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Welcome to Education Development Trust

At Education Development Trust, we have been improving education around the world for 50 years. We design and implement improvement programmes for school systems, and provide consultancy services deploying specialists internationally.

Our work is informed by our continually refreshed body of research which focuses on the bright spots in education, from education authorities as diverse as those in Vietnam, Kenya, England, New York and Dubai.

Bringing about real change that alters the aspects of a national system that, for many reasons, aren’t working so well at the time, requires knowledge and ability to design and implement changes to any of the levers that can impede great educational outcomes. So the ability to affect policy, practices, pedagogy, behaviour, funding, attitudes and more is a prerequisite for a company that can truly claim to transform lives through improving education.

As highly informed agents of change operating in low- to high-income countries with their varying internal contexts, we not only design but also show and enable, so when working with us, everyone involved, from policymakers to school leaders and teachers, is able to apply their new knowledge to drive sustainable system reform.

Our expert knowledge, programme design and implementation expertise is also deployed in delivering Ofsted-rated outstanding careers services in England, and in owning and managing a family of independent schools.

We are a not-for-profit and we are driven by our values of integrity, accountability, excellence and collaboration.

About the International Institute for Education Planning (IIEP)-UNESCO

The IIEP-UNESCO was created in 1963. It supports Member States in planning and managing their education systems so that they can achieve their national objectives as well as the internationally agreed development goals. IIEP develops sustainable educational capacity through training, research, technical assistance, networking, and information sharing.

The views and opinions expressed in this book are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of UNESCO or IIEP. The designations employed and the presentation of material throughout this book do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of UNESCO or IIEP concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or its authorities, or concerning its frontiers or boundaries.
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Chapter 1

Introduction
This literature review covers primary and secondary sources that describe the main aspects of management relating to teachers of refugees. The geographic focus is on countries in the Middle East and East Africa, which host the largest number of refugees. The review analyses findings along four major themes relating to (1) recruitment, certification and selection of teachers of refugees, (2) teacher preparation and development, (3) teacher remuneration and incentives and (4) teacher retention.

The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) estimates that 65.6 million people are forcibly displaced, having either crossed national borders or become internally displaced within their own countries. Of this estimate, over 22.5 million are refugees. Over half of the world’s refugees are children. With an average length of displacement of approximately 20 years, the majority of these children will spend their entire childhoods away from home. Refugee children have limited access to basic social services like healthcare and education. Given the length of their displacement, generations of refugee children throughout the world could miss out on education altogether.

As various international declarations and conventions stipulate, education is a fundamental and basic human right for all children, regardless of their circumstances. Numerous studies show that the teacher is the most important in-school factor affecting the quality of education, particularly in refugee contexts, where the teacher is sometimes the only resource available to students. In refugee contexts where infrastructure and resources are limited, the role of the teacher is particularly important to the quality of education.

Yet few studies to date have examined the role of teachers in refugee contexts. With more literature focusing on refugee children and youth, little is known about who the teachers of refugees are and how they are recruited, trained, retained, compensated and managed in their contexts. Importantly, there is little research on

1 UNHCR (2017)  2 UNHCR (2016)  3 Sesnan et al. (2013: 10)
national teachers who are teaching refugee children; rather, much of the available literature focuses on refugee teachers – that is, teachers who are also refugees. In addition, this lack of literature on teachers of refugees hinders our understanding not only of their needs but also of ‘how refugees can contribute to education in their host countries and (eventually) to their home countries’.  

More research is needed on teachers of refugees to make it possible to design and/or reform effective educational systems and management structures to support teachers working in refugee contexts.  

As emergencies increasingly become protracted crises and refugee populations continue to grow, we need, now more than ever, an evidence base to guide policies and support governments and partners in providing a quality teaching force for refugees.

The purpose of this literature review is to survey policies, practices and debates that governments and their partners must navigate to provide education for refugee populations, and the strategies they have used to select and manage teaching forces. The review analyses findings from the main literature on teachers of refugees according to the following themes: (1) recruitment, certification and selection of teachers, (2) teacher preparation and development, (3) teacher remuneration and incentives and (4) teacher retention. In addition, for each of these themes, this review highlights the salient gaps in the research and suggests an agenda for further research.

**Methodology and scope**

The overarching goal of this literature review is to examine what evidence and literature are available on teachers of refugees, in an effort to identify gaps and areas for future research. The review surveys a wide variety of secondary source materials and grey literature on the topic of planning, selecting and managing teachers for refugee populations, as well as research on refugee education, both classroom- and school-based, that provides relevant information about teachers. This literature review covers documents from 2000 to 2017 and includes reports from governments, donors, international organisations (IOs), UN agencies and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) at the international, national and regional levels, and peer-reviewed academic journal articles. Google and Google Scholar were used to search for additional literature.

Given the dearth of literature and evidence on teachers of refugees, this literature review takes a broad approach and also examines theoretical and conceptual arguments, debates and advocacy and policy briefs. As much as possible, the review focuses on context-relevant empirical evidence and literature, but it widens to post-conflict contexts and also draws on research from other populations with possible applicability to refugees.

The literature review focuses on two regions – East Africa and the Middle East – as these two regions have the highest cross-border population movements. Within these two regions, the review examines Jordan, Lebanon and Turkey in the Middle East; and Ethiopia, Kenya and Uganda in East Africa. However, given the lack of research and literature on teachers of refugee teachers in these two regions,
the literature review also takes into account other contexts and instances where governments engage with refugees’ education.

For this literature review, a refugee is defined by the 1951 Refugee Convention as an individual who, ‘owing to 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 nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail [oneself] of the protection of that country’. Refugees are defined and their legal status affords them protection under international law. Refugees can be recognised with refugee status in a country of asylum in two ways: prima facie at the group level or through an individual Refugee Status Determination process.

The review covers all types of teachers of refugees and the multiple pathways by means of which teachers of refugees come to take on this role. The term teacher refers to instructors, facilitators or animators in formal and non-formal education programmes. Teachers may have different levels/amounts of experience and training; they may be older learners or educated members of the community. A qualified teacher is an individual with a nationally recognised teaching certificate, diploma or degree; national recognition is obtained either in their host country or in their country of asylum. A trained teacher is someone with an alternative teaching certificate, whereas an untrained teacher is someone in a teacher position who has not undergone comprehensive teacher training.

In this literature review, teacher of refugees refers to both national (host country) and refugee individuals who hold teaching positions. Specifically, refugee teacher refers to refugees who teach refugee students. This includes refugees who were teachers prior to their displacement. National teacher refers to teachers who are from the host country and who teach refugee students. In both cases, teachers of refugees include previously unqualified individuals who have taken up the teaching profession to teach in classrooms where there are refugees.

While international conventions oblige host countries to provide only basic education, this literature review looks at teachers at all levels of education with the aim of providing a comprehensive picture of teachers of refugees. Ultimately, findings from this review seek to inform the research agenda for a larger study on the management of teachers of refugees. The goal of this forthcoming study is to identify good practices in the management of teachers of refugees, to raise the awareness of education policy makers and to support governments hosting refugees to design policies on providing teachers for refugee children and youth.

Limitations

Although it is widely known that teachers play a fundamental role in the delivery of high-quality education, few studies to date have examined their role in refugee and crisis-affected contexts. Consequently, this literature review has several limitations. In particular, evidence-based literature on teacher attrition and retention in refugee contexts is often anecdotal. Limited data on teacher management does exist but is not widely available. Indeed, much of the work

---

6 UNHCR (2017)  7 Penson et al. (2012); Sesnan et al. (2013)  8 Bennell (2004); Mulkeen (2010); Penson et al. (2012)
that does exist on teachers of refugees focuses on teachers who are refugees themselves, and excludes national teachers. Little data and literature exist on those teachers teaching refugees outside of the camp system, or on teachers working in schools that teach host country students and refugee students together. Additionally, the majority of empirical studies and reports on education in emergencies focus on children.

The vast majority of the available literature for this review was produced by UN agencies, NGOs and other international actors. This is perhaps because such organisations need to demonstrate their accountability and to share knowledge about their programmes for fundraising purposes, which may limit the nature of the knowledge produced. Furthermore, national formal systems and local non-state education providers are unlikely to generate much documentation that is in English and available on the internet.

There is also a bias in the published literature and data towards refugees living in camps. This is partly because refugees living within private accommodation in host communities are less easy for international aid organisations and researchers to access. However, it should be noted that the majority of refugees do not live in camps – either official or unofficial self-settled ones. In 2016, UNHCR estimated that only a third of refugees worldwide were living in camps or in camp-like situations. There is very little research available on the education of refugees living in urban areas or other refugees living outside of camps.

---

6 Rose (2011) 10 Ring and West (2015a); Sesnan et al. (2013) 11 UNHCR (2017) 12 See Mendenhall, Buckner and Russell (2017) for a rare example of such research
Education of refugees: overview, history and the importance of education
In the past five years, the number of forcibly displaced people has increased dramatically. As a result of ongoing conflicts in Democratic Republic of the Congo, Somalia, South Sudan, Syria and many other countries, the world is witnessing the highest number of displaced persons globally since the end of World War II.  

As mentioned above, UNHCR estimates that 65.6 million people are forcibly displaced, having either crossed national borders or been internally displaced within their own countries. Of these 65.6 million people, there are 22.5 million refugees, 2.8 million asylum seekers and 40.3 million internally displaced people.  

Over half of the world’s refugees are children. Access to basic social services, such as healthcare and education, is often limited, especially for refugee children. Indeed, only 50% of refugee children have access to primary school, 22% of youth have access to secondary school and only 1% of refugees have access to higher education. Owing to the protracted nature of the world’s ongoing crises and conflicts, the average length of displacement is approximately 20 years. Consequently, the majority of these children will spend their entire childhood away from home. Thus, it is crucial to ensure refugee children have access to high-quality education.

The provision of schooling or non-formal educational opportunities in crisis contexts dates back at least to World War II. Through the Marshall Plan, communities provided grassroots educational opportunities to refugee children in the US and Europe. Also, when education was not available, refugees would often develop their own schools and other informal learning programmes. Until the 1980s, few resources within UNHCR were allocated to education, and the agency relied on refugees to create their own primary school opportunities. Not until the 1990s was education recognised as important enough to be undertaken concurrently with humanitarian relief. This recognition came about as a result of awareness of its role in facilitating stability, imparting life-saving messages and establishing normality.
Education in emergencies also did not garner attention and was not considered a specialised field until the early 1990s. The term ‘emergency education’ was used at inter-agency level in many agencies to refer to ‘education in situations where children lack access to their national education systems, due to man-made crises or natural disasters’.20 At this time, efforts were largely individualised and they emphasised access to education – that is, simply getting children in schools. By the early 2000s, organisations had begun to come together and collaborate on the provision of education and to emphasise gender parity, access and quality in schools.21 In 2001, the Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE) was initiated by a handful of network members in response to the Dakar Framework for Action, one of whose 12 strategies for action focused on education during crisis. UNHCR was one of INEE’s founding members, in addition to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) and NGOs including Save the Children and others.22

Chapter 3

The right to education for refugees: frameworks and policies
Education is recognised as a universal human right across a range of international legal frameworks. Legal and policy frameworks play an important role in protecting the right to quality education of displaced populations on many levels – from legally binding international treaties that establish global norms shared by sovereign nations to non-binding international agreements and national legislation covering domestic protection.

