



BARRIERS TO EDUCATION FOR SYRIAN REFUGEE CHILDREN IN LEBANON

OUT OF SCHOOL CHILDREN PROFILING REPORT

NOVEMBER 2014

SUMMARY

The Syria crisis, now in its fourth year, has led to an unprecedented number of refugees in the Middle East. Since the spring of 2011, more than one million refugees have arrived in Lebanon to seek refuge from the civil war that rages in their home country. The arrival of such high numbers of refugees in a country of approximately 4 million people has a significant socio-economic impact. Public services are under pressure and struggling to meet the needs of local residents as well as those arriving as a result of the crisis. Education, as a service, has not been spared.

The majority of refugees crossing the border into Lebanon are children¹ and providing them with an education is a top priority. However, despite having generously open access to its schools for a large number of refugee children, the Lebanese education system (LES) and its public schools lack both the capacity and the resources to accommodate the large increase in the number of school-aged children. This, along with a complex interrelated set of other barriers, has resulted in a large out of school population among Syrian children and youth. While the exact number of out of school children is unknown, UNHCR estimates that 420,000 Syrians aged 6-14 are in need of education services², and many of these children have been out of school for 2 or more years.

This report aims to paint a clearer picture of these out of school children (OOSC) and better understand their profiles and the barriers they face in order to strengthen UNHCR's planning for the next academic year. The findings of this assessment will feed into the design of the strategies to enrol them in programmes adapted for their age and needs. It will also call to attention the need for additional research on the out of school population in order to have more effective targeting of these beneficiaries.

Overall, the study found that the main barriers to accessing education are multiple and often overlap. These barriers range from financial constraints such as the cost of transportation or school supplies and the need for support of family economies, to structural reasons such as lack of capacity in schools, the need of official documentation and differences in curriculum³. These barriers can vary in their impact; they can either prevent enrolment or attendance of Syrian refugees or are potential causes for dropout. Moreover, the report found that the importance and impact of these barriers differs from one geographical area to another. For example, while security - the fear of passing checkpoints and the possibility of armed conflict - is an issue across Lebanon, the problem is particularly acute in certain areas such as Wadi Khaled and Aarsal.

Finally, the assessment revealed that many solutions already exist. Some of these solutions are being implemented and others would help improve outreach and retention. Formal and non-formal education provided by UNHCR, UNICEF and their implementing partners have made great strides in providing opportunities for access to education. Limited awareness of these services among Syrian refugees remains a key challenge.

Overall, this study found that it is of utmost importance to have more efficient and innovative outreach mechanisms to make sure Syrian refugees are aware of the education opportunities available to them, that additional funding needs to be made available to accommodate specific challenges such as transportation, and that certain areas of the country require deviations from national standards to effectively address education needs for OOSC.

¹ [Syrian refugees in Lebanon surpass one million](#), UNHCR, April 3, May 2014

² Lebanon: RRP6 Monthly Update, Education, UNHCR, May 2014

³ These barriers are ranked in order of importance according to the parents of OOSC interviewed

CONTENTS

Summary	2
Contents	3
Abbreviations and Acronyms	4
Geographic classifications	4
Education sector terminology.....	5
List of figures and maps.....	5
Introduction	6
Methodology	7
Secondary data review/Field visits.....	7
Primary data collection.....	7
Spatial analysis.....	8
Challenges and limitations	8
Findings	10
Low Levels of Enrolment.....	10
Major Barriers to Accessing Education and Causes of Dropout	12
Hard Barriers or Barriers to Accessing Education.....	12
Soft Barriers or Causes of Dropout.....	19
Conclusion	23
Annexes	24

About REACH

REACH is a joint initiative of two international non-governmental organizations - ACTED and IMPACT Initiatives - and the UN Operational Satellite Applications Programme (UNOSAT). REACH facilitates the development of information tools and products that enhance the capacity of aid actors to make evidence-based decisions in emergency, recovery and development contexts. All REACH activities are conducted within the framework of inter-agency aid coordination mechanisms.

For more information about REACH and to access our information products, please visit: www.reach-initiative.org and www.reachresourcecentre.info. You can also write to our in-country team at: lebanon@reach-initiative.org and to the REACH global team at: geneva@reach-initiative.org. Follow us @REACH_info.

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

ALP	Accelerated Learning Programs
BLN	Basic Literacy and Numeracy
CBE	Community Based Education
FGD	Focus Group Discussions
IS	Informal Settlement
IP	Implementing Partner
JENA	Joint Education Needs Assessment for Syrian Refugee Children
LES	Lebanese Education System
MEHE	Ministry of Education and Higher Education
MSNA	Multi Sector Needs Assessment
NFE	Non Formal Education
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization (s)
INGO	International Non-Governmental Organization (s)
OOSC	Out of School Children
ROV	Refugee Outreach Volunteers
RRP6	Regional Response Plan
UNHCR	United Nations High Commission for Refugees
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund

GEOGRAPHIC CLASSIFICATIONS

Operational Area	Refers to UNHCR regional operational areas in Lebanon. There are five UNHCR sub-office regions in Lebanon: Akkar, Bekaa, Mount Lebanon/Beirut, Tripoli T5 and South. The operational area of Akkar coincides with the governorate of Akkar, and the operational area of Bekaa comprise the districts of Baalbek, El Hermel, Rachaya, West Bekaa and Zahle. However, the operational area of Mount Lebanon/Beirut includes the governorates of Beirut and Mount Lebanon. Tripoli T5 operational area refers to the districts of Tripoli, Batroun, Bcharre, El Minieh-Dennieh, Koura and Zgharta. The South operational area includes the governorates of South and El Nabatieh.
Governorate/ Mohafazat	Largest administrative division below the national level. Lebanon has eight governorates: Bekaa, Baalbek / Hermel, Beirut, El Nabatieh, Mount Lebanon, North, Akkar and South.
District/Caza	Second largest administrative division below the national level. Each governorate is divided into districts or cazas. Lebanon has 26 districts.
Cadastre/ Cadastral zone	Geographic classification which are below the level of district/caza. Cadastral is not an administrative division and is used solely by humanitarian practitioners in Lebanon. Cadastrals may encompass one or more contiguous villages/neighbourhoods.
Municipality	Smallest administrative division in Lebanon. Municipalities serve villages and urban areas. There are 985 municipalities in Lebanon.

EDUCATION SECTOR TERMINOLOGY

Term	Definition
Formal Education	Certified education services provided by the Ministry of Education schools.
Non Formal Education (NFE)	Non-formal education (NFE) is an organized educational activity outside the established formal system that is intended to serve an identifiable learning clientele with identifiable learning objectives. Non-formal education can be delivered by governments, UN agencies, trade unions, sports clubs, youth organizations and national institutions.
Drop Out	Previously attended school in Lebanon but no longer attending.
Out of School	Dropped out or never attended school in Lebanon.

