triplehorn, 2001: 3).

Most practice falls into either short-term ‘emergency’ provision, which tends to be reactive, quick and focussed on physical provision, or long-term, ‘developmental’ provision, which tends to be proactive, delayed and focussed on capacity building (Baxter and Bethke, 2009). Policy-makers, however, tend to agree that integrating developmental aspects into emergency provision from the very start, whilst being difficult, is nonetheless necessary to ensure long-term success (Pigozzi, 1999; Nicolai, 2003). This is further complicated by the difficulty of distinguishing in practice between immediate post-emergency provision and longer term forms of provision for long-term displacement situations, and the difficulty of drawing any distinction between the two when the future is unknown. Two school feeding programmes, for example, may look identical in practice, but have very different purposes: in an emergency situation, school feeding may be used simply to ensure children are adequately nourished, whilst in a more developmental situation, it may be used to encourage higher rates of access to education. How, where and why the ‘goal-shift’ takes place may not be clear (Penson and Tomlinson, 2009). This again points to the usefulness of clear policies to provide reference points for managing education during and after the emergency.

Additional factors are the curriculum and language of instruction in refugee and internally displaced person (IDP) environments. In short-term emergencies, with the expectation of a quick return to the area of origin, using the origin country systems, curricula, language and certification structure provides continuity and prepares students to fit back in with the system when they return. In

---

\(^8\) The term ‘institution’ in this paper is generally used in the New Institutional Economics sense of a system of rights and obligations in the form of recognised, formal or informal, enforceable rules that enable individuals to co-operate to achieve common purposes by creating regularised role relationships (North, 1990). Institutions can be either constraining or enabling (Hodgson, 2006).
longer-term emergencies, students might be expected to assimilate in the host community on leaving school, and so should undertake host country courses of study in the host country language, leading to host country certification (IIEP, 2006). The difficulty is of course that an emergency’s timescale is usually unknowable. The tension this represents gets greater the further one progresses through the school system, and students become more inextricably linked in with one system or the other. This increases the difficulties surrounding providing anything but basic education, and hence leads to the erosion of will to provide post-primary education through the formal system.

The fact that most refugees move to a neighbouring country may have advantages, as cultural similarities may make host communities more receptive and the experience for migrants consequently less disturbing. But governments tend to see migration as a containment issue, as it involves the violation of a national border, and hence they take steps to regulate what can be viewed as an aberrant situation (Marfleet, 2006). Planning and providing education for refugees is, then, not always integrated into the wider education context. To take one current example, that of asylum seekers from Côte d’Ivoire in Ghana, “No asylum seekers are attending local schools,” meaning that the school in the refugee camp housing the asylum seekers, Camp Fetama, will have to re-open (UNHCR, 2011c: 4).

Education can be used as a tool with which to manipulate refugee and displaced persons. Host governments or authorities and donors may tire of supporting refugees and IDPs for long periods of time. Local integration of the displaced population may be resented and resisted, for political, cultural or economic reasons, and may fluctuate dramatically over time. Governments and donors may restrict access to education cycles, such as pre-school, secondary or tertiary education, or even cut off funding to whole refugee or IDP school systems, in order to incite populations to repatriate or return home. We should not lose sight of the potential for education to contribute not towards peace and reconciliation, but towards distrust and violence (Davies, 2004). And education facilities themselves may be occupied by military forces, adding further pressure to already over-burdened infrastructure and creating an intimidating atmosphere not conducive to increasing access and learning (Human Rights Watch, 2011).

Other external factors are relevant. In particular, continual, systemic issues of poor co-ordination in emergencies condition the environment in which alternative education programmes arise (Sommers, 2004; McNamara, 2006). Indeed, education continues not to enjoy the same status as other aspects of humanitarian initiatives, and is frequently sidelined in emergency planning and implementation, despite an apparent consensus among international agencies, governments and actors that close co-ordination is desirable. As Sommers (2004) argues, co-ordination by national governments is often difficult, due to a lack of governmental power, control over resources, capacity, and an aid industry which can seem designed to prolong dependence in order to ensure its own continuation (Harrell-Bond, 1986). Additionally, the majority of funds are channelled to nongovernmental actors. UN agencies frequently have overlapping mandates and hence ill-defined roles on the ground. NGOs have a tendency to resist national government control, as they see their sector as politically independent, yet they are influenced by donor priorities. Donors traditionally see education as a ‘development’, not a ‘humanitarian’, concern, and hence remain somewhat reluctant to prioritise emergency education (Brannelly, Ndaruhutse and Rigaud, 2009).

However, the formation of a global education cluster by the Inter-Agency Standing Committee, and recent refocusing of many donors’ resources on conflict-affected countries, is changing this. Lexow states that:

Funding to education in humanitarian assistance has increased tremendously if one looks at natural disasters and conflicts combined. But it is less certain that the same increase has happened in conflict ridden areas. Figures from the country case studies show that the gap between requirements and actual contributions is huge (in Rose and Greely, 2006: 39).

A number of authors have noted that the breakdown in formal institutions during a conflict can provide an opportunity, during both emergency and post-emergency provision, to work towards an improved education system – not so much to reconstruct as to reform (Buckland, 2005; Nicolai, 2009). This of course is generally targeted at the conflict affected country from which refugees are emanating, but nonetheless, providing education in emergencies is often seen as an opportunity to
improve the delivery of education even in host countries. Frequently this seems to be pedagogically focussed – an opportunity to move from ‘traditional’, teacher-centred methodologies to ‘modern’, child-centred methodologies, such as that exemplified by UNICEF’s ‘child-friendly schools’ or the International Rescue Committee’s (IRC) ‘healing classrooms’ (Kirk and Winthrop, 2007).

What emerges is that there is now a strong body of evidence demonstrating the value of education in emergencies, and the convergence of actors supporting it – at least in principle – and that an emergency can present an opportunity for change. Triplehorn (2001: 6) laid out a persuasive case for this value. Using his list of the potential benefits of education in emergencies as a starting point, a conceptual framework for understanding education in emergencies can be devised (Figure 1). This paper concerns itself mainly with the institutional contextual factors (while recognising that there is strong inter-relatedness between these and the other contextual factors).

As Figure 1 shows, teachers are among the most important resources in education in emergencies and reconstruction (Buckland, 2005). Without teachers, there can be no schooling, and teachers can help bring communities together and re-establish community bonds (Rose and Greely, 2006). Conversely, teacher recruitment and placement can directly and indirectly affect fragility and quality:

Teacher recruitment and placement can create or exacerbate tensions if not performed in a nondiscriminatory, participatory and transparent manner. Policies that ensure teacher retention are essential to assure that teacher training and professional development programs positively impact on long-term education quality (INEE, 2011: 5).

Teachers can also be important drivers of change, supporting recovery from emergencies and promoting human rights, peace and security (Bush and Saltarelli, 2000; Smith and Vaux, 2003). This need not be in the conflict affected country: the conditions for change can be nurtured in refugee communities before being transplanted on refugees’ return. Rose and Greely note that:

An entire generation was educated in refugee camps in Guinea before being repatriated to Liberia... This included teacher training... Trained teachers were an important cadre of people in supporting the transition post-conflict, as they helped to kick-start the education system in conflict affected areas... Given the important role teachers play, the need for attention to teacher training is recognised even during emergency situations... A key challenge in the transition towards post-conflict is that teacher qualifications from one country may not be recognised when refugees are repatriated. In recognition of this, UNHCR and IRC have been supporting initiatives by helping to negotiate the recognition of teacher qualifications with the Liberian Ministry of Education (2006: 10).

With an eye to the future reconstruction scenario, Shepler (2010) argues, in a study in post-conflict Liberia and Sierra Leone of returnees trained when refugees in Guinea, that it may be better to focus on trained teachers who are able and willing to work rather than train new teachers. These might be teachers already working in schools, especially in rural areas, who could be supported through in-service training and continuing distance education programmes.

Efforts to facilitate mobility and protect migrant workers’ rights have been made by some leading international organisations. Some have become legally binding conventions, and others are voluntary codes of practice. Box 1 shows selected examples of existing instruments facilitating mobility. Also relevant is the joint ILO/UNESCO Recommendation Concerning the Status of Teachers, which “sets forth the rights and responsibilities of teachers, and international standards for their initial preparation and further education, recruitment, employment, teaching and learning conditions” (UNESCO/ILO, 2008: 3).