**International treaties**

Several international treaties outline the right to education for refugees, displaced persons and children, regardless of their circumstance. It is important to note that basic education is the only level of compulsory education that these international treaties stipulate. Article 22 of the 1951 Convention specifies only primary education, as does Article 28 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child. Article 13 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights stipulates that basic education should be free and further education should be made readily available. These legal documents are binding and normative in their establishment of minimum legal standards expected of countries in their duty to provide basic education. It is important to note that, while the majority of countries have signed the treaties above, many, including Jordan, Lebanon and Pakistan, have not. And some countries, including Ethiopia and Turkey, have reservations affecting education. Table 1, overleaf, summarises the key international frameworks as they pertain to refugee education.

---

TABLE 1: INTERNATIONAL TREATIES THAT STIPULATE EDUCATION FOR REFUGEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Stipulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Convention Related to the Status of Refugees\(^\text{25}\)          | 1951 | • This UN multilateral treaty defines who is a refugee and sets out the rights of individuals who are granted asylum and the responsibilities of nations that grant asylum.  
  • Article 22 of the treaty states that the ‘contracting States shall accord to refugees the same treatment as is accorded to nationals with respect to elementary education’.  
  • 146 countries have signed the treaty; Jordan, Lebanon, Malaysia and Pakistan have not signed.\(^\text{26}\) |
| International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights\(^\text{27}\) | 1966 | • This convention sets out rights related to education, work, an adequate standard of living, housing, food, water and sanitation, social security and health.  
  • Article 13 states that primary education shall be compulsory and available free to all; it also states that secondary education and higher education should be generally available and accessible.  
  • Malaysia has neither signed nor ratified the convention. |
| United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child\(^\text{28}\)     | 1989 | • This human rights treaty sets out the civil, political, economic, social, health and cultural rights of children.  
  • The convention is the most widely and rapidly ratified human rights treaty in history, ratified by all countries, except for two the US and South Sudan.\(^\text{29}\)  
  • Article 28 stipulates ‘State Parties recognize the right of the child to education, and with a view to achieving this right progressively and on the basis of equal opportunity’ and primary education should be free and compulsory for all children. |
| New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants\(^\text{30}\)           | 2016 | • Article 32 stipulates that all refugees and migrants shall have access to education and psychosocial development.  
  • Article 39 calls for taking measures to improving integration and inclusion in access to education, as well as language training.  
  • Article 79 seeks to expand admissions programmes related to education, through scholarships and student visas.  
  • Article 81 calls for safe learning environments at the primary and secondary levels, within a few months of displacement.  
  • Article 82 stipulates support for early childhood education and tertiary education, including skills training and vocational education. |

In addition to these legally binding conventions, several other agreements and frameworks exist. The World Education Forum held in Dakar in April 2000 affirmed the crucial role education plays in ‘[meeting] the needs of education systems affected by conflict, natural calamities and instability’ and incorporated the pledge in a Framework for Action adopted in pursuit of the objectives of Education for All.\(^\text{31}\) This declaration was a milestone because it signified that donors now recognised that education provision in refugee camps served multiple purposes – including providing structure and continuity in children’s daily lives as well as psychological support.\(^\text{32}\)

The Incheon Declaration and Education 2030 Framework for Action emphasises that member states should commit themselves to ‘developing more inclusive, responsive and resilient education systems to meet the needs of children, youth and adults [...] including internally displaced persons and refugees’.\(^\text{33}\) Sustainable Development Goal 4, to ‘ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all’ will not be achieved unless the educational needs of vulnerable populations, including refugees, migrants, internally displaced persons (IDPs) and other forcibly displaced persons, are met.\(^\text{34}\)

The most recent declaration, the New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants, agreed upon by 193 member states, calls on UNCHR to develop a global compact on refugees, and a subsequent Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF) that emphasises access to quality education, at all levels, for all children in conflict and crisis contexts. One of the main goals of the CRRF is to ensure support for the immediate and ongoing needs of refugees, which include health, education and protection. Designed to engage a broader group of stakeholders, the CRRF seeks to more systematically link humanitarian and development efforts early on in a crisis.

Despite the varying national and international legal frameworks that exist, these all require signatory member countries to ensure the right to education for refugees. Nevertheless, this responsibility belongs to the states themselves. The UNESCO and UNHCR joint policy paper, *No More Excuses: Provide Education to Forcibly Displaced People* advocates that states take the initiative to include displaced children and youth in their education systems. Moreover, states should enable accelerated education programmes to offer flexible and alternative pathways to education. The paper emphasises that it is essential that displaced children and youth have trained and motivated teachers. As is stipulated in the 1951 Convention, governments need to ensure teachers are paid appropriately and have access to professional development opportunities.

While several international and regional treaties and policies stipulate that refugees have the right to a quality education as well as the right to work (for teachers), the extent to which these treaties and policies are implemented and enforced varies. This is particularly problematic for refugee populations, since it means that the realisation of the right to education rests with nation states. In many refugee hosting countries, quality education may be in short supply for the national student population, and refugee students may be perceived as placing an additional burden on an already weak or strained system.

As the sections that follow highlight, it is clear that, in many countries, teachers of refugees, particularly refugee teachers, in addition to obstacles related to the right to work, are confronted with numerous challenges in finding paid teaching positions, training opportunities and professional support.

Beyond international policies, regional approaches to refugee governance have a major impact on the degree to which refugee rights and entitlements are enabled. In the Middle East, as highlighted earlier, Jordan and Lebanon have not signed the 1951 Convention. Yet these two countries still provide education services to refugees and have both signed the Convention on the Rights of the Child. Meanwhile, Turkey has signed both the 1951 Convention and the Convention on the Rights of the Child, but with reservations. In the Middle East there has been a concerted effort to coordinate governments and partner efforts to manage the influx of millions of Syrian refugees in five host countries: Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon and Turkey.

The Regional Refugee and Resilience Plan (3RP) is the regional response to the Syrian refugee crisis. The 3RP mid-year report for 2016–2017 touches only briefly on education for the 56% of school-aged Syrian children out of school, and has
a noticeable absence of regional frameworks that target teachers of refugees. UNICEF has found that, in the Middle East, governments and IOs in countries hosting refugee populations have each adopted different practices and strategies on a number of policy areas regarding Syrian teachers, including recruitment, payment and training.

Few frameworks focus on teachers of refugees specifically. Although the Commonwealth Teacher Recruitment Protocol, adopted by Commonwealth ministers of education in 2004, sought to ‘balance the right of teacher to migrate internationally, on a temporary or permanent basis... [and] safeguard the rights of recruited teachers and the conditions related to their service in the recruiting country’, it does not explicitly address forced displacement. Furthermore, by 2006 these ministers had reported varying levels of implementation of the protocol, and they suggested a review of implementation in 2009. Following the review, findings showed that the majority of teachers were unaware of the protocol.

A draft African Union Teacher Recruitment Protocol was prepared in 2012. This included a reference to the responsibility of host countries for developing policies and mechanisms to support refugee teachers. At the time of writing, the protocol had not yet been officially published, demonstrating that, although policy makers are familiar with the issues related to teacher recruitment in forced displacement settings, these are politically very sensitive issues, which makes it difficult to gain consensus. Finally, ministries of education (MoEs) often do not capture data on teacher migration, recruitment and employment, this review highlights later.

This literature on international treaties on refugee education point towards important research gaps – on the effects of politics on refugee education and specifically teachers of refugees, and on the gap between policy and politics.

UNHCR’s education strategy: then and now

International policies have an impact on how governments provide education to refugees and how well they are able to select, manage and retain teachers for those populations. As the central body charged under the 1951 Convention with managing refugees, UNHCR has undergone changes to its policies regarding education since its creation. In its early years, UNHCR played a relatively small role in the provision of education for refugees. For instance, in the 1970s and early 1980s, the agency initially provided individual short-term post-secondary scholarships and funding. However, in the late 1980s UNHCR shifted its focus so that 95% of the beneficiaries of its education work were primary school children. This aligned with national trends in many developing countries, whose focus was on mass expansion of primary schooling. Aligned with the Convention on the Rights of the Child and the Education for All Declaration of 1990, UNHCR emphasised universal access to education.

At this time, refugee education, under the UN mandate, was not typically of interest to hosting countries, and was not implemented or regulated by hosting MoEs. Rather, UNHCR favoured refugee camps, such as those in South-East Asia (Thai border), Pakistan and Rwanda, as it was efficient to deliver social services to a
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larger refugee population. Host governments also preferred this approach, for both security and financial reasons. 46

From the 1990s and throughout the first decade of the 21st century, most education policies were created from UNHCR headquarters in Geneva and were thus implemented from afar. In effect, ‘refugee education entered a phase where it was led by policy and not by people’. 47 Indeed, there were no field UNHCR staff members in host countries, and UNHCR outsourced its education programmes to national and international NGOs. Meanwhile, refugees were segregated from national education systems and attended camp schools, where they learned from various curricula, including host country curricula, origin country curricula and perhaps others, depending on the teachers. 48

In 2012, UNHCR released its new Global Education Strategy, which outlined its shift away from providing education for refugees in segregated camps to an emphasis on the integration of refugee learners within national education systems. 49 Specifically, through its 2012–2016 strategy, UNHCR sought to:

- ensure that 3 million refugee children have access to primary education
- expand secondary education to 1 million young people
- provide safe schools and learning environments for all young learners
- ensure that 70% of refugee girls and boys achieve quality learning in primary school
- provide teacher training that leads to professional qualifications so that 80% of teachers are trained
- provide non-formal education and training opportunities for 40% of young people, male and female
- increase by 100% the number of students attending tertiary education.

To achieve these goals, UNHCR aimed to develop stronger partnerships with MoEs, collect and manage data on education programmes and strengthen the capacity of national partner staff. 50 Now, with a dedicated staff of 15 global members and 29 field-based members, UNHCR has also established partnerships with the education ministries of 20 of its 25 priority countries (those with the highest number of refugees).

### Coordinating policies on education for refugees

For displaced populations, realising their legal rights, where afforded, can be challenging when international frameworks have not been ratified or adapted into national legal frameworks. It can be equally difficult when legal frameworks are poorly integrated into social service policies, plans and strategies (e.g. within national education sector plans). The gap between official policies and actual implementation is an important variable affecting the efficacy of teacher management policy. 51 The importance of education as a human right has been well established, but this has not necessarily translated to effective implementation on the ground.
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In theory, governments’ education policies should set out a series of tasks to be coordinated between partners, yet in refugee situations this often does not happen. Approximately 86% of refugees are hosted in low- and middle-income countries, almost exclusively in the Global South, and, while children have a legal right to access education, this can be obstructed by political reluctance or lack of capacity everywhere. It is a particular problem for countries with already weak infrastructure and resources that are experiencing large influxes of refugees. While national policies may enable refugees to access education, they may also limit such access, for example through heavy documentation or certification requirements; the imposition of strict age requirements for entry to different levels of education; or school fees, to name a few.