LIST OF FIGURES AND MAPS

Figure 1: Sample size by sub-office	8
Figure 2: Main reasons for non-attendance of Syrian refugees	13
Figure 3: Main reasons for non-attendance by sub-office	14
Figure 4: Main reasons for non-attendance by type of accommodation	14
Figure 5: Main reasons for non-attendance by date of arrival.....	15
Figure 6: Type of education attended by sub-office.	16
Figure 7: Enrolment by type of education	17
Figure 8: Total number of registered Syrian refugees (ages 3-18 years).....	17
Figure 9: Access to documentation proving school attendance in Syria	18
Map 1: Density of OOSC by cadastre.....	10
Map 2: Estimated number of OOSC in Lebanon	11
Map 3: Estimated Number of OOSC in Akkar.....	24
Map 4: Estimated Number of OOSC in Bekaa.....	25
Map 5: Estimated Number of OOSC in Mount Lebanon and Beirut.....	26
Map 6: Estimated Number of OOSC in North (T+5)	27
Map 7: Estimated Number of OOSC in South	28

INTRODUCTION

Half of Syrian refugees in Lebanon are children⁴ and according to UNHCR, the number of school-aged children⁵ is now over 400,000, eclipsing the number of Lebanese children in public schools.⁶ It is crucial to provide these children with education opportunities as “the prospect of a better future recedes the longer they remain out of the classroom”⁷.

As a result of support from the Ministries of Education and Higher Education (MEHE) as well as the response provided by humanitarian actors⁸, 90,000 Syrian refugee children between the ages of 5 and 17 were enrolled in public schools in 2013/2014. More than 30,000 of these children were enrolled in a second shift program that delivers a lighter certified curriculum in Arabic for Syrian students who were not able to enrol in the first shift⁹.

Despite these achievements and the availability of non-formal education (NFE), it is estimated that more than 50% of Syrian refugee children aged 5 to 17 are not enrolled in any form of education (some children might be enrolled in private schools, but numbers are unknown)¹⁰. Adolescents in particular have few opportunities to participate in any form of education.

Many reports and assessments have identified lack of capacity in public schools, transportation costs, language of instruction, tuition fees, bullying, child labour, safety concerns of Syrian parents, and limited outreach to children over the age of 10 and vulnerable families as some of the main barriers to education. However, there is the need to refine this analysis at a micro level and better understand profiles of children, to deploy strategies to keep them in school and enrol them in adapted programmes for their age and needs.

The Out of School Children (OOSC) profiling was carried out to paint a clearer picture of out of school Syrian children in Lebanon and better understand their profiles and the barriers they face in order to strengthen UNHCR’s planning for the next academic year. The profiling took place during the months of May and June 2014 and included secondary data collection conducted in each of the five UNHCR field-offices, and household level assessments with the families of out of school children.

The findings of the OOSC report will feed into the design of the strategies to enrol them in adapted programmes for their age and needs and then to keep them in school. It will also call to attention the need for additional research on the out of school population in order to have even more effective targeting of these beneficiaries.

⁴ [The number of Syrian refugees in Lebanon passes the 1 million mark](#), UNHCR, April 3, May 2014

⁵ (5-17 years old)

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ [The number of Syrian refugees in Lebanon passes the 1 million mark](#), UNHCR, April 3, May 2014

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ [Education Update](#), UNHCR, January 2014

¹⁰ [Education Update](#), UNHCR Lebanon, April 2014

METHODOLOGY

According to the May 2014 Interagency Multi Sector Needs Assessment (MSNA)¹¹, there is a significant information gap concerning understanding who out of school children are, where they are, how many there are, and what types of education opportunities are available to them. This study aimed to create a snapshot of the various profiles of out of school children in Lebanon and to better understand the problems and potential solutions related to creating the conditions necessary for access to education.

To address the information gap identified in the 2014 MSNA, a two-stage methodology was employed. First, a secondary data collection and review was conducted in each of the five UNHCR field-offices in Lebanon through a combination of remote assessments and field visits. Second, a series of household level assessments were conducted with the families of out of school children.

SECONDARY DATA REVIEW/FIELD VISITS

The secondary data collection and review included a desk review of existing research and assessments related to out of school children and access to education from each field office, as well as a series of stakeholder interviews with key education partners. Inputs varied widely from office to office depending on what resources were readily available. Focus group discussions, interviews with education stakeholders, write-ups on critical issues around access to education, and accessing summarized protection monitoring data were part of the over-all process.

Information coming from key informants is, without exception, based on direct field visits by the interviewer, implementing partners, or one of their colleagues. Any insights taken purely from hearsay were discouraged and disregarded from analysis. Focus group discussions were conducted by partners and UNHCR with guidance and training provided by a REACH Assessment Specialist. The target group, discussion, and guideline questions for these discussions were not uniform throughout the study and so detailed methodologies of each discussion were determined by conducting partners.

PRIMARY DATA COLLECTION

The primary data collection component of this study was done through interviews with parents and children of households in which at least one OOSC lived. The surveys were conducted from the 1st to the 20th of June 2014. While initially it was imagined that these interviews would be conducted by UNHCR protection staff only, due to the willingness of other humanitarian partners to participate in the process, the interviews were conducted by partner protection teams, UNHCR registration staff, UNHCR field staff, and others.

The survey itself was designed to be rapid (approximately 20 minutes per household) and easily integrated into the normal work flows of those who were conducting it. Data collection staff was asked to complete as many assessments as possible, without disturbing their normal work, within the allotted timeframe. All forms were completed electronically on the ODK mobile data collection platform except for those in the South (Tyr) due to constraints with using electronic data collection devices in the field. In this case, registration staff completed the forms on a computer during the registration and renewal process. By completing the forms electronically, inaccuracies and inconsistencies in the data collection were largely avoided and resources were saved by eliminating a data entry period and mitigating the need for extensive data cleaning.

¹¹ [Inter-agency Multi-Sector Needs Assessment \(MSNA\) Phase One Report: Secondary Data Review and Analysis](#) (May 2014)

Data collection staff were trained to identify OOSC, to ask to speak to the head of their household and, with permission of all parties, to interview the parents and, when available, any children aged 11 or older. Each interview consisted of a series of questions that were asked *about each individual child*, so parents were asked to explain barriers for Child 1, Child 2, Child 3, Child 4, and Child 5. Children over the age of 11 were asked about themselves as well as the other children in the household.

The content of the survey was designed to collect basic information in a standardized way across all field offices. The data collected is not representative of the country as a whole, but rather serves as a collection of case studies to confirm or not the experiences of field staff reflected in information from the secondary data review and field visits.