Novelli (2009) shows how internally displaced teachers in Colomba were able to bring about improved conditions of service for themselves as a result of the opportunities for change opened up by the re-ordering of social and political institutions during and after a conflict. And Triplehorn notes:

education programs in emergencies protect the national educational investments by keeping teachers and educational administrators from leaving the education profession during times of crisis and by sustaining parent-teacher associations, teachers’ unions, and other educational bodies (2001: 5).
School climate or learning spaces can help to:
1. Protect children from physical harm and military recruitment
2. Prevent gender-based and sexual violence
3. Prevent separation of children from their families
4. Provide a safe place for young people, especially adolescents and small children
5. Prevent children from turning to or being forced into exploitative work
6. Identify and combat labour practices that harm children
7. Prevent alcohol and drug abuse

Enabling conditions:
1. Effective leadership from agencies or teachers
2. Training of teachers and provision of learning kits
3. Flexibility and autonomy

Teachers in school can mitigate psychosocial impact by:
1. Re-establishing children's positive identity as students
2. Enhancing children's understanding of events they have lived or are living through
3. Providing daily structure, purpose, and meaning; and restoring playfulness

INPUTS
Teachers and education staff or adults in emergencies can:
1. Facilitate or assist in the distribution of water, food supplies and nutrition education to children & parents
2. Facilitate screening of children for specific protection needs
3. Identify children who need special assistance
4. Form strong positive relationships with young children
5. Provide positive role models in periods of instability
6. Build children's sense of positive self-identity
7. Access networks with the outside world

OUTCOMES
Education can provide for children's future by:
1. Developing children's organisational and analytical skills
2. Increasing children's options for careers and helping them find positive ways to make contributions to their community
3. Promoting self-reliance
4. Promoting reconciliation between parties to conflicts
5. Conveying survival and peace-building messages
6. Promoting children's rights and leadership

Contextual Factors
Institutional, cultural, political, economic

Figure 1. A conceptual framework of education’s influence on children and young adults in emergencies (after Triplehorn, 2001)
Box 1. Examples of existing instruments to facilitate mobility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO Conventions on Academic Recognition (Arusha Convention) (1981)</td>
<td>Promotes (1) greater mobility of students and professionals throughout the African continent; (2) effective use of resources through improving academic mobility of students and teachers; and (3) better recognition of academic and professional qualifications, stages of study and experiential learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO Multilateral Framework on Labour Migration (2006)</td>
<td>A set of non-binding principles, guidelines and best practices for governments, organisations of employers and workers to pursue a rights-based approach to labour migration. The Framework aims to foster cooperation in order to assist in the implementation of effective policies on labour migration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO Equality of Treatment (Social Security) Convention (1962, No 118)</td>
<td>Guarantees equality of treatment with nationals of destination countries and portability of benefits if they return to their countries of origin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO Global Code of Practice on the International Recruitment of Health Personnel (2010)</td>
<td>Aims: to (1) establish and promote voluntary principles and practices for the ethical international recruitment of health personnel, taking into account the right, obligations and expectations of source countries, destination countries and migrant health personnel; (2) serve as a reference for Member States in establishing or improving the legal and institutional framework required for the international recruitment of health personnel; (3) provide guidance that may be used where appropriate in the formulation and implementation of bilateral agreements and other international legal instruments; and (4) facilitate and promote international discussion and advance cooperation on matters related to the ethical international recruitment of health personnel as part of strengthening health systems, with a particular focus on the situation of developing countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth Code of Practice for the International Recruitment of Health Workers (2003)</td>
<td>The Code is intended to provide Commonwealth governments with a framework within which international recruitment of health workers should take place, so as to allow workers the right to migrate internationally, on a temporary or permanent basis, against the need to protect the integrity of national education systems, and prevent the exploitation of scarce human resources in developing or low-income countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippine Overseas Employment Administration (POEA) (1982 and 1987)</td>
<td>The legal mandate of POEA is to: (1) promote and develop the overseas employment programme and protect the rights of migrant workers (1982); and (2) regulate private sector participation in recruitment and overseas placement, maintain a registry of skills, and secure best terms of employment for overseas Filipino workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuning Educational Structures in Europe (2000)</td>
<td>Promotes comparability of study programmes across institutions and national borders along subject areas. It is a process and an approach to (re-) designing, developing, implementing, evaluating and enhancing quality first (bachelor), second (master) and third (doctoral) cycle degree programmes. The project covers about 30 subject areas, including education, medicine and civil engineering.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17 TUNING Educational Structures in Europe started in 2000 as a project to link the political objectives of the Bologna Process and at a later stage the Lisbon Strategy to the higher educational sector. The Bologna Process is a tool for student mobility and convergence in Europe started in 1998 with the aim of creating a European Higher Education Area by making academic degree standards and quality assurance standards more comparable and compatible thorough Europe to facilitate mobility and recognition, in particular under the Lisbon Recognition Convention. Available at: http://tuning.unideusto.org/tuningeu/index.php.
However, as Burde (2004; 2005) notes, the status of the affected population – whether they are refugees, internally displaced, or ‘stayee’ civilians caught in a conflict – has a powerful influence on these outcomes. She further notes that:

International organizations that replace the state (albeit partially) during a complex emergency by providing social services, or by assisting communities to do so, should not abandon government ministries during social reconstruction (2004: 84).

We know then that, in an emergency, teachers are important. And we know that encouraging the formal frameworks for education is important too. However, we also know that:

In emergencies, qualified teachers are often unavailable, unready, or themselves suffering from the physical and psychological effects of the crisis. Often, additional teachers need to be rapidly recruited among community members present at the emergency site (UNICEF, 2005: 230).

Despite the prevalent view that “camp teachers should be recruited from among the displaced population” (NRC/CMP, 2008: 549), “in situations of emergency or post-conflict, there is often a shortage of trained and/or experienced teachers” (IIEP, 2010a: Ch. 5.1: 2). The NRC goes on to note that “Together with the education provider and the local authorities from the host government, it should also be assessed whether teachers from outside the camp can be integrated in the camp education system” (NRC/CMP, 2008: 548).

It is understandable that host countries are unlikely to have considerable numbers of teachers ready to be deployed into refugee camps, given the obvious enormous political, financial and logistical challenges that would entail. It is presumably fair to assume that, all else being equal, the proportion of teachers in a displaced population should be similar to the proportion pre-displacement18. The question raised then, is: What happens to the ‘missing’ teachers – and how can their skills and experience be put to good educational use?

Sesnan confirms that in refugee communities teachers are under-represented – by which is meant not just low teacher-pupil ratios, but lower teacher-pupil ratios compared to pre-migration populations. Referring to the makeshift schools which arose in camps housing refugees, he notes:

The big problem was that – with rare exceptions – they didn’t have any teachers. I observed this first-hand in Northern Uganda, in Khartoum, in rural Sudan and, looking at the experiences in other places, I saw that it was often the same in other countries. Mozambican refugees in Malawi in the Eighties and Nineties had a very small number of teachers among them (2011: 2).

Sesnan attributes this to the fact that “When they could, teachers fled or gravitated towards their salaries” (2011: 4). Whilst this might be the official salary, it might also be the opportunity to earn through private tuition. Sesnan also addresses the question of the portability of a teacher’s qualification:

There are not many cases in Africa where the formal qualification is an issue if a refugee with at least secondary education wishes to teach in a camp. It will depend normally on how strict the NGO chosen as UNHCR’s partner is. It becomes an issue if they continue on beyond the camp and wish to teach in the schools of the host country (2011: 4).

Little is known about the teachers who are not in the refugee camps, as noted by Rose:

Many refugees do not live in camps, but in informal settlements in urban areas. These refugees often lack the official papers that would allow them access to education and other basic services. In many contexts, they are also denied the right to work... Very little is known about those refugees who are living in urban areas or displaced internally; they are likely to be more numerous than refugees living in camps (2011: 186).

---

18 It is accepted that this is a naive assumption and that the factors affecting teacher migration may be different from the general population. This would be a fertile area for further research.
Another possible contributory factor for the lack of teachers is that “relief agencies ‘cream off’ the best qualified refugees and provide them with ‘escape’ scholarships to other countries” (Pennells and Ezeomah, 2000: 179) – or indeed jobs in the agencies.

It appears that there are few studies which focus particularly on how professional, legal and other formal institutional frameworks in host countries encourage or inhibit refugee teachers from teaching, or what effect this may have on education in the classroom or the wider management of education in an emergency. Rather than working within a clear national policy environment that has the buy-in of government, organisations working in education in emergencies are forced to revert to other frameworks. For example, UNHCR says of its operations in Pakistan, “In the absence of national legislation on refugees, UNHCR will continue refugee status determination (RSD) in accordance with its mandate” (UNHCR, 2011b).

The unpredictable nature of emergencies, and uncertainties as to how long they may last, mean that governments may radically alter policies, where they have them. Rutinwa charts the movement in Tanzanian refugee policy in response to changing circumstances and government positions. He states that the “Refugees (Control) Act [1965] was introduced not to provide refugees with rights but to control them and perhaps to discourage others from taking refuge in Tanzania” (1996: 292). The Act was passed in response primarily to a steady influx of refugees from ongoing violence in Rwanda. It included allowance for refugees to be deported and their property to be requisitioned or confiscated without compensation (Peter, in Rutinwa, 1996). Notwithstanding the Act, Rutinwa states that in actuality, Tanzania maintained an ‘open door’ policy with regard to refugees, welcoming them and accommodating them. This applied even to the large numbers of Rwandan refugees entering Tanzania as the conflict in Rwanda, which began in October 1990 and culminated in the 1994 Genocide, intensified. However, in response to a surge in refugees from Burundi in 1995, the Tanzanian Government adopted a ‘no more refugees’ policy. The reasons for this are given by Rutinwa as:

the pressure exerted by the sheer magnitude of the refugee problem, the impact of refugees on Tanzania, security concerns, the economic crisis in the country, shrinking international support, and the failure of the open door policy in ending refugee crises (1996: 296).

Rutinwa notes that the ‘no more refugees’ policy was likely to have a significant detrimental impact on refugees. As well as the direct impact of the policy is the lack of policy stability, which further undermines refugees’ personal and professional status by creating unpredictable institutional frameworks. The adoption of long-term policies based on international frameworks would help to alleviate these insecurities.