Recently, however, we have seen a major policy shift away from parallel systems and pressure on states to include and/or mainstream refugees in national systems. As described above, the UNHCR strategy emphasises integration of refugees into national systems, rather than advocating for parallel education systems for refugee communities. Other frameworks are also calling for the inclusion of refugees in national systems, including the Sustainable Development Goal 4 Framework for Action, the 2015 European Parliament Resolution on Education in Emergencies and the 2016 New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants. Today, more than 11 countries integrate refugees into the national curriculum and language. For instance, Cameroon, Niger and Pakistan now include refugees in national and provincial planning documents.

However, in many contexts, despite refugees being integrated into national education policy frameworks, in practice inclusion is often not realised. For example, national schools may not have space/seating for an influx of new students. Furthermore, the language of instruction may be a challenge for refugees, and the ‘highly politicized tensions between refugees and citizens’ in settings such as Kenya and Egypt mean refugee children remain out of school or attend school in parallel systems run by NGOs.

While the UN is mandated to serve member states and their governments, NGOs do not have the same obligation. Even though NGOs are not necessarily obliged to work with governments (though they often do), if a partnership with the government is deemed critical for ensuring the sustainability of educational support, concerted efforts to work more closely with government are made. In the past, when UNHCR led coordination (prior to its 2012 Global Education Strategy), the relevant MoE may not have been involved or, instead, may have played a secondary role. Examples of effective alignment between refugee and emergency education systems and national education systems were few and far between. Indeed, NGOs and other partners often create additional parallel systems of educational provision for refugees.

In refugee camps, for example, education has historically been an enclave run by agencies that operate outside the host country’s main education system, often because of the remoteness of the camps. Working groups are often set up to ensure coordination between partners and the government, but their ability to carry this out is inconsistent. In Ethiopia, for example, the Refugee
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Education Working Group, a subcomponent of the National Refugee Taskforce, meets regularly. Despite this coordination, the links between the Administration for Refugee and Returnee Affairs – the ministerial body that oversees primary education for refugees – and refugee education programmes are neither clear nor systematic. The type of education system established and its management therefore depend on which actor is implementing the programmes. Consequently, partners are effectively running a parallel teacher management system, which is uneven and unregulated.

Within host governments, ineffective collaboration between the relevant ministries (education, labour, refugee or foreign affairs, etc.) and an inconsistent application of rules and requirements for refugee teachers (where they exist) complicate the alignment of processes. In some jurisdictions, nominal education authorities are not actually responsible for education of refugees and therefore have no policy authority. From a service delivery perspective, Williams also highlights the challenge in providing services that are in line with local standards, so as to mitigate the risk of tensions between the host and refugee populations. This is the case in Ethiopia, where even national teachers are leaving the national school system to teach in UNHCR-run camps.
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Chapter 4

Management of teachers of refugees
Countless studies show that the teacher is the most important in-school factor affecting the quality of education. In refugee contexts, where learning materials, classroom space and furniture are often in short supply, the role of the teacher is particularly important to quality education, as a teacher is sometimes the only resource available to students.

Teachers’ role in education in emergencies

Teachers working with refugee children ‘may be the only literate adults in a community ravaged by the effects of war’. Many argue that in such contexts that are permanently without teachers there can be little effective schooling. The UNHCR Global Education Strategy 2012–2016 acknowledges that teachers matter more than any other single factor to learning and focuses on the instructional role of teachers and the training they need to be effective in student learning processes.

Beyond simply being present to teach, teachers play several critical roles in providing education to refugee children and youth. First, teachers provide a source of continuity and normality for children, attending to their physical, cognitive and social needs. Second, their direct work with children and their families is critical in helping restore a sense of stability and confidence. In addition, teachers can help support recovery and transition post-conflict and after emergencies, and can promote security, peace and human rights, both in their home countries upon return and in host countries, where they may stay indefinitely.

Indeed, teachers can have an immense influence on (refugee) children’s learning. Education can both enhance and hinder conflict, as can teachers. While teachers have great potential to positively affect children’s lives, in some contexts their limited professional orientation and support may hinder such possibilities; indeed, some teachers can be abusive and disempowering. At the same time, teachers in certain contexts, such as Afghan refugees in Pakistan, bear a heavy cost in times of conflict. In contexts where refugees have already fled persecution, teachers

The UNHCR Global Education Strategy 2012–2016 acknowledges that teachers matter more than any other single factor to learning and focuses on the instructional role of teachers and the training they need to be effective in student learning processes.

have been targeted by regimes that see them as a threat to their power or as tools for indoctrination. In Rwanda, for example, more than two thirds of the teachers in primary and secondary schools were killed or fled. In Nigeria, Boko Haram frequently target teachers and schools.

Teacher policies in refugee settings

While there are no international frameworks for the management of teachers of refugees, several normative frameworks exist that provide guidelines on how teachers should be managed. For example, the INEE’s Minimum Standards stipulates the standards necessary for recruiting and selecting teachers, outlining their conditions of work and ensuring they are trained and given professional development and support. Further details are included in its guidance notes on teacher compensation and on teaching and learning. The World Bank’s Systems Approach for Better Education Results (SABER) framework provides several key dimensions to consider in creating teacher policies. Its open access online database also provides data on each teacher policy dimension, disaggregated by country.

UNESCO has developed three sets of guidelines, which include two from the IIEP-UNESCO and the International Task Force on Teachers, a global partners’ alliance aimed at coordinating efforts to ensure there are sufficient numbers of well-qualified teachers to achieve the Education for All goals. The Task Force’s Teacher Policy Development Guide presents an evidence-based tool that comprises nine interrelated dimensions that countries can use to develop their national teacher policy. The most comprehensive of any of the teacher policy frameworks, this guide also offers principles and detailed approaches for contextualising and implementing a national teacher policy.

IIEP-UNESCO’s Guidebook for Planning in Education in Emergencies and Reconstruction provides guidance on the identification, selection and recruitment of teachers, teacher motivation and compensation, and on how to measure and monitor teacher quality in emergency contexts. Finally, IIEP-UNESCO also hosts an Education Policy Series report, Preparation, Recruitment and Retention of Teachers, which provides aspects of a teacher policy that are critical in ensuring the supply of sufficient quality teachers. Table 2 summarises the dimensions of teacher policy that each framework puts forth.

While only two of these – INEE’s Minimum Standards and IIEP-UNESCO’s Guidelines – are designed for conflict-affected contexts, neither of these is specific to teachers of refugees or refugee teachers in particular. Moreover, these frameworks do not explicitly address the credentials or certification of teachers in refugee settings. However, in nearly all of these frameworks, teacher certification or qualifications are included in the recruitment and/or selection dimension. Thus, there is a need for specific policy frameworks for refugee teachers and teachers of refugees, to ensure they have the right to teach, fair compensation and other essential terms of employment, as national teachers typically already have.
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Based on the available literature and data available, and with a focus on refugee contexts in the Middle East and East Africa, we have examined four key aspects of teacher management to be considered in this literature review:

1. teacher recruitment, certification and selection
2. teacher preparation and development
3. teacher remuneration and incentives
4. teacher retention

While other dimensions, such as school governance, supervision and teacher accountability, are vital components of a national teacher policy, we argue that these above-mentioned four dimensions be prioritised initially in ensuring qualified and prepared teachers are recruited, compensated and retained in refugee settings. The next sections present the available literature on each of these four dimensions.

### TABLE 2: TEACHER POLICY FRAMEWORKS FOR LOW-INCOME AND CONFLICT AFFECTED CONTEXTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>International Task Force on Teachers</th>
<th>INEE</th>
<th>World Bank</th>
<th>IIEP-UNESCO</th>
<th>IIEP-UNESCO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Policy Development Guide</td>
<td>Minimum Standards</td>
<td>SABER framework</td>
<td>Teacher Management</td>
<td>Guidebook for Planning in Education in Emergencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher recruitment and retention</td>
<td>Recruitment and selection</td>
<td>Attracting the best into teaching</td>
<td>Teacher recruitment</td>
<td>Identification, selection and recruitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher education (initial and continuing)</td>
<td>Training, professional development and support</td>
<td>Preparing teachers with useful training and experience</td>
<td>Teacher training (initial and professional)</td>
<td>Teacher training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deployment</td>
<td>Teacher deployment</td>
<td>Deployment</td>
<td>Teacher careers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career structures/paths</td>
<td>Conditions of work</td>
<td>Setting clear expectations for teachers</td>
<td>Teacher motivation, compensation and working conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher employment and working conditions</td>
<td>Conditions of work</td>
<td>Setting clear expectations for teachers</td>
<td>Teacher motivation, compensation and working conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher reward and remuneration</td>
<td>Motivating teachers to perform</td>
<td>Remunerations, incentives and benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher standards</td>
<td>Matching teachers’ skills with students’ needs</td>
<td>Teacher professional status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher accountability</td>
<td>Monitoring teaching and learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School governance</td>
<td>Support and supervision</td>
<td>Leading teachers with strong principals</td>
<td>Supervision and support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 5

Recruitment, certification and selection of teachers of refugees
Who are teachers of refugees?

In their extensive review of the literature on teacher retention in refugee and emergency settings, Ring and West suggest there are two groups of teachers of refugees: refugee teachers teaching in a host country and national teachers teaching refugee populations. They argue that, while both groups are considered ‘refugee teachers’, ‘the two have vastly different experiences, with critical issues such as certification and incentives […] In addition, national policy, the right to work, and access issues will inevitably be different for each group’. As the literature typically overlooks this distinction, little is known about either group of teachers, particularly national teachers teaching refugees. Yet this category of teachers is especially important as we see the global policy shift towards inclusion of refugees in national education systems.

In their research on the role and status of refugee teachers in Kenya, South Africa and Uganda, Sesnan et al. group refugee teachers into three categories:

1. individuals who were teachers when they became refugees and are teaching now or wish to teach
2. qualified teachers who do not teach when in the host country, including those who do other jobs, and
3. refugees who became teachers after arriving in the host country

Little is known about the background and role of teachers of refugees. As highlighted earlier, research on education in refugee settings is limited, and the majority of this research examines refugee children and youth. Nevertheless, this section presents the available literature and evidence on teachers of refugees – who they are and how they are recruited, trained, retained, compensated and managed in their contexts.
Each group faces its own set of challenges in finding and maintaining paid employment in education. In this literature review, we focus primarily on two categories of teachers: national teachers who are teaching refugee populations and refugee teachers; and refugees who became teachers and are teaching refugee populations.

Policies affecting teacher recruitment: right to work and encampment policies

Right to work is a critical issue for teachers of refugees. For refugees, the right to work is vital to enhance resilience and economic security and reduce vulnerability. Nevertheless, in many contexts, refugees face obstacles to finding any kind of work. In their review of 20 countries hosting 70% of refugees, Zetter and Ruadel found that the majority of countries were highly restrictive; consequently, refugees work in the informal sector, under more exploitable conditions. Depending on the national policies of the host country, refugee teachers may not have the right to work for a salary, or to work as a teacher in the public education system. In some contexts, refugee teachers can legally work only as volunteers or teacher assistants, paid only ‘incentives’. In these cases, it is often more financially rewarding for qualified teachers to seek work in other areas.

Refugee teachers face innumerable challenges in finding paid teaching work. First, there is a lack of coordination between MoEs and ministries responsible for refugees and asylum seekers. Second, teachers are often unable to obtain recognition for their credentials, which limits their ability to seek employment. Third, in many contexts there is a reported oversupply of trained teachers without jobs, despite a large number of unfilled teaching positions. Finally, language differences may make it difficult for teachers to find work, especially in the public sector.