SPATIAL ANALYSIS

The spatial analysis conducted as part of this study is the best estimation of both the number of OOSC and their location with available data. Enrolment data from Activity Info¹² on first and second shift, as well as non-ALP NFE programmes (mainly remedial programmes, as these are meant to target in-school children) was combined before being subtracted from school-aged (5-17 years old) population data taken from the UNHCR proGres registration system on a district by district basis.


Theoretically, this shows the number of children who are outside any education system within the coordination structures. That being said, there are significant limitations to this analysis due to the data upon which it is based, which itself has significant limitations. These limitations are explained in the section below.

CHALLENGES AND LIMITATIONS

Non-representative sampling strategy for primary data collection

Perhaps the most critical limitation of the methodology is that no representative sampling strategy was used for the household assessments due to resource limitations. This means that the results are not representative, geographically or numerically, at the national, field office, or district level, and so not generalizable. All findings from the primary data collection are therefore indicative rather than representative, and each household stands as a single case study. This also means that the results of this study cannot accurately provide numbers of out of school children, or even representative trends on barriers to access. Instead, indicative profiles and the best available data on enrolment and refugee population were generated. A total of 168 forms were collected.

Figure 1: Sample size by sub-office



¹² ActivityInfo is the agreed upon reporting mechanism for humanitarian action in Lebanon. All actors participating in the humanitarian coordination structures are asked to contribute their organization's data to this system.

Insufficient data for spatial analysis

Another major limitation is that the spatial analysis may be misleading in terms of overall trends and is most certainly not very accurate at the micro level. Theoretically, with perfect data on refugee locations and where students are enrolled in education programs, the spatial analysis would show gaps in coverage and areas with a high concentration of OOSC. Unfortunately, both data sets have significant limitations.

Registration data, while certainly the most accurate picture of the refugee situation in general, may have considerable issues in pinpointing exactly where refugees live. Locations are based on self-reporting and many recent arrivals may not know exactly where they live. Also, while refugees are meant to report a change in address, it is questionable how reliable the static location data can be given strong patterns of internal migration and displacement.

Enrolment data is accurate to the degree that education programs are run by participants in the education coordination structures, which are mainly composed of international NGOs (INGO). That being said, there is not an accurate measure on the scope of education programming outside official MEHE or INGO run programs as these programmes are run independent of UNHCR and partner support and do not report their data. Community based, religious based, Syrian and other education programs are frequently mentioned and their existence is well known, but there is not a monitoring mechanism that measures enrolment, curricula, or learning facility location. This represents a major obstacle to accurately understanding how many children are out of school.

Finally, the spatial analysis is based on location data which is inherently flawed because it does not convey outreach in any meaningful way. Enrolment numbers for a school can only be ascribed to the administrative district in which schools are located, rather than the “catchment areas” from which schools accepts students. Thus, when calculating the difference between enrolment and refugee population data in specific districts where refugees are known to live, districts with a school will tend to skew toward apparently full coverage (or even negative numbers of OOSC), while nearby districts in which refugees are known to live that do not have schools show up in the data as having 100% OOSC, even if students living there are enrolled in educational programming elsewhere.

Stakeholder interviews skewed towards INGO staff

Finally, one limitation to the methodology used during the stakeholder interviews is that there was not enough time allotted to speak to all categories of stakeholders. Most interviews were conducted with UNHCR or UNICEF implementing partners, specifically field staff or coordinators who work on education and child protection. One finding of this study is that more outreach needs to be done. This would include speaking directly to school directors and parents with children in school, working children, MEHE regional and national staff, and perhaps most critically, authorities at informal (Syrian or religious) schools.

Much of the work needed to gather information from this wide swath of people was done by the stakeholders interviewed. Indeed, it was precisely their insights that led to a greater understanding of the need to go beyond the international humanitarian community to better understand education dynamics from the perspective of the beneficiary. However, the study would have benefited from a greater opportunity to speak directly to more of these stakeholders.

FINDINGS

This section of the report presents the main findings from the Out Of School Children profiling and is comprised of:


- a an overview of levels of enrolment, density and numbers of OOSC by governorate;
- an analysis of the main barriers hindering Syrian children from entering the LES as reported in stakeholder interviews, focus group discussions, primary and secondary data collection and review, as well as recent education assessments conducted in Lebanon; and
- a presentation of findings related to shelter and other sectors of humanitarian assistance, notably in regards to tenure security and access to land, access to sanitation facilities, and livelihoods and income sources.

LOW LEVELS OF ENROLMENT


In order to identify gaps in coverage and areas with a high concentration of OOSC, existing data on school enrolment among Syrian children was collected, collated, and compared with UNHCR registration data. However, as mentioned previously (see methodology section), both data sets have significant limitations. Therefore, while the following maps indicate potential areas with high numbers of OOSC, they cannot be considered comprehensive.

The map below shows that Beirut and its southern suburbs have high numbers of OOSC. In the North, Tripoli and its surrounding areas, as well as parts of Akkar are the areas dense with OOSC. In Bekaa, the latter are mostly located around Zahle and Baalbek.

Map 1: Density of OOSC by cadastre



Map 2: Estimated number of OOSC in Lebanon



MAJOR BARRIERS TO ACCESSING EDUCATION AND CAUSES OF DROPOUT

As the maps above shows, there is a high number of OOSC in Lebanon and many of these children are concentrated in specific areas. Numerous reports have assessed the causes for low enrolment levels and have identified several common barriers hindering Syrian children from entering the LES. This section of the report presents the main findings on barriers reported in stakeholder interviews, focus group discussions, primary and secondary data collection and review, as well as recent education assessments conducted in Lebanon. The different barriers were split into two categories: “hard barriers” and “soft barriers”.

“Hard barriers” consist of barriers to enrolment such as lack of awareness of education opportunities or financial constraints. “Soft barriers”, on the other hand, do not impede a child from enrolling but may be the cause for his or her dropout. These range from bullying and mistreatment to language barriers. This classification gives an indication of the relative importance of different barriers on Syrian refugee children, however, some of these can be both ‘hard’ and ‘soft’ barriers concurrently. In addition, the assessment found that barriers to education and causes of dropout also vary from one region to another depending on geography, the security situation or the availability of services.

HARD BARRIERS OR BARRIERS TO ACCESSING EDUCATION


Lack of awareness

The most prevalent barrier to accessing education identified through the OOSC profiling was a lack of awareness of education opportunities amongst Syrian refugees. This barrier was overarching and may explain the fact that parents of OOSC surveyed by REACH declared that one of the main reasons why their children do not go to school in Lebanon was because there is a lack of opportunities (see figure 4) or because they did not know they were allowed. According to education partners, some families do not know about any opportunities or simply do not consider education options due to the confusion around the different types of education programs.