Within these macro-level policy frameworks and the uncertainties surrounding them and the general situation, education managers must take difficult decisions: should students study host country or source country curricula? Can students’ learning certificates (and teachers’ qualifications) be recognised whether they return home or stay? With regard to qualifications, the question of the cross-border validity of learning certificates for students has now been covered in some depth in the literature, and policy recommendations made, most relevantly in the IIEP publication Certification Counts (Kirk, 2009). However, cross-border portability of teachers’ qualifications is not included in that study (although it notes that similar issues apply). Similarly, although field guides and minimum standards for education in emergencies address the question of curriculum, and whether the host country or source country curriculum should be followed for students, there are no agreed international standards for teacher training curriculum content, or on related professional standards.

The Commonwealth Secretariat has, with the South African Qualification Authority, developed useful tools on the recognition of teacher qualifications and professional registration status across Commonwealth member states (Morrow and Keevy, 2006; Keevy and Jansen, 2010). However, these do not cover non-Commonwealth countries (as noted above, there is currently a number of Commonwealth countries sheltering refugees from non-Commonwealth countries); nor do they take into account the special circumstances of education in emergencies, where teachers may arrive without their certificates, having left home precipitously. And, as Baxter and Bethke (2009) note, authorities often do not recognise teaching certificates given by NGOs or other non-formal providers. For example, at the time of writing the Cote d’Ivoire MoE would not automatically recruit trained refugee volunteer teachers into its workforce so it had indicated its wish to avoid direct involvement
in the training process of teachers recruited to teacher Ivorian children in Liberia’s camps. There is a strong argument for a framework for professional standards which would cover both formal and extra-regular teacher training, and ease the recognition of teacher qualifications. This should be competency-based.

Given the difficulties in comparing qualifications, in trying to make meaningful and fair comparisons, and in keeping comparison tables up to date (Gravelle, 2011) – and in accessing such information on the ground in an emergency – the value of qualification comparability frameworks is arguably higher as a tool for managing formal recruitment and mobility and voluntary migration than for emergencies. That does not mean, however, that they should be discounted. As most refugees move to a neighbouring country, there is a high level of predictability in the qualifications refugee teachers are likely to have. Planning for the possibility of an emergency could, therefore, realistically include neighbours comparing qualifications and agreeing concordances.

In some countries, a number of tools have been developed to help assimilate refugee teachers in the formal job market. In the UK, for example, the Refugee Assessment and Guidance Unit at London Metropolitan University produced an overview identifying a considerable number of programmes in the UK designed to help refugees teachers join the UK teaching profession (RAGU, 2007). One such example is a one-year programme offered by the Institute of Education at the University of London called Pathway into Teaching for Refugee Teachers, offered free to refugees, to support their entry into the formal teaching system in the UK. Similarly, the Refugees into Teaching Partnership, between the UK Training and Development Agency for Schools and the UK Refugee Council, offers guidance on assimilating refugee teachers into schools (Refugees into Teaching, 2007).

Although there are well-established systems of formal and informal institutions for incorporating refugee teachers in countries like the UK, these may not be clearly linked to teacher supply, demand and deployment policies. Ochs and Jackson, in a review of the implementation of the CTRP, found that “a challenge... was a lack of in-country data tracking systems to report on the numbers of recruited and/or foreign trained teachers in any given country” (Ochs and Jackson, 2009b: 4). It is even less clear how this could be accomplished in developing countries dealing with a sudden large influx of refugees. Göttelmann-Duret and Tournier found ‘irrationality’ in the general management of teachers in many countries, resulting in inefficient deployment and utilisation:

One can hardly expect that teachers are deployed in a rational and equitable way if the official norms and regulations guiding this process are non existent, inadequate, incoherent or hardly ever enforced (2008: 7).

The findings that sometimes teacher management systems are deficient, and that legal frameworks for supporting education incomplete, are supported by Mulkeen, who, in synthesising eight studies of sub-Saharan African countries, found that “Systems for management of supply were often weak” and “Teacher deployment presented challenges in all of the case-study countries” (2010: 2). It should be noted, however, that both this and the Göttelmann-Duret and Tournier study address the formal, state system, and do not address education in emergencies, which is often left to non-state actors to provide. Kirk and Winthrop note, “In emergency, chronic crisis and early reconstruction contexts, very little attention is given to the make-up of the teaching corps” (2005: 19). Given that there are ‘porous borders’ between the established formal system and the provision of education in emergencies, there does seem to be a significant research gap looking at the interchange of teachers between the two systems. Such research could support advocacy efforts attempting to encourage governments to prepare for emergencies:

There is a dire need to convince national authorities to prioritize preparedness or conflict mitigation efforts. Frustratingly, unless there has been a natural disaster or conflict in recent history, there is often little sense of urgency amongst many of those working at a ministerial level on the impact of conflict and natural disaster on education (IIEP, 2010b: 22).

Mulkeen does note that “Most of the case-study countries had some system for providing

---

19 B. Sesnan, personal communication with author, 6 October 2011.

20 Details available from http://www.ioe.ac.uk/PITR08.pdf.
emergency initial [in-service] training and qualifications to unqualified teachers” (2010: 174). This refers to the emergency of significant teacher shortfalls in the entire national system, not necessarily as a result of a conflict-induced emergency. There is in fact a wide and growing body of literature about the training of teachers in emergencies, and many agencies delivering education in emergencies have teacher training programmes. Indeed, training is often presented as an intervention necessary because of teacher shortages:

The importance of teachers in children’s lives dramatically increases in situations affected by armed conflict: children may have lost or been separated from their parents, and parents may be less able, for many reasons, to support their children. Support for teachers’ professional development is even more important as acute teacher shortages often mean that adults and youth who have never taught before or even finished their own education are recruited as teachers (Kirk and Winthrop, 2005: 18).

Other strategies for tackling teacher shortages have been suggested, such as the use of open and distance learning (Thomas, 1996), but there remains a strong preference for initial training. Training new teachers, however, as a response to teacher shortfalls in the emergency, does not address the question of where the already qualified teachers are.

Sesnan (2011) noted that teachers tend to follow their salaries, often moving to urban areas rather than remain in refugee settlements. Baxter and Bethke (2009) similarly report that teachers tend to prefer government schools, because they receive a salary from the government. They add that in some countries, teachers with a recognised qualification are automatically eligible to go on the payroll, putting pressure on the country’s budget. Citizenship issues notwithstanding, this might provide an incentive for governments not to recognise refugee teachers’ qualifications. With regard to teachers employed by non-governmental bodies, Penson and Tomlinson (2009) noted the disruptive effect of the wide range of remuneration paid to teachers during the emergency in Timor-Leste by different agencies, with some being paid nothing and others receiving relatively high allowances, making it difficult to deploy teachers efficiently.

The question of compensation of teachers in emergencies is beginning to be addressed. Both the IIEP Guidebook for Planning Education in Emergencies and Reconstruction and the INEE Guidance Notes on Teacher Compensation in Fragile States, Situations of Displacement and Post-crisis Recovery contain advice on compensating teachers. However, on the ground, it appears that much needs to be done to rationalise and coordinate incentives, and ensure that they are paid consistently (INEE, 2010a). As the Joint ILO/UNESCO Committee of Experts on the Application of the Recommendations concerning Teaching Personnel (CEART) puts it: “Compensation in the form of monetary and non monetary rewards for teachers in fragile states, emergency or displacement situations, and in post-crisis recovery periods is inadequate or non-existent” (CEART, 2009: 23). Baxter and Bethke (2009) call for both a minimum living wage for teachers, and for greater harmonisation in teacher incentives. Both would contribute to a more stable institutional framework encouraging teachers to remain in the teaching profession.


Among the economic rights protected under the Refugee Convention, Part III regulates ‘gainful employment’. With respect to wage-earning employment, Article 17 requires States to accord to refugees ‘lawfully staying in’ their territory the most favourable treatment accorded to non-nationals in the same circumstances” (2006: 6).

Manik, however, found that refugee teachers from Zimbabwe seeking employment in the formal education sector in South Africa encountered a number of bureaucratic and other hurdles preventing them from easily taking up employment. Some of these were raised by formal institutions, such as permit application procedures which were perceived by migrants to be inconsistent, time-consuming and onerous, and school management policies which precluded promotion prospects or long-term contracts to migrant workers. One of Manik’s research participants noted that it took them “a year and a half from the time of my application to actually taking up the job” (2011: 7); whilst others
noted that, because they were on temporary contracts, they were paid significantly less than nationals on a permanent contract, and suffered from job insecurity. Other obstructions were more informal, such as language barriers, and xenophobia in host communities. The combination of these factors led migrants to feel financially, professionally and socially insecure.

Bets similarly notes:

an absence of formal opportunities for teachers in destination countries. In many Sub-Saharan African states, legislation focuses either on asylum and refugee protection or on channels for voluntary economic migration. Rarely, is clear thought given for how forced migrant populations can be brought into the labour market (Betts in Chanda, 2010: 29).

Betts and Kaytaz identify the phenomenon of ‘survival migration’ in reference to the “Zimbabwean Exodus”: those “fleeing an existential threat to which they have no domestic remedy (2009: 1). Their studies “demonstrate the arbitrary and inconsistent nature of the response and the lack of guidance provided by the existing international institutional framework” (ibid: 3). Although Betts and Kaytaz’s study is written of a context in which migration is not primarily a response to conflict, there are still lessons to be learnt. Migrants moving from Zimbabwe to Botswana face a stringent regulatory environment which may discourage them from applying for refugee status, but instead provide an incentive to enter the informal economy:

asylum seekers are required to remain in detention during their RSD process. If they receive recognition, they are entitled to live in the refugee camp but can apply for a work permit if and when they find work. There is very little additional legal provision that relates to the situation of the Zimbabweans (ibid: 18).