In Kenya, refugee teachers are not permitted to teach in the Kenyan government schools; nor are they allowed to earn a salary in any capacity. Rather, the majority of refugee teachers earn a monthly ‘incentive’, equivalent to approximately $70. Similarly, in both Algeria and Ethiopia, refugees do not have the right to work, and may receive only a stipend. The absence of the right to work for refugee teachers undermines their status, and teachers often complain of a lack of respect from parents and communities. In Uganda, however, refugees have the same right to work as nationals, so long as Ugandan competent authorities recognised their credentials. This is perhaps open to interpretation, depending on the origin of credentials and the type of school within which a refugee wishes to teach. In 2016, Turkey issued a decree that allowed Syrian refugees to obtain work permits. Jordan similarly agreed to provide work permits for up to 200,000 Syrians.

Host country encampment policies and limitations on refugees right to free movement can make it challenging for refugee teachers to move throughout the country to gain qualifications and to teach outside of camps. Of the six countries examined in this review, Ethiopia and Kenya have official encampment policies.
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Teacher recruitment

There is little data on teachers of refugees and what data does exist is usually available only at the local level. Without data, tracking teachers, and their subject specialisations, ethnic/linguistic/religious backgrounds and reasons for entering or leaving the profession, is a challenge and, therefore ‘we know little about how to effectively recruit, select, and deploy teachers in any setting’.  

There are several debates on who should be recruited to teach refugee populations. The global policy shift towards the inclusion of refugees in national systems, the tension between refugee community desires and practicalities like certification and the need for specific and sometimes new language skills for the effective integration of refugees in host communities all have implications for the selection of teachers.

These policy-level challenges have led to divergent views on who should teach refugees. For example, some argue that teachers of refugees should be refugees or teachers selected from the community. The INEE Minimum Standards advocate that teachers be selected primarily from the affected community because of their understanding of the social, economic and political issues faced. From a community perspective, refugees tend to declare that host country teachers do not know how to teach them, regardless of their qualifications, while host country schools/systems may refuse access to national exams unless trained teachers have taught the children. For example, Syrian refugee parents prefer informal settlement schools that teach the Syrian curriculum because they feel Syrian teachers will not only better understand refugees’ needs but also be less likely to discriminate against refugee children. Dryden-Peterson and Adelman found that, in Kenya and Uganda, refugee teachers (rather than national teachers) could better adapt the prescribed curricula to the refugee context by imparting its goals into classroom discussions.

As mentioned above, the language of instruction and choice of curriculum may also influence which type of teacher should be hired. The INEE Minimum Standards advocate for the recruitment of teachers who speak learners’ mother tongue and, where necessary and appropriate, it is recommended that ‘intensive courses in the national or host country language(s) be provided’. In this regard, then, perhaps national teachers may be better placed, both linguistically and in terms of familiarity with the curricula, to integrate refugees into national education systems. Thus, despite refugee communities’ desires for their children to learn from teachers of the same or similar backgrounds, it is essential to consider what is best for children’s learning. Moreover, given the protracted nature of many conflicts, coupled with the push for integration into national education systems, refugee children will likely need to learn the national language and curricula so they can continue their education and pursue economic opportunities. However, regardless of the choice of language or curriculum, both national and refugee teachers will need support to help their students navigate linguistic and curricular transitions.
Relatedly, in a study of Somali refugees who had attended school in Dadaab refugee camp in Kenya, the majority of the 21 participants had experienced closer relationships with and more academic support from their refugee teachers, in contrast with their Kenyan national teachers. They attributed these stronger relationships to sharing a similar cultural background and language, as well as shared experiences of conflict in their home country. Several former students mentioned that, when they did not understand what their Kenyan teacher was teaching, they would go to their refugee teachers for support in learning the material. Other former students mentioned that they felt more motivated and encouraged by their refugee teachers, who wanted to see them succeed and overcome their situations. The majority of former students who are now oversees, or outside of the camp, remain in close contact with their refugee teachers. Nevertheless, when Dadaab shifted to a Kenyan curriculum and language in 1997, these former students recognised the importance of having qualified and trained teachers to help them learn the new material and language. In short, this case study provides a positive example of the roles that both national and refugee teachers can play in educating refugee children.

Given the global policy shift towards the inclusion of refugees in national education systems, there has been a recent movement towards using both national and refugee teachers, as discussed later. Nevertheless, funding and politics both influence decisions on who should teach refugees, and who teaches refugees varies greatly from one country to the next. As teacher salaries comprise up to 90% of education budgets, hiring (and training) more teachers may be fiscally challenging for MoEs. In addition, in some countries there may be an oversupply of qualified national teachers who cannot find teaching jobs. As such, tensions may arise between qualified national teachers and newer and potentially unqualified refugee teachers who are vying for the same jobs. Yet in many contexts this is a non-issue, as refugee teachers do not have a legal right to work.

While there are arguments for and against recruiting refugee teachers to teach refugee students, as demonstrated by the previous examples, recruitment should be based on the context, and the needs of the community. And what may work for one context may not work for another. Selecting and managing the right teachers has long-term implications that will have implications for the quality of education that refugee students receive. Moreover, recruiting and, importantly, retaining quality teachers depend on compensation, incentives, employment conditions and overall support. Thus, it is crucial to have in place a systematic process for attracting, recruiting and retaining quality teachers, refugees and nationals, males and females, to teach refugee children.

**Attracting teachers of refugees**

Some researchers argue that we do not know how to effectively ‘(re)build a teaching corps’ in emergency settings as we do not fully understand the factors that influence the ‘participation (or not) of would-be teachers within any given context’. Indeed, teaching in such contexts brings a plethora of additional

challenges, on top of the challenges of teaching in low-resource settings. Thus, it is often difficult to attract and recruit high-quality teachers of refugees.

For example, militarisation, xenophobia and hatred, found within many education systems either in the curriculum and content or in the selection process, often drive teachers away from teaching.\(^\text{112}\) In many contexts, teachers are the targets of attacks, so ‘it is not surprising, therefore, that in these instances teachers are in short supply’.\(^\text{115}\) Relatedly, there is often an insufficient supply of female teachers in emergency settings, in part because of a lack of educated females, as well as safety concerns and cultural practices in many refugee settings.\(^\text{114}\) However, it is important to note that this is a significant gap in the available literature – that is, the extent to which female teachers feel safe in teaching or are able to secure positions at all.

Working conditions may also affect who decides to teach in emergency settings. Inadequate infrastructure, a lack of teaching and learning materials, overcrowded classrooms and excessive workloads are some of the many challenges of teaching in any low-resource setting, but are especially pronounced in refugee settings.\(^\text{115}\) Importantly, teacher attrition is exacerbated by the lack of financial incentives in many refugee settings. In Algeria and Ethiopia, Ring and West\(^\text{116}\) found that teachers would leave the profession for more lucrative employment opportunities. In the Sahrawi refugee context in Algeria, there were more teaching vacancies than teachers available, as young people reportedly wanted to pursue law and business opportunities where they could make more money.\(^\text{117}\) Often, refugees who were teachers in their country of origin or who have achieved a high educational level do not enter or remain in the teaching profession in exile, for a number of reasons (pay, work conditions) and many take better-paying jobs with NGOs operating in the refugee context.\(^\text{118}\)

Finally, the teacher recruitment process itself in emergency settings, in both national and refugee education systems, may turn away interested and suitably qualified candidates. Establishing a systematic teacher recruitment process for emergency contexts is crucial, as teacher recruitment and deployment can ‘create or exacerbate tensions if not performed in a non-discriminatory, participatory, and transparent manner’.\(^\text{119}\) For instance, individuals may seek employment by paying bribes to school officials for teaching posts, resulting in a cadre of teachers who ‘do not feel accountable to school management, parents, or the wider community’.\(^\text{120}\) In their study of teachers in four refugee camps in Ethiopia, Ring and West\(^\text{121}\) found that refugee teachers complained about nepotism and lack of transparency in the teacher selection process. However, it is important to note that in Ethiopia teaching positions are posted publicly. It is possible that the teachers in this study were, for some reason, not able to access the selection criteria or application requirements. As such, in designing transparent and fair recruitment processes for teachers of refugees,\(^\text{122}\) it is necessary to ensure teachers are able to access information about the process. It is likewise important that there are appropriate checks and balances in place to ensure teacher recruitment processes are implemented transparently and impartially.

\(^{112}\) Burns and Lawrie (2015)  
^{113}\) Ring and West (2015a: 108)  
^{114}\) Bennell (2004); Ring and West (2015a)  
^{115}\) INEE (2011); Ring and West (2015a)  
^{116}\) Ring and West (2015b)  
^{117}\) Ring and West (2015b)  
^{118}\) Kirk and Winthrop (2007); Penson et al. (2012)  
^{119}\) INEE (2011) as cited in Ring and West (2015a: 109)  
^{120}\) Bennell (2004: 11)  
^{121}\) Ring and West (2015b)  
^{122}\) INEE (2011)
Supply and demand issues

Several authors have argued that the actual supply of teachers in host countries to fill the needs posed by an influx of refugee children and youth is in itself not always problematic. 123 Sesnan et al. found that host countries did not seek to identify teachers among refugee populations because they already had an adequate supply. 124 For example, in Jordan and Lebanon the governments can hire a large number of unemployed university graduates searching for work to fill gaps in teacher supply. In Lebanon specifically, according to Ministry of Education and Higher Education (MEHE) statistics, there are sufficient numbers of teachers, and the national ratio of students per teacher is 7.4 in public schools. 125

In several other countries, including Kenya and Uganda, there is reportedly an oversupply of trained national teachers without jobs, despite the large number of vacancies. According to Sesnan et al. (2013), there are tens of thousands of unemployed teachers and, although there are vacancies, the state cannot afford to employ them all. 126 This makes it increasingly difficult for non-Kenyan teachers to join the official teaching force. In such cases, the government cannot afford to fill these vacancies, with either national or refugee teachers, and vacant posts remain unfilled. It should likewise be mentioned that, in most countries, the choice of teacher is rarely made at the school level. Mpokosa and Ndaruhsutse found that in many developing countries the recruitment and deployment of teachers was not the responsibility of the headteachers. 127 While the headteachers are best placed to know what teachers would complement existing deficiencies, they cannot do anything to balance this at the recruitment stage. Currently, there is no evidence that this is the case in refugee contexts.

While there may be an oversupply in many contexts, the reality is that, in most contexts with refugee populations, such as Turkey, there is an inadequate supply of teachers in a host country to deliver education to newly arriving refugees. In this case, as mentioned earlier, Ring and West argue that there are often more teacher vacancies than people wanting to be teachers. 128 In lieu of systems that can help identify qualified teachers among the refugee population and if there are simply insufficient numbers of qualified teachers, those with little or no experience may need to be considered. 129 A quick selection process, as described by Crisp et al., 130 sees volunteer teachers recruited at the beginning of a refugee emergency, their only qualifications being motivation and commitment. 131 In the case where these contract teachers are refugees, they can provide a valuable resource for education systems suffering from teacher shortages.