Focus group discussions (FGD) conducted for the study also demonstrated that a lack of awareness about funding opportunities was prevalent among Syrian refugees. Indeed, participants of the FGD held in Tripoli immediately said that the cost of education was the most important barrier to enrolment. The moderator informed them of funding for public schools and no participant knew of this. REACH’s survey of OOSC and their parents also found that the main reason why Syrian refugee children do not attend school in Lebanon was because parents “cannot afford tuition” (see figure 4), however MEHE and humanitarian agencies are providing refugees with financial aid for tuition fees. This implies that Syrian refugees may not know about this type of aid.

Indeed, interviews conducted with stakeholders revealed that many of the problems cited by Syrian refugees such as transport, cost of school supplies/tuition and the lack of education opportunities available to them could be due to an outreach and information issue. Moreover, parents may feel that the costs of finding out and registering in education opportunities is too great as they do not have the time or money to look for schools that can receive their children.¹³

¹³ Interview with Vanan Mandjikian (UNHCR), May 16, 2014

Figure 2: Main reasons for non-attendance of Syrian refugees¹⁴

The lack of awareness of available programmes which support the enrolment of Syrian refugee children was confirmed by Global Communities' Rapid Needs Assessment which reported that while UNHCR provides service to pay school registration fees along with uniform and transportation costs, more than 70% of Syrian refugee respondents reported that they did not know UNHCR provided public school registration support. Lack of awareness was not limited to refugees, as none of the school administrators interviewed knew of humanitarian actors providing assistance to Syrian refugees for school registration fees¹⁵.


Participants of the FGD said that better awareness campaigns are needed and this includes schools reaching out to them directly.¹⁶ **Improvement of awareness campaigns and outreach mechanisms is an important part of providing education opportunities to Syrian refugees.** There are, however, further questions to be answered on the topic of awareness before designing these. Indeed, the survey of OOSC found that reasons for non-attendance vary between sub offices. While safety is mentioned by respondents living in Tripoli +5 and Bekaa it is not mentioned in the South, Mount Lebanon and Akkar.

¹⁴ Respondents who responded "Other" did not specify the reason for non-attendance

¹⁵ *Global Communities Rapid Needs Assessment: Lebanon. Mount Lebanon Governorate, Choud, Baabda and Aley Districts*, Global Communities, November 2013


¹⁶ FGD conducted in Tripoli/T+5 by Vanan, May 22, 2014

Figure 3: Main reasons for non-attendance by sub-office



The survey also found that the level of awareness of education and financial support was affected by where Syrian refugees live. Figure 4 shows that refugees living in small shelter units cite ‘cannot afford tuition’, ‘transportation costs’ and ‘no opportunities’ as reasons for non-attendance more often than refugees living in informal settlements.


Figure 4: Main reasons for non-attendance by type of accommodation



How long a Syrian refugee has been living in Lebanon may also affect his or her level of awareness of education and financial support available. Figure 5 shows that Syrian refugees who arrived in Lebanon one to two years ago are less inclined to say that tuition fees are a barrier to attendance than refugees who arrived 6 months to a year ago. This appears to indicate that refugees who have been in the country for a significant amount of time are more informed about funding opportunities or may have found jobs which allowed them to cover their children’s schooling costs.

Therefore, **information about education, funding opportunities and specific schools upon arrival and at registration centres is increasingly crucial and would mean that refugees do not have to spend time and money (transportation costs, cost of fuel...) to try and find schools for their children.**

Figure 5: Main reasons for non-attendance by date of arrival



Further research areas

- Further research is required to determine who are unaware of education/financial support in Lebanon, where they live, and what type of accommodation they live in.
- Why are some Syrian refugees unaware of the existing opportunities?
 - Does time of arrival and length of stay in Lebanon affect levels of awareness of education/financial support? If so, how? Among those who are aware, in what ways have they become aware?
- Are some Syrian refugees unaware of education opportunities as implementing partners (IPs) are generally implementing and communicating on programs in areas with high concentration of refugees? Does information about education fail to reach refugees scattered/living in less populated areas? There is a need to determine if lack of awareness or the lack of opportunities is the real barrier to accessing education. Have families and their children moved since their registration, and are therefore unaware of education opportunities in the new area in which they reside?
- Does information come at a cost? Refugees may be unwilling to put the time and effort into finding out more about education opportunities for their children. A further study should explore at which point and why parents who initially wanted to enrol their children into some type of education gave up their search of education opportunities.


Lack of capacity

The significant increase in the number of school-aged children in Lebanon has put additional pressure on the LES. UNICEF estimates that there are approximately 275,000 Lebanese children in public schools with an estimated maximum capacity of 300,000¹⁷. In addition, in January 2014 the MEHE announced that the number of Syrian children per school (first shift) should not exceed 50% of the Lebanese children and that it should not entail additional costs (such as the provision of new classrooms or hiring additional contractual teachers). As a result of these factors, accommodating new students into public schools proves challenging.

In Aarsaal, the situation is of particular concern. Indeed, the southern valley has a high number of OOSC and there is a major gap in capacity. According to implementing partners in the area, all schools (public, private, Syrian-run...) in Aarsaal are overstretched¹⁸. The area needs new schools and more teaching staff. Unfortunately, very few Lebanese are willing to travel there for work and implementing partners are also somewhat reluctant to work in the area due to security concerns.

In Bekaa, there are cases of **Syrian teachers running ad hoc schools in Informal Settlements (IS)**, this **could be a potential solution to teacher shortage issues** in Aarsaal¹⁹. The OOSC survey revealed that Syrian-run schools are the second type of education most attended by Syrian refugees in Bekaa (see figure below).

Figure 6: Type of education attended by sub-office.



Additionally, as a result of overcrowding, many public schools have put a second shift or additional rooms in place to ensure they can enrol more students²⁰.

¹⁷ UNICEF Factsheet, May 16, 2014

¹⁸ Interview with Fabio Flori, Terre des Hommes, May 26, 2014

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ UNICEF Factsheet, May 16, 2014

Lack of space in public schools is not an issue everywhere in Lebanon but a full capacity mapping is not yet available. Indeed, first shifts, particularly in rural areas, have significant capacity for additional students. REACH's Public Schools Assessment in Akkar revealed that very few schools were over capacity. Overall, 55% (90 schools) in Akkar were reported by key informants as being at capacity, 11% (17 schools) as being over capacity, and 34% (56 schools) as being under capacity. Therefore, **bringing public schools to capacity with Syrian refugees in areas where they are not overcrowded is a viable option.**

In Beirut and Mount Lebanon, the majority of Syrian children are enrolled in first shifts while in Bekaa Syrian refugees are generally split evenly between first and second shifts (See figure 6).