Dissuaded from pursuing formal paths, “the majority bypasses the asylum system entirely and either cross the border illegally or use temporary visitors permits issued at the border” (ibid: 19). They are then dispersed around the country, and, as they are undocumented, their vulnerability increases. This phenomenon has two main consequences: “First, scarce skills remain untapped, curtailing a positive impact of the flow. Second, exploitative employment practices thrive, creating a negative effect of migration on jobseekers in the host country” (Kiwanuka and Monson, 2009: 51).

Although South African institutions value the quality of Zimbabwean teachers, and seek them to fill gaps in the supply of teachers in South Africa21, according to Betts and Kaytaz the South African regulatory framework similarly presents obstacles to efficiently accommodating Zimbabwean survival migrants in formal systems. Whereas in Botswana, “there is an absence of free movement and the right to work for asylum seekers” (Betts and Kaytaz, 2009: 18), “South Africa has an unofficial ‘no camps’ policy (a ‘self-settlement’ policy)” (ibid: 14). Notwithstanding this,

Despite low recognition rates, many Zimbabweans apply for asylum in order to get the ‘asylum seeker permit’ granted under Section 22 of the Refugee Act, which confers asylum seekers the right to work and freedom of movement until an RSD decision (ibid: 10).

But in their attempts to work legally in South Africa “migrants face many bureaucratic challenges” (ibid: 10). Betts and Kaytaz thus find, like Manik, that the institutional framework for processing migrants does not necessarily lead to optimal outcomes. Experienced, well-qualified teachers and head teachers end up in menial jobs, not using their professional skills (Sibanda, 2010).

Although, as noted, Betts and Kaytaz’s research does not focus on refugees from conflict or on teachers specifically, as Betts notes:

From an institutional point of view, what matters is not the cause of movement but the rights that are unavailable in the country of origin and consequently need to be offered through substitute protection (in Chanda, 2010: 28).

Betts has, however, noted that there are skilled, qualified teachers in survival migrant populations, and that these often end up working in the informal sector in less than ideal conditions. In view of

21 Personal communication with author, June 2011.
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this, he states:

Survival migration may represent an alternative and neglected source of supply for teacher recruitment. There is a need to go beyond the false dichotomy of voluntary/forced migration, and to recognise that forced migration can offer a valuable pool of qualified labour (in Chanda, 2010: 29).

Thus, “the Zimbabwean situation demonstrates how serious the human consequences of this unpredictability can be in a mass exodus situation. A clear division of institutional responsibility is required” (Betts and Kaytaz, 2009: 26). Furthermore, there are “hard law norms – in terms of International Human Rights Law – but what is needed is a ‘soft law’ consolidation of those norms to highlight their implications for survival migration” (in Chanda, 2010: 28).

The Zimbabwean experience is not unique. The 2011 EFA GMR provides further examples:

Under Malaysian law, refugees are not distinguished from undocumented migrants. In Thailand, a long-standing refugee population from Myanmar has no entitlement to state education. More generally, restrictions on refugee employment reinforce poverty, which in turn dampens prospects for education. And difficulty obtaining refugee status leads many to go underground (UNESCO, 2011: 16).

Ochs (2011) found that there was a lack of effective collaboration between relevant ministries within receiving countries. Ministries of education and ministries of foreign affairs often did not coordinate their registration processes for migrant teachers, even in non-emergency environments, yet establishing a coordinated and consistent plan of action would increase efficiency. The role of institutions is clear: “Stringent eligibility requirements, inconsistent application of rules, and restrictive laws result in many refugees being undocumented, in some cases because they are forced underground” (UNESCO, 2011: 152).

Sinclair (2001) makes a number of recommendations to enhance educational responses in an emergency. Among these are improving organisations’ preparedness, strengthening institutional policies, and inter-agency co-operation. The majority of these recommendations are intended for non-governmental or inter-governmental organisations. Sinclair’s recommendations could, however, be held equally to apply to governments, especially where the emergency education is being provided in a refugee camp outside the conflict state. Williams notes:

Infrequent mention is made in the literature on refugee education of the relationship between the refugee system in the camps and the local education system in the host country. Quite often refugee camp education is a kind of enclave run by agencies which are outside the country’s curriculum, regulations and administrative set-up (2006: 25).

Goldberg and Jansveld do provide an example of where government and NGOs worked together in Guinea to address the needs of Sierra Leonean refugees, taking local contexts into account:

UNHCR and IRC met with the Guinean Ministry of Education. As a result of this initiative, they avoided establishing two parallel educational systems: one serving refugees and their host communities and one the general Guinean population (2006: 31).

Collaboration and consultation on establishing roles and responsibilities not only results in a clearer institutional environment, is also eases the process of transition of education sub-systems from NGO management to government:

It is imperative, therefore, that the state and its educational authority, on all levels, be involved as early as possible in educational interventions. This includes developing cooperative agreements, inclusion of authorities in planning and implementation and capacity building” (ibid: 33).

However, Goldberg and Jansveld do note that “working with government can be difficult” (ibid: 45).

In their study of Burmese refugees living in camps in Thailand, Oh and van der Stouwe draw attention to an institutional framework which does not seem to result in either the protection of the
rights of the refugees, or an environment enabling them to fulfil their potential:

Officially, refugees do not have access to services provided outside the camps, nor are they permitted to leave the camps to earn an income. International nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) provide most basic and capacity-building services in the areas of food, shelter, health, education, and community services. Despite these contributions and the good intentions of the NGOs, the protracted refugee situation and the restrictions on refugee movement have created a deadlock situation in which it is extremely difficult for the refugees to control the development of their own society (2008: 590).

Oh and van de Stouwe make explicit the link between the institutional arrangements for managing refugees and the impact on the quality and inclusiveness of education. The inability to earn resulting from the Thai regulations keeps incomes low and continues the refugees’ dependence on NGOs. In turn, the limitations placed on teachers, together with the less than optimal management of teachers in particular and the education system in general, contribute towards the continuation of entrenched patterns of exclusion of certain groups, and poor uptake of the opportunity to increase the quality of the education system. Oh and van der Stouwe relate this institutional situation to the Education for All framework, “which mandates that a government is responsible for guaranteeing access to quality education for all learners residing in its country” (ibid: 593). The difficulties presented by the camp arrangements mean that many teachers exit the education system. In addition to the inevitable effect on quality of a class’s teacher changing, and the negative impact on the children’s sense of normalcy from seeing their teacher, with whom they may have built up a relationship of trust, depart, the high turnover of staff simply continues the problem of needing to recruit more teachers. Furthermore,

the constant resettlement of teachers and other camp residents imposes even more pressure on teachers. In both mainstream schools and special education centers, faculty and staff members need to be recruited and trained continuously because of high turnover (ibid: 605).

The selection of replacement teachers in an emergency can affect inclusion and quality in other ways. In refugee contexts, pre-existent community divisions may well be replicated or even strengthened and, unless handled extremely carefully, the selection of teachers from certain groups may well further entrench those divisions in the classroom: “community involvement in the selection of teachers can, inadvertently, give rise to patronage and lower quality than might have resulted from a more independent process” (Sullivan-Owomoyela and Brannelly, 2009: 37). Having said that, “selecting teachers from the local community who are known and accepted by the community, is as important is as important as providing teachers with the right training (ibid.: 140).

It must be remembered that the difficulties teachers face in negotiating the system are in addition to the disturbance to their world caused by their displacement. This disturbance may well reduce teachers’ ability to adapt to their new environment through the loss of resilience, having being compelled to abandon their resources in all their forms. These resources:

- may be of an individual or collective nature and include material possessions; access to land, housing and employment; kin and communal relationships; and familiar language, traditions and institutions – the whole complex of economic, political, socio-cultural and psychological elements that make up the framework for existence of each and every human being (Marfleet, 2006: 194).

Akullu, Ssempala and Ssenkuru (2011), in their research into the effects of experiences of conflict on learning outcomes in Northern Uganda, find a link between teachers’ traumatic experiences, their motivation and performance in the classroom, and students’ learning. As they put it, the past continues to affect teaching and learning in the classroom in the present. Just as psychosocial activities aimed at re-establishing normalcy and building children’s resilience are a key focus of many education in emergency interventions (Penson and Tomlinson, 2009), so too should be measures which re-establish a predictable personal and professional normalcy for teachers. Providing an institutional framework for regularising their legal status and clarifying their employment rights which is clear, predictable, consistent, accessible, rules-based, fair, and – most importantly – in the interests of the teacher – would go a long way to achieving this.

In their study on Eritrean refugees in Ethiopia, Kirk and Winthrop (2007) also found, like Oh and
van de Stouwe, that experienced teachers tended to exit the system, or else ‘migrate up’ from primary to secondary teaching positions due to the higher remuneration and status afforded by the latter. ‘Spontaneous teachers’ were thus recruited to replace the qualified teachers, but the researchers found that these were ‘tentative’ about teaching, having not previously had a plan to be a teacher. This lack of confidence affected quality, especially at primary level.