There are, however, a number of concerns when hiring contract refugee teachers – whose employment is for a limited period of time, although it can be renewed. 132 From a host government perspective, even if an MoE welcomes the influx of refugee teachers, the bureaucratic requirements of other ministries may hinder the effective use of foreign (refugee) teachers. 133 While the use of contract or volunteer teachers can be a helpful solution to teacher shortages, these teachers are more effective when they have sufficient basic education. 134 On the other
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hand, the employment of contract teachers – who may or may not be qualified – can be seen as a ‘threat’ to national teachers, create arbitrary divisions and lead to dissatisfaction among national teachers. Indeed, national teachers may feel their jobs are not as valued if supposedly less qualified teachers are able to get jobs without progressing through the standard certification and hiring process.

Current recruitment practices for teachers of refugees

While there is no comprehensive or formal system in the majority of emergency settings for recruiting teachers of refugees, the informal recruitment and selection processes vary largely by context. One of the main limitations to understanding who teaches refugees is that national laws restricting the right to work for refugees also preclude their admission into the national system and education management information systems. As such, details of their private employment are fragmented and generally not widely shared, or understood.

Some countries’ governments stipulate that a certain number of teachers of refugees must be national teachers. In Dadaab, Kenya, for example, a number of qualified and experienced Kenyans are hired to serve as teachers and mentors to support refugee teachers. In 2012, about 10% of teachers were qualified Kenyan nationals; the remaining 90% were refugee teachers drawn from the camps. However, of these, only 2% of refugee teachers were qualified, while 25% had undergone between 10 days and 1 year of teacher training. The remaining 75% were untrained.

Rather than choosing between refugee and national teachers, other countries have opted to use both types of teachers to their advantage. In Sweden, for example, older refugees are being trained as teaching assistants to expedite integration. In Greece, well-educated refugees participate in educational activities, like providing Arabic and English lessons, even though they are not qualified teachers. Having both refugee and national teachers in one setting also allows for interesting comparisons in research. In Ethiopia, for example, Ring and West reported that, while both refugee and national teachers agreed that they had positive recognition from their communities, it was possible that refugee teachers received less respect and had less power than their Ethiopian counterparts. In government schools, Somali refugees reported that their certifications were not recognised and they were not allowed to teach outside of refugee contexts.

In other countries, refugee teachers are not permitted to teach in government schools, but may be allowed to work as assistants or in non-formal or private schools. In Uganda, according to the Directorate of Refugees, Office of the Prime Minister, registered refugees have the right to employment. However, there is no specific policy on how a refugee can be employed; nor is there any assistance provided to help refugees find employment. The Ministry of Education and Sports of Uganda has no specific mandate for refugee teachers. At the secondary level, refugee teachers can look for teaching jobs on their own, but negotiations are carried out between the teacher and the school, depending on the teacher’s qualifications. Reportedly, it is more common for refugee teachers to teach in private schools.

In Jordan, Syrians are not permitted to be teachers either in government schools or in host community schools. Instead, Syrian teachers are allowed to work as teaching assistants in the camp schools and for NGO educational programmes. An agreement between the Jordanian MoE and the UNICEF Country Office resulted in 260 Syrian teachers being hired as assistants for Jordanian teachers in refugee camp schools. The total number of teachers working is not truly known; in the Za’atari refugee camp, the Syrian Cultural Committee estimated there were 1,000 teachers; a REACH Initiative survey estimated 1,900. While not quoting specific numbers, INEE reported that in Jordan World Vision recruitment criteria adhered to in-country teacher qualification requirements, and the Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) has selected Syrian teachers to assist Jordanian teachers in formal schools and to work in informal education programmes.

Many teachers in Jordan are recent university graduates, and refugee teachers serve as intermediaries between the Syrian children and these recent graduates, who are less familiar with the hardships experienced by Syrian children. Research suggests that Syrians serving as assistant teachers in Jordanian camps help smooth the transition to the new curriculum, mediate between children and help new Jordanian teachers in large classes. In cases where refugee teachers work alongside national teachers, the World Bank recommends clarifying the role of volunteer teachers and encouraging the development of mentoring partnerships between experienced and volunteer teachers. This approach both supports the qualified teacher and recognises the important contribution of an alternatively qualified teacher.

In Lebanon, the MEHE recruits the formal teaching force, and there is no official role for Syrians as teachers. Lebanon has a long history of private schools operating a significant portion (70%) of the education system, and there are an unknown number of Syrian community schools. Syrian teachers in Lebanon are not employed in the public system (though they could be once their teaching certificates are recognised) but in private schools Syrians can be employed upon receiving clearance from the MEHE. Both national and international NGOs recruit Syrian teachers, usually for non-formal education programmes, and these recruits receive incentive payments.

Teacher certification and qualification

INEE underlines the importance of recruiting qualified teachers with recognised credentials. However, in refugee contexts, recognition of qualifications is a significant problem for individuals outside the country where the qualification was obtained, especially since refugees do not always flee with their certificates in hand. Proof of certification is often a necessary requirement in recruitment and selection processes for teachers of refugees, particularly for refugee teachers.

A certificate represents a record of personal accomplishment, and has a significant impact on recipients’ self-esteem, motivation and hope for future job prospects. Moreover, INEE states that teacher certification is as important as teacher training as it can represent an important investment of the teacher’s time and limited
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family resources. If accreditation does not occur the investment is lost – both for the teacher and for the education system. Either without their credentials or when host countries do not recognise these, refugee teachers cannot be formally employed or receive compensation accordingly. Kirk and Winthrop argue that a pathway to certification is ‘the primary means by which teachers feel connected to the broader institutional environment’.

While international conventions stipulate that refugees may work and study in host countries, there are often several barriers to refugee teachers who seek employment in host countries, especially related to credentials. Sesnan et al. argue that refugee teachers are disadvantaged at almost every step in the process. First, there is little research on the ‘cross-border portability’ of teaching credentials. Second, refugee teachers rarely receive support in obtaining the necessary certification to teach in host countries. Much of the time, refugee teachers who are interested in obtaining certification in their host countries cannot access such opportunities. In Dadaab, Kenya, the majority of teachers are ineligible for admission to higher education institutions. In Ethiopia, for example, refugee teachers reported that they did not have access to professional training opportunities, owing to the geographic isolation of the schools in which they were teaching. Third, as highlighted earlier, as a result of the encampment model for refugees that many countries are utilising, MoEs are largely uninvolved in refugee schools and the management of teachers. As such, there are limited, if any, opportunities for refugee teachers to register, obtain certifications and receive employment.

Current certification practices for teachers of refugees

Evidence on the certification process for teachers of refugees is limited, particularly in this study’s selected countries. Nonetheless, Ethiopia and Uganda provide two examples of the process by means of which refugee teachers can gain employment in their host country.

In Uganda, the national policy for recognising qualifications received abroad is straightforward on paper, but convoluted, time-consuming and expensive to navigate. Teacher qualifications obtained outside Uganda or other East African countries can be transferred to obtain ‘equivalence’. Non-English certificates can be translated and validated by the appropriate institute. The Ugandan National Examination Board or Makerere University are the relevant authorities, while an Education Program for Sudanese Refugees validation will sometimes suffice on its own. In the UK, refugees who have been trained as teachers can be recognised as ‘overseas trained teachers’ and allowed to teach for up to four years as unqualified teachers. Certificates gained abroad can be recognised through a formal process and equivocated to a UK certificate. Additionally, they are able to gain qualification status upon following a training programme in conjunction with teaching. Nevertheless, this process is challenging – the certificate copy must be certified, which is far from easy, particularly for refugee teachers, whose institutions may be inaccessible.
In their literature review, Ring and West found that portable certification remained a top priority for refugee teachers. This was a significant issue for Somali refugee teachers in Ethiopia because neither the education completed nor the teaching certification obtained in Somalia is officially recognised in Ethiopia. Somali teachers at one school said they had to ‘restart their education’ in Ethiopia, with some even having to go back to Grade 8 to obtain a secondary certificate. The difficulty of studying towards a teaching certificate was compounded by the lack of opportunities for professional development within the camps.

The Borderless Higher Education for Refugees (BHER) project is aiming to ensure that refugees, including teachers, have access to higher education. Currently working in Dadaab, BHER, in partnership with Windle Trust Kenya, Kenyatta University – a national and recognised institution – and World University Service of Kenya, is providing tailored courses and portable certificates to refugees to create a new generation of teachers. BHER works in other contexts as well as striving to provide tailored higher education opportunities through both in-person trainings and online courses.

Qualifications

In general, the number of professionally qualified refugee teachers is on the rise. However, wide disparities exist between countries. In Kenya, 65% of refugee teachers in primary schools have professional teaching qualifications; in Ethiopia, the majority of teachers are not adequately trained, with only 35% of the refugee incentive teachers and national teachers officially qualified. Refugee teachers may not be as well qualified as the national host teachers but on occasion they are better educated than the national population, or can be considered as alternatively qualified.

However, when teachers of refugees are not qualified and/or certified, or do not have the ability to obtain the required credentials, this can hinder student advancement and the certification of refugee students. For example, in Kenya schools must have at least 10 nationally qualified teachers to be eligible as an examination centre for the Kenyan Certificate of Primary Education (KCPE). In Dadaab, where most teachers are ‘incentive’ teachers lacking formal qualifications, the schools in which they are the only teachers cannot be included in the exams. However, in this case, Dadaab refugee schools were temporarily granted status with the agreement that the camp would build a pool of qualified staff and provide remuneration packages that would draw qualified Kenyan teachers to work in Dadaab. Yet this policy also stipulates that Kenyan teachers require a mother tongue-speaking refugee classroom assistant to translate, which can be costly, and is far from ideal for a smooth learning process.

In the absence of standardised mechanisms for accrediting teachers, potential teachers are excluded from the pool of candidates as a result of a lack of credentials. In light of this, the INEE Minimum Standards recommend that, if qualified teachers no longer have certificates or other documents because of the emergency, their teaching skills should be assessed. NGOs in Pakistan have done
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just this, by giving qualification tests to refugee teachers during the recruitment process. However, as Ring and West point out, the practice of ‘emergency credentialing’ can bring about its own set of problems by reducing trust, respect, accountability and the status of teachers.

Standardising credentials criteria can help governments incorporate teachers in the aftermath of crisis. Working across borders to ensure certifications achieved in host countries are honoured upon a return to the country of origin requires careful coordination between MoEs. This type of collaboration is essential, otherwise, even if a refugee teacher obtains qualifications abroad, there is no guarantee of them being recognised when they return home. Granted, cross-border cooperation assumes that the country of origin is receptive whereas, in cases where the government is the perpetrator of violence, this can be extremely challenging. Nevertheless, there is no denying that the recognition of these credentials has a long-term impact on the livelihoods of the recipients.

One of the best examples of cross-border communication to coordinate certification efforts for post-repatriation is that of Guinea and Liberia. Crisp et al. describe the process: after prolonged negotiations with the Liberian Ministry of Education, it was agreed that IRC’s [the International Rescue Committee’s] teacher training program in Guinea was acceptable as a qualification for a ‘C-level’ teacher training qualification in Liberia. A tracer study conducted once these teachers repatriated to Liberia highlights this success. The training that teachers received in Guinea was used both inside and outside the classroom, and two thirds of those trained by the IRC in Guinea were employed as teachers, often in their old school.