Figure 7: Enrolment by type of education





Figure 8: Total number of registered Syrian refugees (ages 3-18 years)



Further research areas

- A future national education assessment should explore the current capacity of schools in order to identify the areas where there is potential space for Syrian students in first shifts as currently this type of data is only available for Akkar.
- Future assessments need to assess the willingness of school directors to accommodate Syrian refugees. Indeed, whether Syrian students are able to actually enrol also depends on the schools' willingness to accommodate them.

Loss of income and child labour

A key reason Syrian children do not attend school appears to be insufficient household income. Specifically, children feel the need or are obliged to participate in income generating activities to support their families in a country where the cost of living is higher than their country of origin. This is particularly true among older Syrian children²¹ living in rural areas or informal settlements (IS).

In Akkar, for example, Syrian children mostly work in agriculture, though some are apprentices for skilled professions²². According to some implementing partners, in IS, child labour is prominent as community leaders such as Shawishes receive some financial benefit when children work and therefore prevent children from going to school. To mitigate this issue, UNICEF in the Bekaa Valley has encouraged its implementing partners to better involve the community and Shawish in particular in education related interventions. In the Bekaa Valley this has meant employing the Shawish as a ‘supervisor’ of a nearby school. This new-found involvement allows the Shawish to receive a payment as well as improve the perception of education within the community. Currently, all UNICEF implementing partners are utilizing this method in Bekaa as child labour is a prevalent issue in the area, especially for seasonal agricultural work.


Other solutions that support prevention of Syrian refugee children from becoming child workers include creating additional non-formal learning centres and more life skills or vocational opportunities. These types of trainings and opportunities not only help children who have dropped out of school get back into class, but also due to their flexible scheduling, help thousands of child labourers attend class after work²³.

Official documentation needed for enrolment

The need for official documentation is another key barrier for Syrian access to the LES. FGD participants in Tripoli mentioned the issues with documentation and said that some school directors demand registration information before allowing the child to enrol. This occurs despite international donor commitment to paying fees for registered and unregistered children alike. A solution to this issue may be to give children an additional identification document or paper saying that they are entitled to education in Lebanon or otherwise communicating MEHE and international donor commitments to school directors and other local stakeholders.

REACH’s survey of parents of OOSC found that only 9 per cent of them have access to documentation proving that their child attended school in Syria (see figure 8).

Figure 9: Access to documentation proving school attendance in Syria



²¹ *The bell of an abandoned Lebanese public school rings again for Syrian students*, Your Middle East, March 17, 2014

²² Interview with Hassan Rajab, UNICEF Education Akkar – 5/29

²³ *Syria Crisis: Education Interrupted. Global action to rescue the schooling of a generation.*, UNICEF, World Vision, UNHCR, Save the Children

The need for official documentation or proof of education in order to pass official tests is a major hurdle for Syrian children. For example, for Syrian children to take the official government exam in grades 9 and 12, they must present proper certification from their schools in Syria proving that they have attended the previous year. However, many refugees do not have these papers with them and do not have the means or security to retrieve these papers from Syria.

A solution suggested by MEHE was to allow refugees to approach the Syrian embassy in Beirut to receive the needed documents, but many refugees are unwilling to do so, fearing repercussions from the Syrian regime. Many other refugees have entered the country illegally and while the Ministry of Education has issued a decree that allows enrolment independent of the legal status of the child, some school principals have decided not to implement this decision²⁴.

Safety

Safety issues are an important barrier to the integration of Syrian refugees into the education system. Syrian children feel endangered or are unsafe simply because going to school can be dangerous in itself. The critical security situation of an area may lead Syrian parents to not want to enrol their children in the LES altogether. According to implementing partners working in the field, this is the case in Tripoli, Wadi Khaled, Arsaal and Dahieh where Syrian refugees have safety concerns about travelling in or through certain areas due to checkpoints. Students and their parents fear harassment or violence, particularly if they are unregistered with Lebanese authorities or they have to travel through a specifically turbulent area. Maps 13, 14 and 15 (in the annexes) show high numbers of OOSC in these areas.

While it may not be realistic to effectively address external safety concerns in all areas of Lebanon, efforts can be made to involve the national government, local authorities, and other stakeholders and impress upon them the need to allow children to move freely to and from education programs. In informal settlements (IS), the inability for many children to travel due to safety concerns necessitates the use of non-formal learning programmes for out-of-school Syrian children²⁵. A FGD conducted with OOSC in Zahle showed that children would be willing to go to school if education was provided within the informal settlements they live in, as they would not have to travel to distant and possibly dangerous places by bus.

Humanitarian actors recognize that insufficient solutions have been provided to education issues born out of safety concerns in these areas but are now starting to implement education programs there. However, it is evident that there is the need to gather additional data in order to better understand the education needs of these areas and to design tailor-made evidence-based programs.

SOFT BARRIERS OR CAUSES OF DROPOUT

Language barriers

Foreign language instruction is one of the major barriers to the educational inclusion of Syrian refugees. It is both a barrier to enrolment and an obstacle to retention. According to the Joint Education Needs Assessment (JENA), “the language barrier remains a cross-cutting issue affecting Syrian children regardless of gender, socio-economic background or geographic origin”.

²⁴ *Lebanon-Syria: No school today - Why Syrian refugee children miss out on education*, IRIN News, August 8, 2012

²⁵ http://www.unicef.org/lebanon/Programme_Factsheet.pdf UNICEF Factsheet, 16 May 2014

As reported by the 2014 MSNA, from grade 1 to 9 all subjects should be taught in either French or English while Arabic is taught as a separate subject. If French is taken as the language of instruction from grade 1-6, children are introduced to English as a subject from grade 7 (and vice versa). In secondary school some subjects are taught in Arabic – philosophy, civics, history, and geography – while all others are in either French or English.²⁶

By contrast, in the Syrian education system, Syrian pupils are used to being taught all of their courses in Arabic. Therefore, Syrian refugees are having severe difficulties performing in the LES. Education specialists in the field pointed out that children are dropping out because of language challenges and this is reflected in the fact that the highest enrolment rate is for Grade 1 while dropout numbers peak and enrolment slumps at around Cycles 2 and 3 when languages are introduced in a more intensive way.²⁷

In addition, language barriers impede Syrian students from pursuing vocational training as technical schools have bilingual requirements²⁸. The JENA found that although vocational training was proposed as a possible solution to Syrian students who are not capable of pursuing formal learning, the language barrier was a cross cutting issue that held students back on all levels of learning.

Further research areas

- More research needs to be done to identify the exact grade at which Syrian refugees tend to drop out from school and understand what type of support would be most helpful to keep them in school.
- Second shift classes, in public schools, are taught in Arabic. Finding out how many children transition from second to first shift and why they do so is necessary.