Kirk and Winthrop suggest training the new teachers as a solution and, like Goldberg and Jansveld, think it important that this be linked to the wider institutional environment through pathways to teacher certification from formal teacher training institutes. In earlier work on Ethiopia and Afghanistan, Kirk and Winthrop drew attention to the link between teachers and access to education, and the connection with recognition of qualifications:

In areas with acute teacher shortages, teachers who have not completed established certification processes but who possess ‘alternative qualifications’ should be formally recognised. This is especially important for promoting access to education in early reconstruction contexts such as Afghanistan (2005: 21).

This brings us to the heart of the issues raised by this literature review. In the aftermath of an emergency, particularly an emergency grounded in conflict, there tends to be a dearth of qualified, experienced teachers available to contribute towards education provision. This is at least partially attributable, in many instances, to the prevailing institutional or regulatory framework. The response to this situation is typically not to provide incentives for the teachers to return to teaching, by addressing the institutional issues, but to train replacement teachers from among the remaining refugee population. However, “teacher training alone will not necessary improve education systems especially in fragile contexts in which for various reasons teachers may leave the profession faster that they can be trained” (INNE, 2011: 5). This paper agrees, and further argues that there is a strong case for further research into the causes of teachers exiting teaching, the relationship between this and the institutional environment, where teachers go to and what they end up doing, and the ways in which they can be persuaded back to the profession (or not to leave in the first place).

The following section, based on the experience of a practitioner in the field, will use a case study of Southern Sudanese refugees to exemplify some of the above issues.

**Case study: refugees from South Sudan**

The recent birth of South Sudan is an opportunity to look at some of the factors involved in the creation of a new teaching force for a new country in the most complex of circumstances. South Sudan inherits its territory from the old Sudan but the history of education for South Sudanese is far more complex than would be expected, in consequence of various historical, practical, social and ‘emotional’ factors. The recent history, that is, of over the second twenty years of civil wars (1983 to 2005), involved:

(a) IDPs: resulting from displacement of probably two million people within the old Sudan, both to the cities of the north, usually in vast displacement camps on the desert periphery, categorised as ‘illegal’ by the State authorities;

(b) Refugees: resulting from flight into exile of another two million to neighbouring countries, sometimes for as long as twenty years;

(c) Stayees: those who stayed behind willingly or unwillingly. They were found on both sides of the civil war: within rebel held territory and in the towns held by and run from the North.

The civil war was one of the few recent wars where education and language were a major issue. After the first combats which led people to flee rebels and government alike, young people fled

---

22 The start of the first civil war is usually dated to the refusal in 1955 of the students in Torit, South Sudan, to accept the Islamic week in their school.

23 Forced recruitment of older schoolboys and teachers was an important reason for fleeing in the early Nineties and led to the disappearance of secondary schools in rebel areas for many years.
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Sudan partly to escape the old education system which was aimed at imposing a unified Arabic medium curriculum which was strongly slanted to Islamicising the largely Christian Southerners.

It is important in the South Sudanese context to distinguish ‘those who teach’ from ‘qualified teachers’. Throughout the recent history, in all parts of South Sudan except the garrison towns the majority of those who taught were not formally qualified and had generally received a series of temporary short courses, inconsistently given and overlapping, with no central record-keeping, filling up a file but never amounting to a formal training which could be offered for a qualification. Emergency and relief teacher training were always a necessity.

The following briefly covers the situation of teachers in the various scenarios previously mentioned.

**Displacement within Sudan**

There was some displacement within the south, though those near the border preferred to go into exile. In many rural areas village schools remained intact. Often, the majority of their teachers had moved to the State capital or large cities (e.g. Juba or Wau) where there was some security and salaries were being paid. Eventually a substantial number of schools were themselves displaced to or replicated themselves in the towns.

In Khartoum and other northern towns there was a great need for schools; the few teachers who were qualified in the national system could find jobs and others, usually higher secondary students or leavers (Grades 10-12) volunteered to teach in the massive displaced camps supported mainly by the Catholic diocese (Sesnan, Sebit and Wani, 1989) and the Sudan Open Learning Unit (SOLU) who provided a modular self-help methodology course. Those who did not live in camps attended evening primary classes, no matter what their age, usually packed into church compounds. It was here that SOLU, supported by funds from Oxfam America, created the first ‘schools in a box’, set up specifically to be packed away when the bulldozers came to clear the ‘illegal’ teaching sites.

**South Sudanese as refugees**

When the South Sudanese left for neighbouring countries they did not have many teachers with them (with the curious exception of Dungu in then Zaire where a whole teachers’ college had fled) (Sesnan, 1993).

In Uganda and Kenya, which had the greatest concentration of refugees, there were eventually quite complex and efficient training programmes. In Uganda, they were run for many years by the Jesuit Refugee Service (JRS) and the Education Programme for Sudanese Refugees (EPSR, now Echo Bravo). The Uganda syllabus was used with no objection from any quarter, since Ugandan qualifications had always been accepted in Sudan. There was from the beginning an emphasis on getting teachers trained in the Ugandan systems.

There was intense debate, involving UNHCR, Uganda’s government, (both local and national) and the refugees themselves, about the use of untrained teachers. This debate occurs frequently in such situations where, as in the case of Darfur’s refugees in Chad, it is the small salary (allowance) that is focussed on, not the education of the children. The refugees tend to declare that host country teachers, however qualified they may be, do not know how to teach them. The host country in return refuses access to their exams unless the children have been taught by trained teachers. The NGOs stick to a policy of ‘letting the refugees choose their teachers’, even when they are patently not qualified to make such choices.

Eventually, as part of the refugee-affected area approach, not only did Ugandan teachers come to take some of the teacher training posts, but enough Sudanese had been trained in Uganda. By then the schools themselves were beginning to have mixed pupil populations as well, serving both Sudanese

---

24 An important step for those working in rebel areas was around 1992 when the UN/NGOs Education Coordinating Committee in Nairobi adopted a modular training programme to which all NGOs and churches were supposed to sign up. Teachers could take month-long modules in their vacations and in theory they would accumulate a quasi-qualification. The modules were written and standardised by the Sudan Literature Centre run by Across in Nairobi. The first ones were on methodology, then some content followed. B. Sesnan was part of this process.

and Ugandan children.

By linking teachers to Uganda’s own Northern Integrated Teacher Education Project distance upgrading programme, with a centre in the camps, and the JRS policy of sending 30 girls a year to train as primary teachers in the Uganda system, together with EPSR’s policy of sponsoring students to finish secondary school, the result was a good education system which has now developed nine full secondary schools in the camps and for some years now the children have been graduating from Uganda’s universities.

When this population began its half-hearted return (basically each family adopting a one-foot-in-each-country approach) they continued to use the Uganda system. However, as the South Sudan Government consolidates itself interesting new twists appear. For instance, in a much-needed effort to upgrade teachers (most of whom had not been in Uganda, of course) they gave two-year residential training courses to two teachers from each primary school. This was a great setback to many schools as these teachers continued to receive their salaries when in training and were not replaced by anyone in the school.26

South Sudan’s stayees – Government areas
It is often only at the moment of the refugees’ return that it is realised that the part of the population which had stayed (or fled into the bush) had often suffered much more than those who got away. They had missed out on the refugee opportunities accrued over many years of exile. In Juba in 2005, with the signing of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement and the gradual takeover of the town by the Sudan People’s Liberation Army, the Juba people saw themselves as heroes for having lived through 20 years of hell. Those who came back from the diaspora or from refugee camps were seen as people who had ‘enjoyed’ – according to Juba people – exile. On the other hand were returnees who believed the Juba people should be grateful for being liberated (and sometimes should give up their posts and jobs to the incoming people).

Indeed, the people coming back from 15 years in refugee camps in Uganda were taller, healthier and much better educated than those who had stayed at home. Those who had stayed at home though, had, because the Khartoum government paid them, better salaries and better housing, and felt threatened by the new arrivals.

At the time of writing, South Sudan is consolidating all these different elements. Initial tensions have diminished and at least in the beginning salaries are being paid. It remains to be seen, though, whether the good things that were learned in exile, say in Uganda, about management and organisation will survive the transition. An initial study in an area to which refugees who had grown up under the JRS system in Uganda had returned was not optimistic on this. The government offices seemed to have retained many of their poor habits (such as instant transfers of teachers with no respect for continuity) and teachers who had been pupils in the system in Uganda not seeming to have absorbed all of what had made education good.

The principles of the Commonwealth Teacher Recruitment Protocol and emergencies
Adopted by Commonwealth member states in 2004, the main aim of the Commonwealth Teacher Recruitment Protocol (CTRP), as stated in paragraph 2.3.1, is:

to…balance the rights of teachers to migrate internationally, on a temporary or permanent basis, against the need to protect the integrity of national education systems and to prevent the exploitation of scarce human resources of poor countries.