Shepler advocates for collaboration between MoEs to ensure that certification upon repatriation is not lost, perhaps in the form of regional teacher certification systems.

Research gaps on recruitment, certification and selection of teachers

As highlighted earlier, there are several gaps in the evidence on the recruitment, certification and selection of teachers. First and foremost, there is hardly any available data on teachers’ background characteristics, including language, ethnic and religious characteristics, and educational qualifications (and/or teaching experience), as a result of the lack of formal recruitment systems in most contexts. Consequently, teachers are hired ad hoc and are not selected based on specific needs and priorities in education systems. Thus, there is a need for more research on who teachers of refugees are and their background and experience.

Second, because overall data on teachers of refugees is lacking, it is not possible to know the extent to which persons with disabilities and females are represented in the teaching workforce. In instances when they are underrepresented, it is critical to understand what the barriers are to their participation in the teaching workforce.

There is not enough research yet into what it would take to recognise various certifications that teachers obtain, and how these certifications can be taken across borders and upwards in the teaching career ladder.

Chapter 6

Teacher preparation and professional development
Teacher development and training is in most cases largely neglected during conflict. Ring and West argue that, especially in refugee and emergency settings, teacher professional development that helps new teachers with ‘contingency planning, awareness of violence/attack, and psychosocial emotional learning challenges is paramount but is often missing’. However, the provision of training programmes is dependent on funding and other resources. During emergencies, resources are limited, and other priorities, such as food, water and shelter may take precedence over teacher development. Although there may be ample training opportunities, often organised ad hoc by international NGOs, these one-off, short-term and unaligned trainings do not contribute to the certification of teachers; nor are they recognised nationally. This is the case in South Sudan, where teachers in refugee or IDP settings often receive a wide variety of training from the different NGOs that work in camps, but the trainings are one-offs and not cumulative and do not lead to any kind of certification. Here, this challenge owes in part to the absence of teacher certification frameworks within the host country; however, in countries where such frameworks exist refugee teachers are often excluded. The South Sudan Education Sector Plan (ESP) aimed to ensure that (1) the country developed a training certification mechanism for its own teachers and (2) teachers in refugee and IDP settings benefited from this framework.

Governments are often aware of the importance of teacher training. A survey of 36 Education Sector Plans (ESPs) by the World Bank showed that teacher training was a pressing need, with a heavy focus on in-service training, particularly as pre-service training is either absent, inconsistent or of low quality. In difficult settings, like refugee camps or urban schools housing refugees from multiple backgrounds, competent teachers are indispensable to success and, in the right form, teacher training can be a productive mechanism to improve the quality of teaching. However, as Ring and West found in their literature review, there is limited information on professional development in refugee and emergency settings, and the majority of available information provided is often anecdotal evidence of poor teaching practices.

Although there may be ample training opportunities, often organised ad hoc by international NGOs, these one-off, short-term and unaligned trainings do not contribute to the certification of teachers; nor are they recognised nationally.

Some evidence suggests that teachers in refugee settings are not adequately equipped to address and manage the context-specific needs of their students. In their study of Syrian students in schools in the Middle East, Culbertson and Constant found that schools and teachers were generally unprepared to handle traumatised students in need of psychosocial support.187 Similarly, in Algeria and Ethiopia, Ring and West found that teachers reported having discipline issues, psychological problems and a lack of motivation among their students.188 Teachers felt demotivated by ‘their perceived inability to “reach” their students or adequately address the trauma and related problems with which students were grappling’.189 Meanwhile, these same teachers indicated that their placement in rural refugee schools limited their access to professional development and networking opportunities.190

Few countries have explicitly addressed how national teachers will accommodate the needs of refugee children. This is arguably the biggest challenge facing refugee education: ensuring that teachers, whoever they may be, have the knowledge and skills to meet the needs of complex (refugee) learners, including psychosocial skills and behaviours. For instance, in Turkey, according to the 3RP, national teachers will receive training to enable them to meet the social and pedagogic needs of refugee children who are not proficient in Turkish.191 Syrian teachers are currently allowed to provide services to other Syrians in Turkey; nearly 12,000 Syrian volunteer teachers are paid incentives.192 UNICEF reported a different figure, stating that there were at least 3,650 Syrian teachers working in camps and that the Turkish Ministry of National Education (MONE) had agreed to use the Syrian curriculum (academic year 2012/13).193 The MONE also agreed to mobilise Syrian teachers as volunteers, both in camps and in host communities. Syrian teachers will now be factored into national education plans and be a resource to support the education response to Syrian refugees.194 This task will be made especially challenging as the government and its partners do not necessarily have data for teachers living outside of the camps or working in private Syrian-run schools.195

Psychosocial training in refugee contexts is particularly important because the insecurity inherent to refugee situations can ‘harm children’s physical, intellectual, psychological, cultural and social development’.196 Moreover, trauma and disruption have the potential to have long-term impact and lay the foundations for the next generation to engage in revenge, conflict and displacement.197 Experiences in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Croatia show that basic training in the signs of psychological trauma that explained behavioural changes in students helped teachers cope in their roles.198 In Jordan, smaller teacher training programmes have focused on training newly hired teachers in classroom management and dealing with traumatised students.199

Teachers need training, especially to be able to handle spontaneous and potentially dangerous situations, as described by Dryden-Peterson and Adelman in the case of two Syrian students: ‘One student had drawn the revolutionary flag and the other had drawn the regime flag’.200 The teacher was able to diffuse the situation as a result of the training, and continue with the lesson, but this example puts into focus the importance of teaching teachers to manage students who are

sometimes aggressive and have dealt with extreme trauma.\textsuperscript{201} Despite evidence that points to the importance of psychosocial programmes in schools for the long term, the majority of education systems have not yet adapted.\textsuperscript{202}

Teachers also need training on the language of instruction, the national curriculum and pedagogical skills for multi-grade classrooms and classrooms with special needs learners and/or learners who have missed a significant amount of school. It is also important that teachers of refugees have training on ways to reinforce and support social cohesion strategies. In sum, teachers of refugees are working in complex environments, where class sizes are typically large and classrooms are comprised of learners of different cultures, ages, academic backgrounds and learning abilities. As such, training and ongoing support are critical for such teachers.\textsuperscript{203}

**Formal training**

INEE recommends that teacher training be designed to fulfil national requirements and to qualify teachers of refugees so they can eventually join the regular teaching force.\textsuperscript{204} Formal training also mitigates possible problems with MoEs, which may be unfamiliar with non-formal teacher training programmes or disapprove of such programmes’ methods.\textsuperscript{205}

However, full-time training in an official institution leading to a recognised qualification is expensive and may not be accessible to refugees. In many settings in Africa, refugee teachers do not meet the minimum eligibility requirements to enter a teacher training college. Moreover, these courses take place in institutes, often in urban areas, and take teachers away from schools for an extended period of time, with no guarantee of return upon graduation.\textsuperscript{206} Alternatively, distance education is an option.\textsuperscript{207} While distance education programmes leading to qualifications through correspondence may take longer, this option allows teachers to continue teaching and receive compensation throughout training; granted, it does demand a great deal of effort from the teacher.\textsuperscript{208}

In many emergency settings, teachers are often hired quickly, \textit{ad hoc}, and there is not enough time to ensure they are trained.\textsuperscript{209} In Jordan, the rapid expansion of the education system as a result of the influx of Syrian refugee students has meant that systematic training for newly appointed teachers is not always possible, particularly those appointed on contract.\textsuperscript{210} Nonetheless, training has been offered to newly appointed teachers and teachers in schools hosting large numbers of Syrian students (approximately 2,550 teachers in 2013), and also to 450 MoE officials, to enhance their capacity to support teachers in schools.\textsuperscript{211} In addition to this, by mid-2016 the MEHE in Lebanon had trained 493 national teachers on the main core academic subjects, class management and the INEE Minimum Standards.\textsuperscript{212}

The Kenyan government has sought to reduce classroom pupil–teacher ratios by sending untrained or ‘incentive’ refugee teachers to attain P1 Diploma and Early Childhood Development Certificates. These newly certified teachers are then integrated into host community institutions.\textsuperscript{213} Primary teachers working in Kenya are supposed to have scored a C grade on the Kenya Certificate for Secondary

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{201} Wamberg (2013); \textsuperscript{202} Culbertson and Constant (2015); \textsuperscript{203} INEE (2015); Mendenhall, Buckner and Russell (2017); \textsuperscript{204} INEE (2010a); \textsuperscript{205} Mendenhall (2014); \textsuperscript{206} Crisp et al. (2001); \textsuperscript{207} Shepler (2011); \textsuperscript{208} Crisp et al. (2001); \textsuperscript{209} IIEP-UNESCO (2010); \textsuperscript{210} Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation, Kingdom of Jordan (2014); \textsuperscript{211} ibid.; \textsuperscript{212} 3RP (2016a); \textsuperscript{213} Sesnan et al. (2013).}
Education and the minimum certification is a P1, achieved after two years in a teacher training college. In Ethiopia, there is one summer course available to teachers at Sheder and Aw-barre camps, taking place at the Jigjiga College of Teacher Education, but this course is contentious because of the limited number of slots available and the perception that ‘only refugee teachers’ or ‘only national teachers’ have access to it.

The reality in Kenya and Ethiopia, like in Jordan and Lebanon, is that many teachers of refugees have not benefited from these professional development opportunities. This being said, Mendenhall et al. also detail a successful teacher training programme in Kenya’s Kakuma refugee camp, where the Lutheran World Federation and Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology collaborated to offer refugee teachers and a few national teachers working in Kakuma an accelerated one-year diploma programme. Focused on curriculum, pedagogy, and content knowledge, the programme combined training in the afternoon and practical in-class time in the morning. According to Mendenhall et al., this year-long diploma is the most comprehensive professional development programme in Kakuma. By combining in-class time with training, teachers were able to put their new skills to use, while still earning their salaries, and schools were able to retain their teachers.

The United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) has invested heavily in education in general, and in teacher preparation in particular. UNRWA has put in place a foundation for teacher preparation, with degree-level pre-service training at universities and teacher training institutes. Graduates are then required to teach at UNRWA schools for two years. UNRWA’s 2013 Teacher Policy is aimed at supporting teachers in the classroom through ongoing professional development opportunities and motivational career growth opportunities. The School Based Teacher Development programme, aligned with this policy, emphasises active pedagogies, learning-focused classroom practices, assessment and an inclusive approach to raising student learning. The World Bank found that not only was the UNRWA able to attract and recruit high-quality teachers but also UNRWA students outperformed students in public schools. This is one positive example of a policy that appears to be effectively preparing and retaining its teachers of refugees.

Non-formal training

According to INEE, in-service teacher professional development is especially important in emergency settings in which education systems, curricular content, and education policy are rapidly evolving to meeting changing needs and where a lack of teaching capacity can amplify inequitable access, corruption, and fragmented community structures. This review found more information on informal training programmes than on formal ones. However, this may owe in part to the methodological bias towards documentation published by international organisations, discussed in Section 1.2. Non-formal programmes, while not leading to national certification, can fill the gap in emergency situations when teachers are desperately needed.