Bullying and mistreatment

Bullying and mistreatment of Syrian refugees by both staff and pupils is common in Lebanon and has been observed through monitoring and child protection follow-up as well as through referrals via MEHE mechanisms. Issues can range from verbal harassment or neglect by pupils and staff to corporal punishment and physical mistreatment. If there is a case of physical violence towards a child then there generally is a follow-up; however this is not as systematic if the child is being verbally abused or threatened²⁹.

Students may also face bullying or, in the case of girls particularly, sexual harassment from both peers and drivers in public transport or school buses. This is why some agencies, such as SCI, have had to employ bus monitors to prevent and identify protection issues. However, according to the Akkar Education Working Group³⁰, there are too few bus monitors to adequately address the issue. For instance, SCI has one volunteer for every 15 school buses in Akkar. An alternative solution would be to have several parents accompany students on their bus journeys.

Addressing bullying and mistreatment of students at school and on their way to school is essential as Syrian refugee children may be experiencing violence and stress in other contexts such as at home and in the streets.

²⁶ Multi Sector Needs Assessment education chapter, June 2014

²⁷ Interview with Rawad Zakhour, UNHCR Education Associate, Zahle – 5/26

²⁸ *Joint Education Needs Assessment for Syrian Refugee Children in Schools, Communities and Safe Spaces*. Education Working Group, August 2013

²⁹ Interview with Rania Zakhia (UNICEF education) and Zeina Dib (UNHCR education) on June 6, 2014

³⁰ Meeting with Education Working Group, Akkar, May 29, 2014

Outreach mechanisms

From the perspective of addressing the needs of OOSC, outreach is amongst the critical issues to be addressed as it directly contributes to solving the issue of lack of information, which is so prevalent. While outreach varies from field office to field office, a lot of similar tools are used by UN Agencies and their IPs across the country. Additionally, a substantial amount of outreach is done by the refugees themselves, with parents directly approaching schools to register their children.

Most outreach relies on pre-enrolment lists from schools, MEHE waiting or school aged children lists, local government lists of residents, or some combination thereof. Without exception, this data was cited by education partners as being incorrect or inaccurate (i.e. containing a lot of duplicates) and not sufficient to effectively reach out to the refugee population in its entirety. Increased technical capacity by MEHE to manage official enrolment and pre-enrolment lists would greatly improve the situation. Already, UNHCR is seconding technical staff to MEHE for the 2014-15 school year to better address this need.

Schools may also directly be involved in outreach, with school directors and other staff soliciting registration from children in the community, but this may be limited by logistical constraints (especially for schools which cover large rural areas).

Humanitarian actors typically rely on the above outreach mechanisms but also supplement these efforts in a number of different ways. First, the humanitarian community has Refugee Outreach Volunteers (ROVs) whose specific purpose is to provide outreach to refugee communities to engage them with a variety of subjects, including education opportunities. These have been widely cited as an effective outreach tool, so much that education partners will utilize the ROV programme extensively during the back to school campaign for the 2014-15 school year. As a result of increased outreach to parents of Syrian refugee children, an increased enrolment rate can be expected.

UNHCR was also involved in an SMS mass information campaign that was cited by international stakeholders and refugees alike as being an effective outreach mechanism. Even when the list of phone numbers is incomplete, the SMS campaign contributed massively to spreading news about education via word of mouth. However, in some cases, the campaign led to expectations that could not be met. Indeed, the fact that it was not a targeted SMS campaign meant that it raised expectations of availability of education in the immediate vicinity of refugee locations. Finally, through registration centres, UNHCR works with MOSA on linking refugees up to education opportunities as well.

Implementing partners will also post fliers and other promotional materials around their areas of interventions at key locations like mosques or community centres. Some IPs also have a distinct advantage in outreach through their work in community centres. If an agency can address a number of different concerns for a given beneficiary in one location at one time, they are able to more easily gain the trust required to encourage enrolment in education opportunities. Furthermore, partners who are involved in non-education related activities are able to link to their education programs, or to link students of NFE programs to public education.

One major issue with outreach is reflected by the efficacy of the aforementioned example of a single agency involved in multiple areas of assistance through a single gateway. This is the issue of communication, particularly related to outreach. Communication between agencies, schools and agencies, MEHE and schools, and MEHE and agencies is severely lacking. Within the humanitarian coordination structure, no nationalized set of SOPs exists for adequately making referrals for education programming the way it does for, for instance, protection or shelter cases.

Children who are not able to enrol in public schools are not always made aware of other education opportunities and the linkages between NFE and the public school system is not as effective as it could be. It should be noted that efforts are being made in this direction, but so far coordination structures have dealt with the problem on an ad-hoc basis that has left beneficiaries and IPs alike wanting more. Taking the success of the referral system in other sectors and replicating it in the education sector (or integrating education referrals to protection work) could have positive effects on enrolment and would enable the humanitarian community to build on an existing mechanisms rather than starting from scratch.

Another issue to consider is that of geographical or logistical constraints on outreaching certain segments of the population. High security risk areas are particularly of concern, but there are also substantial issues in reaching rural communities and small or highly dispersed IS. UNICEF in the Bekaa has taken to grouping small IS to better serve them as a single unit³¹, which may be highly effective in other areas with similar issues, such as Akkar. In terms of outreach to dangerous areas, the only solution may be to have a more community based approach to education since the constraints are possibly too great for partners to be willing or able to operate effectively. A community based approach would promote learning with individuals and groups in their communities and also ensure that the latter are informed by default.

Coordination for outreach is an overarching issue, and one that harks back to communication. Effective outreach means coordinating so that all areas are covered and there is no overlap. This is being done to some degree in some of the regions, such as the Bekaa and the South, but should be more structured and standardized in approach across the country. This may mean dividing areas of coverage for which there is one agency leading outreach and referral mechanisms, or otherwise coordinating through donor and other agencies.

Finally, efforts on outreach look to be improving greatly over the 2013-14 school year. Delays and miscommunication beset outreach efforts from the beginning, particularly for second shift programs, which were advertised haphazardly and only weeks before the start of the program. This situation can only improve as communication and clarity increase between MEHE, donor agencies, and their partners. The hiring of education ROVs should also bolster efforts significantly for the upcoming school year as engaging with the community directly is critical to successful outreach campaigns. ROVs may need to target their interventions to areas that can withstand enrolment

³¹ Interview with Ceasar Al Fakih, UNICEF education focal point for Bekaa, May 26, 2014

CONCLUSION

The assessment found that respondents reported one of the main reasons why children do not attend school in Lebanon is financial constraint. This includes tuitions fees but also transportation costs and economic needs of the family (child labour). While not expressly stated, the prevalence of an inability of Syrian refugees to cover tuition fees as primary factor driving non-enrolment indicates that a lack of awareness of available educational support is likely behind this and a number of other barriers. Effective tools such as mobile phone text messaging campaigns and education Refugee Outreach Volunteers could be effective ways of increasing knowledge amongst Syrians as to the availability of programmes supporting their child's education.