Outlined in the CTRP document are the rights and responsibilities of the stakeholders: recruiting

---

26 In a similar case, a dynamic young man set up the first secondary school in a makeshift set of huts in the camp. Then a well meaning agency sent him away for three years to be trained, depriving the school of its vision and dynamism. This was also a common problem with Canadian scholarships – they took the best (who of course would not refuse to go) but despite pleading would not promise that they could come back to serve their people and retain their right to become citizens. These particular issues are sometimes the most important ones to address.
### Table 2: Rights and responsibilities outlined in the CTRP

#### RECRUITING COUNTRIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RIGHTS</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| To recruit teachers from wherever | - "Manage domestic teacher supply and demand in a manner that limits the need to resort to organised recruitment in order to meet the normal demand for teachers" (p.9, [Para 3.1])  
- "Agree on mutually acceptable measures [with source countries] to mitigate any harmful impact of such recruitment" (p.9, [Para 3.2])  
- "Give consideration to forms of assistance such as technical support for institutional strengthening, specific programmes for recruited teachers, and capacity building to increase the output of trained teachers in source countries" (p.9, [Para 3.2])  
- "Make every effort to ensure that departure of recruited teachers is avoided during the course of the academic year of the source country" (p.9, [Para 3.3])  
- "Provide a source country all relevant information regarding the status of teachers recruited" (p.10, [Para 3.4])  
- "Make every effort to obtain a clearance certificate from a source country prior to any contract of employment being signed" (p.10, [Para 3.5])  
- "Ensure the establishment of a complaints mechanism and procedure in regard to recruitment to be known to the teacher at the start of the process" (p.10, [Para 3.6])  
- "Maintain a quality assurance system to ensure adherence” to the Protocol and fair labour practice by recruiting agencies. “Where agencies do not adhere, they should be removed from the list of approved agencies” (p.11 [Para 3.7])  
- Inform recruiting agencies of their “obligation to contact the intended source country in advance, and notify it of the agency’s intentions” (p.11, [Para 3.8])  
- Reach prior agreement “between the recruitment agency and the government of the source country, regarding means of recruitment, numbers and adherence to the labour laws of the source country” (p.12, [Para 3.9])  
- "Recruitment should be free from unfair discrimination and from any dishonest or misleading information, especially in regard to gender exploitation” (p.12, [Para 3.9])  
- "Provide detailed programmes to enable [recruited] teachers to achieve fully qualified status in accordance with any domestic requirements of the recruiting agency" (p.12, [Para 3.10])  
- "Ensure that the newly recruited teachers are provided with adequate orientation and induction programmes, including cultural adjustment programmes, with a focus on the school and its environment” (p.13, [Para 3.14]) |

#### SOURCE COUNTRIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RIGHTS</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| To be informed of any organised recruitment of its teachers by or on behalf of other countries. If a country decides to refuse any organised recruitment, the recruiting country should be informed of such a decision” (p.15, [Para 4.2]) | - "Manage teacher supply and demand within the country, and in the context of organised recruitment” (p.14, [Para 4.1])  
- "Should have effective strategies to improve the attractiveness of teaching as a profession” (p.14, [Para 4.1])  
- "Ensure the recruitment and retention of qualified teachers in areas of strategic importance” (p.14, [Para 4.1])  
- "Establish policy frameworks which set out clear guidelines as to categories of teachers whose recruitment they will not support” (p.14, [Para 4.1])  
- "Shall endeavour to respond to requests for approval to recruit within 30 days” (p.15, [Para 4.3])  
- "Include within its terms and conditions of service for teachers, if not already in place, provisions that relate to release of teachers under international exchange and organised teacher recruitment arrangements, and to their re-integration into the source-country education system on their return from abroad” (p.15, [Para 4.4]) |

#### RECRUITED TEACHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RIGHTS</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Employment conditions not less than those of nationals of similar status and occupying similar positions” (p.12, [Para 3.10]) | - "Show transparency in all dealings with their current and prospective employers” (p.16 [Para 5.2])  
- "Give adequate notice of resignation or requests for leave” (p.16 [Para 5.2])  
- "Inform themselves regarding all terms and conditions of current and future contracts of employment and to comply with these” (p.16 [Para 5.2])  
- "Bound and subject to rules of national labour law and is also governed by any legislation or administrative rules relating to permission to work and suitability to work with children in the recruiting country” (p.12, [Para 3.11])  
- "Should be employed by a school or educational authority. Only schools and education authorities should obtain work permits to enable the employment of recruited teachers” (p.12, [Para 3.13])  
- "Transparency and full information regarding the contract of appointment”, (p.16, [Para 5.1]) |
countries, source countries, and the recruited teacher. The document also speaks to the role of recruiting agencies as well as the monitoring, evaluation, and future actions required of member countries and of the Commonwealth Secretariat. Since its adoption, the CTRP has been acknowledged, and its implementation actively supported, by international organisations including the ILO, UNESCO, OAS and Education International as a document of best practice in both education and migration policy discussions. A summary table is provided below (See Table 2). As previously mentioned, the document does not specifically address the issues surrounding teachers who are forced to migrate. Yet, the principles within the document apply to a variety of circumstances – including recruitment, forced migration, or voluntary migration – that impact Commonwealth nations and teachers. Although the document refers to ‘recruiting countries’, the term ‘receiving countries’ would arguably be more appropriate in the context of emergencies.

In 2008, the Commonwealth Secretariat commissioned a review of the implementation of the Commonwealth Teacher Recruitment Protocol (Ochs and Jackson, 2009a), which sought to assess and review: (a) the quality, content and impact of initiatives, policies, programmes, practices and procedures that countries (specifically ministries of education) have developed and implemented as a requirement of the adoption of the CTRP; (b) the effectiveness of organisations and institutions, such as international and civil society organisations and teachers’ organisations in advancing the implementation of the CTRP; and (c) the extent and effectiveness of the Commonwealth Secretariat in implementing the Future Actions of the Protocol and in conducting advocacy for CTRP implementation. Key findings from the review, which are relevant to education in emergencies and teacher migration from emergencies, were as follows:

- **Context is central to the implementation of the protocol**, with macro-issues determining migration flows as well as demand and influencing teachers’ individual choices to migrate.

- **Data on teacher movement are not being captured by Ministries of Education**. A subsequent recommendation, agreed by the Meeting of the Commonwealth Working Group on Teacher Recruitment, suggested that “emphasis should be placed on strengthening existing data management systems and monitoring data and information at regional/international and country level to address issues relating to tracking teacher turnover, recruitment, deployment, and relevant information about each foreign recruited teacher” (Ochs and Jackson, 2009a: xi).
• Implementation of the Protocol extended well beyond the work of governments and organisations identified as stakeholders in policy documents. Understanding the system of teacher migration offers lessons for applying the principles of the Protocol to education in emergencies and teacher migration from emergencies (see Figure 2) (Ochs, 2011).

A state of conflict and/or natural disaster in either a sending and/or receiving country impacts teacher migration patterns. Evidence also suggested new trend in recruitment patterns. Following the South Asian tsunami in 2004, migrant teachers working in the Maldives returned to their homes. In recent years, areas of South Africa have become destinations for Zimbabwean teachers who chose to leave their home country in search of other opportunities. Yet, a placement for the teachers is not a guarantee upon arrival. Thus, the implementation of the principles of the CTRP needs to take into account the spectrum of emergency – which might be related to conflict or a natural disaster – that would influence the teacher’s plans with respect to duration of stay.

While the causes of migration may be different, there are similarities in the principles underlying the management of migration, because the purpose of migration management instruments is essentially the same. The following sections seeks to outline some of the issues affecting the implementation of the CTRP, and apply the learning to the emergency context.

Key issues affecting implementation
Key issues affecting the implementation of the CTRP arguably relevant to emergency education are: changing teacher migration patterns, national social and security policy, migration legislation, and global financial conditions. Ochs (2003; 2007; 2008) and Ochs and Jackson (2009a) found, looking at the spectrum of research conducted on teacher migration since 2000, that there have been distinct changes in migration patterns to and from individual Commonwealth countries. Whilst the global education market has impacted some migration patterns, such as a more recent trend for Commonwealth teachers to take up positions in the Middle East to take advantage of comparatively tax-free, high salaries. The impact of the global financial crisis on international exchange rates and the devaluation of currencies in developing market economies have been widely reported. Teachers reported getting ‘stuck’ working abroad and unable to return home due to a downturn in their financial situation, despite negative changes in their life circumstances, suggesting cases of personal, economic emergency situations. The fluctuations of exchange rates affect remittances, even in those countries where remittances have become part of the cultural heritage and a welcomed source of foreign exchange. As a result, an emerging outcome of financial change is a greater awareness of the interconnectedness of the local and global economies, as well as a widespread acknowledgement of the dangers of unregulated industries.

Key successes
Key successes in applying the CTRP include Barbados, which include a robust policy response and innovative co-operations. Although the case of Barbados does not reflect migration driven by emergency, it provides lessons in terms of strategies for collaboration and coordination.

Prior to the adoption of the Protocol in 2004, Barbados experienced significant recruitment demand for its teachers and subsequent migration to the Cayman Islands and Bermuda. This interfered greatly with the organisation of the education system and often required replacing recruited teachers with untrained teaching professionals. In the Ochs and Jackson study (2009a), the Ministry reported that it had not disseminated the Protocol to the teachers, but did believe that teacher unions were important to this process. In an interview, the Barbadian Union of Teachers (BUT) confirmed that a pocket version of the Commonwealth Teacher Recruitment Protocol was disseminated to union members. In addressing the issues faced by Barbadian teachers working within the United States, the Union worked with the American Federation of Teachers to secure health care coverage for teachers working in the US, and to address visa issues and work placements. The position of the Barbadian Secondary Teachers Union (BSTU) was to ensure that those who had taken up positions abroad had not been employed on contracts less favourable than those already working within the Barbados education system. In the US context, the BSTU sought to enlist the support of both major national teacher unions in the US, the National Education Association (NEA) and the American Federation of
Barbados has also been attempting to build collaboration with recruiting countries (Ochs and Jackson, 2009a). Efforts are underway between Barbados and a US school district located in the state of Kentucky, which was led by a Barbadian working in the school district. The recruitment programme was designed to help Barbadian teachers improve their standard of education to meet the highly qualified status requirements for US teachers. It provides an example of a creative solution whereby teachers trained elsewhere could achieve the qualification required in their new destination. With respect to education in emergencies, it is notable that most refugees move to a neighbouring country, which means predictability in the qualifications refugee teachers are likely to have. Planning for the possibility of an emergency could, therefore, realistically include neighbours comparing qualifications and agreeing concordances to facilitate smooth transitions.