Within the same country and even refugee camp, training programmes differ. Some trainings are 10 days, over the school break; others take place over school holidays and sometimes over multiple years; some trainers work with in-school mentoring for teachers or mobile trainers. This is typically because, in a given context, there are multiple agencies, with different grants, projects and timeframes, against a backdrop of a lack of alignment, coordination and collaboration. In Kakuma, Kenya, training programmes for new teachers differ between schools. Most teachers in Kakuma have often only had a five-day induction training covering how to present a lesson to learners. In Turkey, professional development programmes for teachers have trained 7,000 Syrian volunteer teachers on methodologies, psychosocial support and classroom management. Also in Turkey, UNICEF has offered one-day trainings for Syrian teachers, with plans to expand the programme to include host community teachers.

In Jordan, World Vision has offered five- to 10-day trainings, while the British Council holds a four-month training and NRC, in collaboration with the Queen Rania Teacher Academy, has developed trainings for Syrian teachers and MoE staff. Meanwhile, UNESCO is supporting the Queen Rania Teacher Academy to provide a 30-hour training programme to 2,000 teachers in Jordanian schools that host large numbers of Syrian refugees.

The Teachers in Crisis Contexts (TiCC) Working Group has designed a Teacher Training Pack that can be used in the short term and over the longer term with refugee teachers. Created by INEE, Teachers College of Columbia University and several other contributors, the TiCC Training Pack is a free, open-source tool that offers a multi-pronged form of professional development, incorporating in-person training, ongoing peer coaching and teacher learning circles, and mobile mentoring, using WhatsApp. The Training Pack focuses primarily on pedagogical skills, and relies on four modules: (1) curriculum and planning, (2) child protection, wellbeing and inclusion, (3) pedagogy and (4) teachers’ role and wellbeing. Piloted in Kakuma, it has now been used in Bangladesh, Jordan, South Sudan and Uganda. Results from the Kakuma pilot and subsequent scale-up have been positive, and data from interviews and focus group discussions has shown that teachers feel much more prepared in the classroom and more confident as teachers. Similarly, data from classroom observations has shown that teachers are better equipped to manage large class sizes, discipline issues and even subject content and assessments.

Crisp et al. argue that measuring ‘training’ can be challenging and the efficacy of training programmes depends on the project staff, with wide variations in programme offerings. There is often insufficient time to roll out new programmes, and national teachers can perceive the shortening or lessening of pre-service training as a threat to the profession. In addition to programme duration and quality variations, a lack of coordination between partners delivering training can result in serious inefficiencies. In Dadaab, despite the number of partners working in education providing a variety of short capacity building workshops, there is no detailed data on how many of these trainings take place a year, or on how many or which teachers have undergone said trainings.
The methods of training are equally important. Several experts argue that the ‘cascade’ method, from the expert international or national consultants to master trainers and downwards, has little classroom impact, especially if it is followed by minimal supervision and follow-up. Short-term training programmes tend to emphasise ‘quick fix’ teacher training, at the expense of progressively building or rebuilding a national teaching force. In addition, non-formal trainings organised by NGOs are typically implemented in camp schools and rarely lead to any recognised qualifications for teachers. Bhutanese refugee teachers in Nepal, for example, are left without official qualifications, despite their hard work, motivation and commitment to the job, and a great deal of non-formal training. As such, teachers who participate in a multitude of non-formal trainings, sometimes with significant overlap in content, without ever being able to certify their learning into a qualifying credential, may be more likely to leave the profession. Despite these frustrations, Crisp et al. argue that these ad hoc trainings are cheap, provide teachers with relevant information and skills and can, therefore, be considered effective to some degree. Similarly, Mendenhall et al. accept that, while these courses are often too short, and not aligned with national standards and/or other trainings, ‘teachers with more training had clearer learning objectives than those who lacked training’.

In some contexts, refugee teachers do not have sufficient education themselves, thus providing ongoing professional development is a way to promote the retention and development of effective teachers so long as training includes subject knowledge. Informal training may also come in the form of peer-to-peer support. Ring and West found that teachers in the Sahrawi camps (Algeria) created informal professional development opportunities through a culture of peer training and teacher-to-teacher support. These teachers met regularly (daily and weekly) to get feedback on lesson plans, and newer teachers sometimes requested older teachers observe them in class. Teachers later reported that this informal support strengthened their classroom teaching.

As Mendenhall observed in her research, NGOs were hesitant to ‘have anything sustainable in refugee camps due to the overarching goal of encouraging refugees to return to their home countries’. Sommers similarly remarked that there was a tension between humanitarian ideals of providing education and those of the donors, who were reluctant to offer services of higher quality in the camps than what refugees would otherwise receive at home. Most organisations will want to transfer the human resources over to the MoE, in an effort to ensure teachers’ continued employment.

Long-term planning and creating programmes that can build up to certification can mitigate the challenges to post-conflict reconstruction. When education systems struggle to respond to the training backlog, there will often be an influx of untrained teachers. Even if many teachers have been trained by IOs, these organisations may not be in a position to cover the additional costs of integrating the new teachers. This lag between handing over these recently trained teachers may have a dire effect on the teachers, their livelihoods and, ultimately, their retention.

Research gaps on teacher preparation and development

In terms of teacher preparation and development, there are many gaps in the research. First, what training is available for national teachers of refugees? Is it effective? Little is known about the preparation of teachers in host countries and their experiences in teaching refugee children. Second, little is known about what training, if any, is available for teachers, either national or refugees, on social-emotional learning and psychosocial support for refugee children who have experienced trauma. Third, little is documented on refugee teacher training in second language acquisition, pedagogical skills for multi-grade classrooms and teaching learners with special needs, including learners who have missed a significant amount of school. It would be worthwhile to map existing trainings available for teachers of refugees to highlight gaps and topics for future trainings.

Finally, recent evidence suggests that technology is increasingly being used to train refugee teachers. However, little is known about the effectiveness of such trainings. Relatedly, there is a lack of research on how technology is being used to link teachers to communities of practice, mentorship, certification and higher education. As such, research is needed on how technology is being leveraged to prepare and support teachers of refugees.
Chapter 7

Teacher remuneration and incentives
In emergency settings, communities, parents or NGOs often hire teachers as volunteers, and financial or other material incentives are often non-existent. Initially teachers may work for free but they will most often quickly request some form of payment for their services. If teachers cannot receive payment, they will typically search for paid work, rather than teaching for free.

Where refugee teachers do not have the right to work they cannot earn a salary, but they may instead receive ‘incentive’ payments. In Lebanon and Jordan, for example, Syrian refugees cannot be employed as teachers, owing to labour laws that restrict public sector jobs (like teaching) to citizens. In refugee settings, the terminology used to categorise what is paid specifically to refugee teachers should be ‘incentives’, not ‘salary’ or ‘wages’, with the term ‘stipend’ used for training purposes. However, these ‘incentive teachers’ may feel this terminology and the small, often irregular, nature of the payments, undermine their professional status.

On top of being small these incentives may also risk being irregular, as they depend on donors, and salary disbursement to remote areas may be difficult. However, it is important to note that in some contexts refugee teachers are paid more regularly than local host teachers. Nonetheless, research shows that an education system’s ability to pay its teachers not only well but also on time is ‘closely linked with positive results such as teacher recruitment, retention, satisfaction and moral; factors that have themselves been connected with education quality’.

In Turkey, the law prohibits Syrian teachers from receiving salaries as they cannot obtain work permits or be placed on a payroll. They can receive incentives in the form of payment but these vary and are well below a living wage in Turkey. In lieu of salaries, the Turkish government has standardised incentive schemes for Syrian ‘volunteer’ teachers. A recent partnership between the Turkish MONE and UNICEF has led to the development of a legal framework for the formal inclusion of Syrian teachers in the education system and thus a sustainable solution to issues related to their payment. In late 2014, the postal bank signed an agreement protocol that governs the provision of standardised incentives, or compensation,
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for Syrian teachers in camps and host communities. The protocol establishes the first national mechanism for the payment of Syrian teachers through the MONE, with initial financial support from UNICEF.259

Although mixed, there is some evidence that non-monetary compensation can improve the living conditions of teachers with insufficient salaries and reduce turnover.260 For example, teachers may receive housing, bicycles, additional rations or other in-kind benefits. Ariko and Othuon found that teachers in Suba district, Kenya, were less likely to submit requests for transfers after transportation, housing and electricity improved.261 Nevertheless, teachers, like anyone else, ‘are rationally motivated by the availability of income’ as they must satisfy their and their families’ basic needs.262 There is little evidence on whether such incentives exist in refugee contexts, and, if so, whether they can reduce teacher turnover.

Sesnan et al. found that teachers tended to follow salaries, often moving away from refugee settlements to urban environments.263 In these urban areas, they are closer to the salary disbursement if they remain teachers; if they leave the profession, they are better positioned to look for new employment opportunities. Guajardo similarly found that teachers were more motivated when they were paid on time.264 Low pay forces teachers to find additional sources of income, but secondary or tertiary income activities divide teachers’ attention and motivation, which in turn negatively affects the quality of schooling.265

There is an undeniable link between monetary incentives, teacher motivation and levels of attrition as a result of job dissatisfaction.266 There is a real risk that paying refugee teachers less than what they deem appropriate or liveable will cause them to leave the profession. Qualified teachers lose interest because of poor incentives and unsupportive and deteriorating working conditions.267 Refugee teachers are often among the most highly educated people in camps, and will move to higher salaries if given the opportunity. Specifically, teachers will leave teaching and take jobs with NGOs and charities or other skilled work in the host country, or migrate to a third country where their skills can earn them a living. For example, Dryden-Peterson found that in Dadaab (Kenya) an average of 30 teachers out of total of 870 left the profession each year, as they were frustrated with low pay, given their professional experience, and because they felt they could find better-paying jobs or at least earn the same pay for less work.268 Yet what is interesting is how many teachers stay, despite these issues. This is an area where future research could support teacher retention strategies.

Refugee teachers’ pay is often significantly lower than that of national teachers who are working the same amount. The assumption underlying this lower pay is that refugees rarely have to pay for housing, food, schooling or medical care. Indeed, as Ring and West found in Ethiopia, refugee teachers were paid less than national teachers.269 Likewise, refugee teachers in Algeria earned on average $33 per month, compared with national teachers, who earned $700–1,000 per month. Not only did this lower refugee teachers’ perceived status in both the community and the classroom, but also they were also more likely to leave the profession.270 Moreover, these glaring disparities in salary turned away many would-be teachers in Ethiopia, who then pursued other professions they perceived as more lucrative.

and respected. In response to this challenge, Talbot advocates for incentive scales to be equitable, graduated and sustainable, and to reflect qualifications, experience, teaching hours and performance. In Lebanon, for example, teachers are compensated equally based on standards developed by the Education Working Group. Standardising incentive scales not only can help ease tensions between teachers employed by different organisations but also can assist governments to incorporate teachers in the aftermath of a crisis.

Funding teachers of refugees

One of the biggest challenges in refugee contexts lies in devising an affordable and appropriate payment structure for teachers. This is a balancing act because resources are limited and there is a need to recruit a sufficient number of teachers, but if salaries are too low this may dissuade qualified candidates and lead teachers to leave the profession. Considering that their salaries often make up around 70% of primary budgets, teachers are also the ‘the important variable determining the cost-effectiveness of education expenditures’. The World Bank argues that market forces – cost of living, supply and demand, and opportunity costs – shape the appropriate levels of teacher compensation. Nevertheless, evidence has shown that refugee teachers often earn less than a living wage. Salaries below the subsistence level create other challenges to quality education provision. For example, teachers may have to subsidise their income through other work.