Transportation, however, remains a difficult issue to address. The cost of the second shift program, which includes transportation, is not sustainable and yet, high attendance rates in these programs suggests that transportation is a critical element in ensuring children have access to education. Greater emphasis from the humanitarian community needs to be placed on transportation to schools as a benefit itself. This would work towards ensuring higher enrolment rates, as well as the possibility to increase capacity through utilization of first shift spaces.

The issue of children choosing or being forced to work to support themselves and their families is a complicated issue. Efforts to reach out to working children have shown that they are willing to get help, if not necessarily stop working. That being said, perhaps the most effective way to address this issue is to approach and integrate children before they have the opportunity to begin working. Loss of income is more difficult to swallow than the total absence of income. Life skills and vocational education are also an important piece of the puzzle as they may help to persuade children and caregivers that there is a strong link between education and future incomes.

The Lebanese Education System (LES) itself, the overcrowding of its public schools and bilingual teaching are other key reasons why Syrian refugees do not access education or drop out. Many Syrians feel that the education opportunities are of a low quality, or that they do not receive sufficient support to succeed. They are struggling with schools that refuse to fully recognize their accomplishments by withholding certification. Furthermore, behaviour and perceptions of Lebanese pupils and teacher alike discourages full integration into the LES. Syrian children are disparaged within the education system for academic and social reasons alike.

Herein lies perhaps the most difficult and challenging aspect of the OOSC problem. Many of the barriers discussed in this report can, and often do, overlap with each other, and with other social problems. Disability, trauma, poverty, and societal differences between Syria and Lebanon combined with a struggling education system, challenging security and geographic constraints, and misinformation/communication creates a potentially difficult situation for children who want education and the caregivers who believe in its value. The desire to learn is most certainly there, but the challenges to overcome are often simply too much.


Nonetheless, many great strides are being made to address these issues. Indeed, the Ministry of Education and Higher Education (MEHE) and humanitarian agencies are providing refugees with financial aid for tuition fees and transportation. The second shift program, which began in January 2014, has been broadly hailed as a success for its education outcomes and its impact on refugee-host community relations. Efforts made in the Bekaa to track the progress of individual children from Non-Formal Education (NFE) and other education programs to the public education system are slowly proliferating around the country.

Finally, this assessment found that there is a lack of information on specific areas in Lebanon which have been identified by education specialists as having unique education needs generally due to the dire security situations there. It is important to gather qualitative and quantitative data on these areas to design evidence based programs and reach out to children who may have been out of school for several years.


ANNEXES

Annex 1: Maps


Map 3: Estimated Number of OOSC in Akkar




Map 4: Estimated Number of OOSC in Bekaa




Map 5: Estimated Number of OOSC in Mount Lebanon and Beirut



Map 6: Estimated Number of OOSC in North (T+5)



Map 7: Estimated Number of OOSC in South



Annex 2: Survey Questionnaire in English

REACH <small>Informing more effective humanitarian action</small>		Out of School Children Profile Assessment	
Date: (DD/MM/YY)		Database ID:	
Completed by:		Team ID:	Reviewed: <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Hello, my name is _____ and I am conducting an assessment with UNHCR. We have been asked to gather information on behalf of the humanitarian community to better understand the needs and situation of Syrian refugees related to education. To conduct this assessment, we will need to carry out a maximum of two interviews about each child in your household between the ages of 3 and 18. One of the interviews will be conducted with the caregivers of the children and with any children in the household age 11 or older. Please be aware that there is no direct benefit or penalty to taking part or choosing not to take part in this assessment and the results are not directly tied to any specific humanitarian action for your household or area. The data will be used by humanitarian actors to inform programming and understand the needs of Syrian refugees generally. Your household and this survey will remain completely anonymous. You are not in any way required to participate in this assessment. Do you agree to let us conduct this assessment in your household?</p>			
A HOUSEHOLD LOCATION AND DEMOGRAPHICS			
A.1	District	Cedestral	Village / Neighbourhood
A.2	Household settlement type:	Small Shelter Unit (private rented or owned homes/apartments)	
		Informal Settlement	
		Formal Tented Settlement	
		Unfinished Houses	
		Semi-formal tented settlement	
		Large Shelter Units (Collective Centers)	
A.3	Please give details for the following members of the household:		
	Primary Caregiver (Head of Household):	Sex: <input type="checkbox"/> Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female	Age: <input type="text"/> Registered with UNHCR? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Arrival Date: <input type="text"/>
	Education Level Obtained:	<input type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> Read/write <input type="checkbox"/> primary <input type="checkbox"/> intermediate <input type="checkbox"/> secondary <input type="checkbox"/> technical <input type="checkbox"/> Uni	
	Secondary Caregiver:	Sex: <input type="checkbox"/> Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female	Age: <input type="text"/> Registered with UNHCR? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Arrival Date: <input type="text"/>
	Education Level Obtained:	<input type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> Read/write <input type="checkbox"/> primary <input type="checkbox"/> intermediate <input type="checkbox"/> secondary <input type="checkbox"/> technical <input type="checkbox"/> Uni	
	Child (3-18 years old) 1:	Sex: <input type="checkbox"/> Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female	Age: <input type="text"/> Registered with UNHCR? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Arrival Date: <input type="text"/>
			Mental or physical disability: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	Child (3-18 years old) 2:	Sex: <input type="checkbox"/> Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female	Age: <input type="text"/> Registered with UNHCR? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Arrival Date: <input type="text"/>
			Mental or physical disability: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	Child (3-18 years old) 3:	Sex: <input type="checkbox"/> Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female	Age: <input type="text"/> Registered with UNHCR? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Arrival Date: <input type="text"/>
			Mental or physical disability: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	Child (3-18 years old) 4:	Sex: <input type="checkbox"/> Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female	Age: <input type="text"/> Registered with UNHCR? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Arrival Date: <input type="text"/>
			Mental or physical disability: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	Child (3-18 years old) 5:	Sex: <input type="checkbox"/> Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female	Age: <input type="text"/> Registered with UNHCR? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Arrival Date: <input type="text"/>
			Mental or physical disability: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
B CHILDREN EDUCATION PROFILE (to be conducted for each child, once by parents, once by children over 11)			
B.1	If caretakers are present in the household, what is this child's relationship to 1 or both of them?		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Biological child	<input type="checkbox"/> Other blood relative	<input type="checkbox"/> Not related
B.2	Is this child currently attending any kind of learning program/school? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
	<i>If yes, proceed to SECTION D: IN SCHOOL CHILDREN. If no, proceed to SECTION C: OUT OF SCHOOL CHILDREN, and skip SECTION D.</i>		
C OUT OF SCHOOL CHILDREN (to be conducted for each OUT OF SCHOOL child, once by parents, once by children over 11)			
C.1	What is the primary reason they are not attending school now? (select all that apply)		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Unnecessary to be in school	<input type="checkbox"/> Moved locations	<input type="checkbox"/> Transportation costs
	<input type="checkbox"/> Child refused	<input type="checkbox"/> Parent forbids	<input type="checkbox"/> Bullying/safety
	<input type="checkbox"/> Illness or disability	<input type="checkbox"/> Married	<input type="checkbox"/> Need to support family (with work)
	<input type="checkbox"/> School director refused	<input type="checkbox"/> Too difficult to register	<input type="checkbox"/> Did not know they were allowed
	<input type="checkbox"/> No opportunities	<input type="checkbox"/> Too far behind to catch up/ feel discouraged	<input type="checkbox"/> Too old
	<input type="checkbox"/> Distance to school	<input type="checkbox"/> Can not afford supplies	<input type="checkbox"/> Transportation unsafe (security/checkpoints)
	<input type="checkbox"/> No end goal	<input type="checkbox"/> WASH facilities inadequate/unsafe	<input type="checkbox"/> Transportation unavailable
C.2	If other, specify: <input type="text"/>		
C.3	If a caretaker is present, does the caretaker wish to enroll the student in some kind of education program? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
C.4	Do you feel the education opportunities available to this child would be useful for preparing them for the future? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
C.5	If not, why not? (select all that apply)		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Language of instruction	<input type="checkbox"/> Curriculum does not match household beliefs	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Does not follow Syrian Curriculum/will not be accepted in Syria	<input type="checkbox"/> Gender	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Curriculum not relevant to child's future/current position in society	<input type="checkbox"/> Other	
	<input type="checkbox"/> School doesn't prepare students for work/lack vocational training	<input type="checkbox"/> Education opportunities not quality enough	
C.6	If other, specify: <input type="text"/>		
C.7	Did the child attend school before? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		