Barbados has managed to control the worst negative impacts of teacher migration by identifying the factors contributing to the departure of teachers, analysing the effect on domestic supply and demand, and developing robust policy responses based on a balance of the needs of the education system and the rights of teachers. By providing information about the CTRP to teachers, Barbados has managed to increase awareness of the issues surrounding migration. An increasing resilient education system has emerged (Rudder, 2011). The creation of a strong policy framework which balances protection of education systems with protection of teachers’ rights – to the benefit of both entities – would seem to be a useful lesson to be learned.

**Challenges to implementing the principles of the CTRP**

With respect to education policy, it is important to distinguish between teacher supply – the absolute number of teachers in a region – and teacher deployment – the location where the teachers are working. Although a country might have target teacher supply numbers, the teachers must also be deployed where they are needed, which includes remote or unattractive areas. As mentioned previously, training new teachers is a response to teacher shortfalls in the emergency, and does not address the question of where the already qualified teachers are.

Varying security policies also affect teacher migration. Without communication between the ministry of education, immigration and border control, important background information on teachers can be overlooked. In recent years, the international media reports on cases of teachers with criminal records, including known paedophiles, seeking and achieving employment outside their home countries. These examples point toward the need for different government (and non-government) departments to work together on managing teacher migration: it is not just an issue for the ministry of education.

**Learning from the CTRP**

The CTRP has been useful in promoting the concept that managing migration can be helpful to both source and destination countries. Muvunyi (2011) noted how the Government of Rwanda had used the CTRP as a basis for negotiations with the Government of Kenya to manage the temporary migration of Kenyan teachers to work in the Rwandan education system, resulting in mutual benefit to the countries and the protection of the migrant teachers. He noted the strong co-ordination and cooperation between the various stakeholders in Rwanda in managing teacher recruitment, including the Ministries of Education, Finance and Economic Planning, Local Government, and Foreign Affairs and Cooperation; the Teaching Service Commission; Rwandan High Commissions; partners; support institutions; and teacher education institutes. He stressed the importance of systems and structures, with each actor having clearly assigned roles and responsibilities, and the importance of legal frameworks, such as bilateral agreements, between countries. Underlying this is a view which sees the benefit migrants bring, which, it is argued, is true of forced as well as voluntary migrants. Advocacy needs to be undertaken to persuade destination governments to implement creative solutions. For example, in countries which struggle to staff rural schools, survival migrants might be approached to work in these positions.

Enforcing a voluntary agreement can be difficult, as accountability mechanisms lack bite: as Miller, Mulvaney and Ochs note, “The Protocol does not hold any legal authority” (2007: 158). The cases of Rwanda and Barbados demonstrate the importance of institutionalising the principles of migration management through policy and legislation. Gathering data on the implementation of the
CTRPs have similarly been difficult (Ochs and Jackson, 2009b). Even where reliable mechanisms for gathering data on teacher stock and flow exist, they rarely capture the nationality of teachers or whether the reason a teacher has left the teaching service is to work abroad. Improvements to education information management systems would assist teacher supply and demand planning, and should include refugee teachers. Accurate teacher registration systems which responsibly included refugee teachers would help planners in an emergency to deploy teachers effectively.

Another barrier to the smooth implementation of the CTRP is the differing bureaucratic requirements of countries regarding minimum qualifications to teach – and the dynamic nature of this, where changes to minimum standards may make the previously recognised qualifications of a teacher suddenly unrecognised. Moving towards harmonisation of standards would assist the migration process for both forced and for unforced migrants.

Both voluntary and forced migration tends to be temporary, although the duration of the former can be anticipated more accurately than the latter and better included in teacher supply models. However, while voluntary migration is increasingly temporary in nature, as the globally mobile labour force expands (Hugo, 2011), the number of refugees in protracted situations (greater than five years) was the highest in 2010 since 2001, at 7.2 million (UNHCR, 2011a). In planning education in emergencies, regard should still take into account the expected transitory nature of the camp population, and resettlement out of the camps planned for.

There are clear differences between the context the CTRP was designed to address and the situation in a conflict-related emergency. At the policy level, there can sometimes be little for the principles of the CTRP to ‘latch on to’, as it were: the CTRP assumes a certain minimum institutional framework – functioning source and destination governments, the presence of recruitment agencies, a degree of volition and access to information on the part of the teacher, and so on. It is nonetheless the case that there is much that can be learned from the implementation of the CTRP as a tool to manage teacher migration effectively. Policy preparedness, as demonstrated by the case of Barbados, is clearly key. However, preparation for an emergency does not seem to figure highly in many governments’ policies at the moment. “As a result of this lack of political attention, the budget for emergency planning is often neglected and funds are not earmarked for these activities” (IIEP, 2010b: 22). Further, “The vagaries of annual budgeting compound the problems of education financing during emergencies. This is especially true in situations of long-term displacement” (UNESCO, 2011: 19), where budgeting for long-term refugee needs is made difficult by changing political and donor priorities. There remains much advocacy work to be done to increase the understanding of forced migrants’ needs in an emergency, and of developing pro-active institutional frameworks for managing them in the event of an emergency. Development partners could assist in providing the resources necessary to put the plans, policies, systems, structures, and technical management capacity in place. They could also assist in monitoring implementation, to ensure accountability.

In many senses, NGOs and other non-state actors delivering education in emergencies have a similar function to recruitment agencies. Work on the implementation of the CTRP has shown that, because recruitment agencies are existentially and financially dependent on maximising their profits, they may sometimes behave less than ethically, having insufficient regard for the effect of recruiting teachers on the source country or the rights of the teachers (Ochs, 2009). Large-scale emergency recruitment of teachers in an emergency by non-state actors might lead unintentionally to similar effects on the host country systems, if salaries and terms and conditions are sufficiently attractive. Non-state stakeholders need to be mindful of the wider effect of recruitment drives. Again, an institutional framework would be helpful in balancing the needs of agencies and the formal education system.

The CTRP was in part developed to protect the rights of teachers who migrate. Problems they face might include inadequate or non-existent contracts; finding on arrival that their job has significantly less status or remuneration than that promised, poor accommodation, discrimination, or job insecurity (Reid, 2006). As refugee status is often difficult to gain, and as recipient governments may be keen not to be seen to encourage further flows of migrants into their territory, ensuring forced migrants’ rights may similarly be difficult. For example, recognising migrants’ qualifications and allowing them to work might be seen by host governments as adding a pull factor to the existing socio-economic-political-environmental push factors underlying forced migration, thereby potentially increasing the number of migrants which they are already struggling to accommodate. Another example would be
that allowing teachers to work in the host country could drive down the market value of a national teacher if the country already has a surplus of teachers, driving more teachers into poverty (although this might also increase the quality of teaching overall as authorities could be more selective). Where the migrant teacher works outside of the state system in an informal school serving the needs of the migrant community, allowing them to work might be seen to encourage the loss of students from the formal sector to the informal. Yet another example is that some teachers in camps, especially the qualified ones, may be re-settled in the second or a third country, which could have a deleterious effect on teacher-pupil ratios and teaching quality in the camp schools. This may be particularly true where teachers are offered up-skilling programmes by NGOs while in camps, which enable them to secure employment outside their communities. Internationally agreed instruments which provided a framework to manage migration could assist with these difficulties by enhancing systemic stability and predictability, the establishment of minimum expectations in accommodating the needs of forced migrant teachers, and the exchange of good practice.

The CTRP was also designed to help protect vulnerable countries’ education systems from teacher ‘poaching’ without recompense. Clearly, conflict affected countries are vulnerable, and it is important not to encourage teachers away from struggling education systems unless they feel there is no choice. When there is a balance between protecting the rights of a teacher and the needs of an education system, a framework of sound institutions is again helpful.

The African Union Commission, supported by IICBA, is currently developing an instrument to assist the management of teacher migration in Africa (African Union, 2011). Participants at the Sixth Commonwealth Research Symposium felt that this protocol could present a valuable opportunity to contribute towards setting in place policy frameworks which anticipate migration in emergencies, making management of forced migrants more responsive and more effective, and also towards providing greater international consistency in the ways that forced migrants are managed in AU Member States. Clearly the lessons learned from the implementation of the CTRP will be important.

Future actions

Forced migrant teachers face sudden, drastic, unexpected, and uncontrollable changes in their circumstances. The removal of options and agency is disempowering, disorienting and disheartening. Teachers’ power to negotiate is reduced, their access to information curtailed, their entry into the labour market may be barred – at least to the formal market – and they may not be at all prepared for the sudden change in their situation. Added to this, they may have been subjected to physically or emotionally violent acts in their home country or en route to their host country, leaving them psychosocially vulnerable; their financial security may have been severely compromised, and their ability to earn placed in doubt; their legal status may be unclear; and they may be subject to intimidation or abuse in their new surroundings. Their physical well-being may be diminished; they may be inadequately sheltered or nourished; their professional qualifications may be lost or not recognised; and their exit options may be limited or non-existent.