In Liberian and Sierra Leonean refugee camps, UNHCR and IRC developed an education system through which they created some of the most educated populations in West Africa. However, there were several challenges surrounding teacher payments. Refugee teachers were initially paid $40 a month, calculated based on the local market value of a teacher. These incentives were called ‘stipends’ because Guinea barred refugees from working, even though in practice it was effectively IRC that employed the teachers. Competition between NGOs and agencies arose during the recruitment for best refugee teachers, and incentives were driven up as a result. In 2001, IRC, which had been running refugee schools in Guinea for a decade, and had become the de facto MoE of refugee camps, instituted a 10% cut in teacher stipend rates, in an effort to promote community ownership, and encouraged Sierra Leonean communities to contribute modest fees to make up this cut. The stipend cut backfired and IRC lost 30–35% of its teaching force. To win the teachers back, it raised the wage by 25% because neither the IRC nor donors wanted to lose the investment made in training the refugees. Most teachers went back to their former jobs but only after receiving the higher amount.

Hiring more teachers of refugees and paying the additional salaries is a serious issue in the largest refugee hosting countries in the Middle East: Jordan, Lebanon and Turkey.

---

Schools (often semi-permanent), provide learning materials, train teachers and pay the cost to incentivise teachers directly in lieu of salaries, but they are reluctant to pay recurrent costs, if they are not providing budget support. Schools that are funded by international actors are seen as unsustainable, often sourcing their financing from a combination of international donors, diaspora, NGOs and volunteers.

The existence of artificial boundaries between short-term ‘relief’, medium-term ‘reconstruction’ and long-term ‘development’ informally ascribes the roles and responsibilities of international actors. Mendenhall writes that the concept of a ‘relief-development continuum’ implies a smooth linear transition between humanitarian relief and development assistance. Developing countries often over-budget investments and underestimate wages, since donors have a tendency to provide funds for new investments, which are regarded as the main drivers for development.

Other intentional actors play a part in shaping national government policies around managing teachers. As Baxter and Bethke point out, the International Monetary Fund may place ceilings on staffing, affecting the government’s ability to recruit additional teachers, including those recruited to teach refugees. Budget support, multi-donor trust funds (MDTFs) and pooled funding for joint programmes can help fund government expenditures for salaries. Dolan et al. argue that MDTFs not only can provide significant opportunities for paying teacher salaries but also can mitigate donor concerns by allowing accountability mechanisms to be built into programme design.

Research gaps on teacher remuneration and incentives

One of the most glaring gaps in research on teachers relates to how the plethora of projects and programmes and funding modalities affect teachers, including their compensation, retention and opportunities for career advancement. Specifically, how do project cycles affect teachers? It is also important to better understand situations where development funding is used to cover recurrent staff costs, including salaries for teachers of refugees. Finally, in some refugee settings, retention of teachers is actually possible; further investigation into the reasons for this is important.
Chapter 8

Teacher retention
In any context, the retention of ‘not just any teachers, but, rather, good teachers is a challenge’. The low remuneration discussed in the preceding chapter is one of the major factors affecting teacher retention in refugee settings. However, other factors around working conditions, social status, school location and teacher management practices also have an impact on teacher retention.

Factors affecting retention other than remuneration

Teachers in emergency settings face a host of challenges in their work environment that mean retention is an issue. First, teachers of refugees are in classrooms with students of varying cultural, ethnic, religious and linguistic backgrounds, ages and learning levels. In Dadaab refugee camp, where teachers have overcrowded classrooms and a large number of over-age pupils, these factors ‘will continue to push teachers out of the profession and drive down conditions for quality teaching and learning if not addressed’. Second, teachers have limited resources with which to perform their duties. Across several refugee camps in Algeria and Ethiopia, teachers complained of the lack of teaching and learning resources.

Among the camps Ring and West visited in Algeria and Ethiopia, teachers discussed the difficulty in adjusting to the harsh climate and isolated environment. Additionally, teachers expressed that they had to travel long distances to school each day, with little or no access to transportation. Refugee camps are on land designated by the government, which is often in remote locations with sparse local populations. The conditions and locations of these camps are typically not what national teachers in urban settings are accustomed to. The principle factor that should determine the deployment of teachers is of course the location of refugee students, but there are often few qualified national (or host country) teachers working in refugee communities, as they are hesitant to work in such unstable and inhospitable environments.
Certain posts may require additional resources and support to keep teachers connected with colleagues in other locations. In addition to increased pay and housing benefits, mentoring systems can provide support to teachers posted in remote areas. Ring and West found in Ethiopia that both national and refugee teachers missed being part of a teachers’ union and expressed a strong desire to be ‘linked to the outside world’ through a teachers’ association that could provide access to their peers and additional resources, in addition to being linked to local community. Both non-formal and formal training support for teachers of refugees is crucial. Indeed, ‘there is a critical relationship between preparation and retention and that recruiting unqualified teachers (and not preparing them adequately) ultimately leads to higher levels of teacher turnover.’ As highlighted earlier, when teachers do not feel confident or prepared to support students they can become very demotivated.

In emergency settings, teachers are frequently managed by multiple agencies, with different priorities, rules and agendas. As Sesnan et al. highlight, there are relatively few examples of effective alignment between the various agencies that oversee teachers, which results in the inconsistent application of rules and requirements. These inconsistencies, coupled with a lack of transparency in teacher management processes (recruitment, deployment, etc.) not only are powerful demotivators for teachers but also may turn teachers away from entering or remaining in the profession. Thus, establishing management structures that coordinate the multiple agencies involved in providing teachers for refugees to ensure effective management will affect the morale and ultimately the retention of these teachers.

The social status and recognition of teachers also affect teacher motivation and, subsequently, their retention. In Ethiopia, for example, the biggest issue teachers faced was low social status. Similarly, also in Ethiopia, Ring and West found that the teaching profession had little status, even if teachers did receive positive recognition from their communities. Low compensation, coupled with the negative attitudes of national teachers towards refugee teachers, is one of the reasons for teachers’ perceived lack of status and recognition.
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In short, there are several threats to teachers’ motivation in emergency settings and, consequently, their retention. From workload and classroom challenges to geographic and professional isolation, and a lack of recognition, teachers of refugees face stresses in their contexts in addition to the typical challenges of low-resource contexts.

**Research gaps on teacher retention**

Notably, there is a lack of research on the working conditions and wellbeing of teachers of refugees. In particular, refugee teachers, who have themselves experienced conflict and possibly trauma, not only are entering the classroom often with inadequate preparation but also are coping with their own psychological, emotional and/or physical challenges. Thus, research is needed on what services are available to refugee teachers and whether teachers are accessing these. It is also important to better understand challenges to teacher retention, specifically related to how teachers in refugee settings are managed.
Chapter 9

Conclusion
The purpose of this literature review has been to survey policies, practices and debates surrounding the management of teachers for refugee populations. Despite the importance of teachers in these settings, this literature review has found that comprehensive information on who is teaching refugees and how these teachers are managed is limited.

Specifically, information and resources on policies and practices related to the selection of a teaching force and its subsequent management are difficult to find. When this information does exist, it often covers only one aspect of the teacher management, taking for granted the interwoven nature of the aspects involved. Moreover, much of the available literature on the management of teachers of refugees is out-dated, and there are stark gaps in data and evidence on particular topics in each of the selected countries of study. For example, there is very little available information on teachers’ salaries in refugee contexts in middle income host countries such as those hosting Syrian refugees. Relatedly, a significant portion of the available literature presents programmatic recommendations and suggestions on how to apply best practices from low-resource contexts or post- or non-conflict contexts. In addition, such literature often relies on anecdotal observations of what seem to be the issues. Hence, more comprehensive research on the multiple facets involved in the management of teachers of refugees is critical.

The literature does reveal that international policies relating to teachers are often at odds with each other. INEE suggests that teachers be selected primarily from the affected community, whereas UNHCR and the global education community at large recommend students be integrated into host country systems. Yet integrating refugee teachers into host country education systems in order to teach refugee students may be legally impossible, particularly when these teachers do not have the right to employment. This leaves a gap between what is seen as the best solution and what is actually feasible. It is important, therefore, to better understand how to overcome these challenges, to make it possible to effectively include refugee teachers in national education systems, or to align with them where this is not possible, rather than perpetuating an ad hoc, parallel system of teacher management. Further research in a select number of refugee hosting countries would go a long way towards generating an understanding of what
policies have been most effective in supplying and managing quality teachers to refugee populations.

In light of this, more research is needed to understand what host governments managing large refugee populations have done to reconcile the tensions between their international obligations and their capacities to fulfil these. Relatedly, research is needed on how the Global Compact of Refugees will affect government capacity to effectively manage teachers of refugees. Overall, we need to learn more about how to provide education to refugee children by better exploring examples of teacher management models.

The choice of teachers in refugee contexts has long-term consequences for the quality of education received, especially since crises are increasingly protracted. National teachers and refugee teachers are subject to different laws and have different professional development opportunities and different monetary and non-monetary incentives to teach. Much of the literature indicates that teachers from the refugee community are best placed to teach, or should at least be a part of education provision. Indeed, host countries are aware of this, and are utilising refugees to support national teachers, as is the case to some extent in Jordan, Lebanon, Kenya and Turkey. Nevertheless, in most contexts more and more national teachers are teaching refugees, with very limited support and preparation.

As much of the research supports the notion that refugee teachers are typically best placed to teach refugee students, much of the literature featured in this review focuses on these teachers. As such, there continues to be little information on national teachers charged with teaching refugees. Fragmented information on refugee teachers, coupled with a lack of information on host teachers charged with refugee students’ education, points to a need for more research. A comparative study of both refugee and host country teachers of refugees would highlight best practices for each group.

Lastly, the literature shows that teachers are often excluded from dialogue. Issues like the portability of certification and adequate pay are important management factors for both refugee and national teachers. Yet, beyond these issues, there are few studies that critically analyse teachers’ perceptions. A wider study of how teachers of refugees perceive their selection and management would go a long way to ensuring policies and programmes are appropriate, effective and sustainable. Research on policy makers’ understanding and perceptions of teachers of refugees, and their management, would likewise be helpful.

The provision of education to the millions of refugee children in exile is an immense task that requires long-term commitment, coordination between governments and their partners, and evidence-based policy choices for host governments. There is an urgent need to conduct research around the policies and practices related to recruitment, certification, professional development, incentives and retention. The expanding field of education in emergencies would benefit from increased research because, as the past few years have illustrated, there is sadly no end in sight to the need to provide education services to displaced populations.
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Education Development Trust... we've changed from CfBT

We changed our name from CfBT Education Trust in January 2016. Our aim is to transform lives by improving education around the world and to help achieve this, we work in different ways in many locations.

CfBT was established nearly 50 years ago; since then our work has naturally diversified and intensified and so today, the name CfBT (which used to stand for Centre for British Teachers) is not representative of who we are or what we do. We believe that our new company name, Education Development Trust – while it is a signature, not an autobiography – better represents both what we do and, as a not for profit organisation strongly guided by our core values, the outcomes we want for young people around the world.