Work on identifying the issues affecting teachers in emergencies has already begun. In 2010, the INEE asked members what the biggest challenges were that teachers faced in crisis settings, and how governments should be supported in reducing the teacher gap and upholding EFA commitments in crisis contexts. As well as identifying that “Teachers are most needed in crises situations. Yet these are times when they are most difficult to recruit and retain” (INEE, 2010a: Para 2), the consultation found that “Stronger governmental support and policies are therefore needed to help and support teachers... around the world” (ibid: Para 5).

Recommendations

Participants at the Sixth Commonwealth Teacher Research Symposium developed a series of recommendations that would apply to practices in host countries, as well as government-level policies and actions27. At the host country level, policy recommendations included mainstreaming migration issues into national policy and reducing barriers to integration into the (formal) labour market, which ultimately entails action by both policy makers and employers. Actions could also be taken to ensure

27 The Symposium Proceedings Report will be available from the websites of the Commonwealth Secretariat and IICBA shortly.
reasonable security of employment for migrant teachers, and to ensure that migration policy is sensitive to gendered needs. With regard to migration policy, fast tracking the official recognition of refugee status and of professional qualifications/ability to teach was also recommended. This might involve enabling the removal of bureaucratic hurdles to integration and movement of migrant teachers. Language policy could be revised to promote the recognition and utilisation of migrants’ language, whilst also offering support for learning the language of the host communities. In host communities and the work environment, awareness raising activities could be undertaken to increase sensitivity to migrants’ needs. Such initiatives could be undertaken by employers, civil society organisations, and teacher associations as well as by government at the national, regional, or local level.

Regarding education policy, recommendations included providing professional development necessary for teachers to achieve the qualifications required to teach in the formal system, and creating pathways to achieve minimum standards in the host country. In the specific case of education in emergencies, the professional development and qualifications for programmes in the informal education sector must also be considered, which might include initiatives by NGOs. It was also recommended that a transitory mechanism be developed for teachers as yet unqualified under the host country system (or unable to demonstrate their qualification) as an interim measure, before qualification status is given, to enable teachers to teach. This might involve a competency-based rapid assessment of a teacher’s ability in the classroom. An integrated migrant management policy between different authorities/agencies would encourage the rapid registration of teachers. Guidance on acceptable minimum remuneration for teachers could also be addressed, as could a promotion policy which does not discriminate against migrant teachers. Consideration of these issues could be included in proposals to donors, and in donors’ policies.

With specific regard to refugees, it is important to ensure that refugees are subject to equal treatment under the law protecting human rights, and that fair and equal treatment of migrants is advocated. As such, creating and/or strengthening mechanisms to support refugee teachers in host countries is essential. This includes providing physical security, both within the classroom and in greater society, and safe passage within the country. Governments might also consider a housing policy that would encourage teachers to stay where needed in order to mitigate the effect of the emergency on the provision of education.

Further research is needed on a variety of levels to address current knowledge gaps that challenge policy reform. There is very limited information on the role and status of teachers in emergencies, including teachers who are forced to migrate. In addition, more research is required about the refugee population itself, particularly with regard to the linguistic needs of the children and needs for teachers who could deliver education to the children. As Paulson (2011) notes, existing insights into education in emergencies are derived less from rigorous research than from the delivery and evaluation of educational programming. Alongside research into qualitative aspects such as the issues affecting teachers’ decisions, this paper argues for large-scale empirical studies which established, for example, the actual shortfall of teachers in various refugee environments. This would help to provide an evidence base for policy advocacy. Moon asks:

How can the patterns of supply of teachers, particularly where “crisis” situations exist, be monitored and analysed? In particular what forms of enquiry are needed to interrogate national and international statistical information? (2007: ix).

One of the lessons learned from the implementation of the CTRP is that very often the data on teachers are simply not available. Answering the above question will require considerable capacity building of national systems monitoring teacher supply and demand, stock and flow.

**Conclusion**

Well managed teacher migration can contribute both to increased access to education for at-risk children (such as refugees) and the quality of education children receive, even in difficult circumstances. If teachers are prevented or discouraged from teaching by institutional barriers, it represents a double ‘brain drain’: the teachers are benefitting the education system in neither their home country, nor their host country. While they may be contributing in other ways, this still
represents a loss of investment in the teaching cadre – “a denial of rights and a waste of humanity” (Smith, 2004: 38). It is critically important to provide frameworks which protect teachers, especially when cross-border migration is involuntary, as teachers are then at their most vulnerable. It is also important to acknowledge that, formally recognised and properly supported, these same teachers can present an important resource for host countries to educate children. Managing migration is thus a key factor in achieving MDG access and equity and EFA quality objectives.

It seems beyond doubt that the issue of forced migration needs to be specifically addressed in migration management policy. As conflict and natural (meteorologically induced) disasters seem set to increase, policy needs to expect the unexpected, and plan for unanticipated cross-border migration of education professionals. The need to avoid exploitation of vulnerability; the exigencies of disaster preparedness; and the interests of international co-operation all point towards the requirement to set in place both national and regional policies to protect teachers forced to migrate, where they do not already exist. Emerging instruments for managing teacher mobility, recruitment and migration should recognise that not all migrant teachers choose to migrate, and that this necessitates special consideration.

The fact that the length of the emergency is usually unknowable presents particular difficulties in accommodating teachers. Host governments may be concerned that refugee populations may become permanent over time. They may be reluctant to regularise conditions for teachers as this might be seen to encourage settlement. This paper does not argue for policies which promote settlement as their primary objective. It argues for policies which facilitate opportunities for teachers to maximise their potential, regardless of whether they are in temporary, permanent or unknown situations.

It is not wished to make a special case for teachers per se – some sort of exemption to or fast track around immigration procedures. All migrants, regardless of their profession or background, are worthy of and legally entitled to the same protection of their rights, and all have their part to play in protecting and nurturing their own communities. Nor, while speaking about refugee teachers (and those applying for refugee status), should the needs of IDPs be lost sight of, as their needs are arguably even more urgent, as education quality in IDP camps is frequently more neglected than in refugee camps (Buscher and Makinson, 2006). It is recognised that immigration control is the right of a sovereign state, subject to its international obligations. However, it is also the duty of a state to realise the rights of refugees. The case of education in emergencies demonstrates the need for greater preparation and more consistency in international and national instruments dealing with forced migrants. And, because of the high profile of education, and its symbolic value, advocating for refugee and forced migrant teachers is an access point for advocating for the rights of all refugees and displaced persons.

Muñoz puts forward the following recommendation for governments:

Develop a plan that prepares for education for emergencies, as part of the general education program, to include specific measures for continuity of education at all levels and during all the phases of the emergency. Such a plan should include training for the teachers in various aspects of emergency situations (2010: 24).

To this we would add that governments consider in their plan the possibility that they might need to respond to an emergency originating not in their own territory but another, which nonetheless will encumber them with certain responsibilities for which they need to be prepared. Therefore they need to train education managers and immigration authorities in emergency preparedness, and have in place a functioning institutional framework which enables refugee teachers to contribute towards ameliorating the situation. Building the capacity of governments to achieve this should be considered for inclusion in emergency responses, where it is not done already. But, as the World Bank puts it, “Temporary labor migration to neighboring countries or farther abroad can provide job opportunities for skilled and unskilled laborers from fragile or conflict affected countries and requires few reform elements” (2011: 162-163).

Developing a contingency plan for education in emergencies along the lines of those prepared by Inter-Agency Standing Committee Education Clusters is necessary but insufficient. Deeper penetration of the principles of preparedness is required, with policy and legislation in place which supports the positives and mitigates the negatives of forced migration. This should be reflected in national policy and programmes not just in education but in other affected sectors.
Much has been written – justly so – about the rights of children to be educated in an emergency. But to be taught, children require teachers, and therefore the protection of teachers’ rights needs equal attention. With efforts increasingly focussed on quality – again, rightly so – emphasis has been placed on teacher training, particularly the enhancement of teachers’ methodology. It seems that the quantity challenge – the reduced number of teachers serving refugees – is mostly met by training new teachers from the community. This paper has argued for the greater inclusion in the policy debate of those refugee teachers who are qualified, experienced, and potentially ready to teach, but who are prevented from doing so by institutional barriers. It is contended that potentially there are efficiency gains to be made in using pre-qualified teachers, and that enabling long-term professionals to teach has the potential to reduce teacher turnover, which in turn will have a beneficial impact on educational outcomes and psychosocial well-being.

The Commonwealth Secretariat will thus shortly be commissioning research which will attempt to identify the extent to which institutional barriers deter forced migrant teachers from teaching. The research will identify the issues affecting forced migrant teachers and the existing policies influencing their role and status, and analyse the connections between these issues and policies and forced migrants’ ability to contribute towards education in emergencies. It will then formulate recommendations for policy-makers which will protect the professional role and status of teachers forced to migrate and enhance their ability to operate constructively in emergency conditions. The authors of this paper would welcome further engagement with the education, development and humanitarian communities on developing this research.
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