	<input type="checkbox"/> Never attended school	<input type="checkbox"/> In Syria	<input type="checkbox"/> In Lebanon	<input type="checkbox"/> Don't know
C.8	If they attended school before, what was the highest grade obtained? <input type="text"/> Grade			
C.9	If in school in Syria or Lebanon before, and not now, how many months has it been since they last attended school? <input type="text"/> Months			
C.10	If they attended school in Syria, do you have documentation or the means to obtain the documentation proving this? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No			
C.11	If they attended school in Lebanon, why did they stop attending? (select all that apply)			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Unnecessary to continue	<input type="checkbox"/> Moved locations	<input type="checkbox"/> Transportation costs	<input type="checkbox"/> Language of instruction
	<input type="checkbox"/> Child refused to continue	<input type="checkbox"/> Parent forbids	<input type="checkbox"/> Bullying/safety	<input type="checkbox"/> Could no longer afford to tuition
	<input type="checkbox"/> Illness or disability	<input type="checkbox"/> Married	<input type="checkbox"/> Need to support family (with work)	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed to care for family
	<input type="checkbox"/> No longer opportunity	<input type="checkbox"/> Could no longer keep up with coursework	<input type="checkbox"/> Too old	<input type="checkbox"/> Other
	<input type="checkbox"/> Distance to school	<input type="checkbox"/> Could no longer afford supplies	<input type="checkbox"/> Transportation unsafe (security/checkpoints)	
	<input type="checkbox"/> No end goal	<input type="checkbox"/> WASH facilities inadequate/unsafe	<input type="checkbox"/> Transportation unavailable	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Director refused/ Syrians kicked out of school			
C.12	If other, specify: <input type="text"/>			
C.13	What are the top 3 types of non-monetary assistance that would be most helpful in having this child attend school?			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Tuition waivers	<input type="checkbox"/> Transportation	<input type="checkbox"/> School supplies	<input type="checkbox"/> Bus ride monitors/safer transport
	<input type="checkbox"/> More education opportunities	<input type="checkbox"/> Different education opportunities	<input type="checkbox"/> School uniforms	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Food or other support provided at schools	<input type="checkbox"/> Language training	<input type="checkbox"/> School security	<input type="checkbox"/> Other
C.14	If other, specify: <input type="text"/>			
C.15	If different education opportunities, what kinds?			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Accelerated certified VT	<input type="checkbox"/> Syrian schools (teachers and staff)	<input type="checkbox"/> Syrian Curriculum	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Official certificate programs	<input type="checkbox"/> Access to higher education pathways	<input type="checkbox"/> Syrian students only	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Religious based education	<input type="checkbox"/> Language training	<input type="checkbox"/> Other	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Lebanese school	<input type="checkbox"/> Formal technical education	<input type="checkbox"/> In-home or community based education	
C.16	If other, specify: <input type="text"/>			
D IN SCHOOL CHILDREN (to be conducted for each child, once by parents, once by children over 11)				
D.1	What kind of school is the child attending?			
	<input type="checkbox"/> NFE	<input type="checkbox"/> Syrian Run	<input type="checkbox"/> Technical Public	<input type="checkbox"/> Language Classes
	<input type="checkbox"/> Lebanese Public School	<input type="checkbox"/> Lebanese Private	<input type="checkbox"/> Vocational Training	<input type="checkbox"/> Technical Private
				<input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <input type="checkbox"/> Other
D.2	If other, specify: <input type="text"/>			
D.3	Were they attending school before, in Syria? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No			
D.4	If they attended school in Syrian, what was the highest grade obtained? <input type="text"/> Grade <input type="text"/> School year			
D.5	If they attended school in Syria, does the household have access to documentation proving this? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No			
D.6	Do you foresee the child will continue until grade 12? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not sure			
D.7	What are the main challenges they face and will face while completing their education? (select all that apply)			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Language/curriculum changes in future grades	<input type="checkbox"/> Education may not seem necessary after a point		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Tuition fees difficult to afford	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost of school supplies		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Child might not want to continue	<input type="checkbox"/> Bullying (by fellow pupils or teachers)	<input type="checkbox"/> May need to care for family	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Will marry soon	<input type="checkbox"/> May need to support family (with work)	<input type="checkbox"/> Safety concerns (specify)	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Opportunities decreasing	<input type="checkbox"/> Coursework becoming too difficult	<input type="checkbox"/> Becoming too old	<input type="checkbox"/> Other
D.8	If other, specify: <input type="text"/>			
D.9	What are the top 3 types of non-monetary assistance that would be most helpful in having this child stay in school?			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Tuition waivers	<input type="checkbox"/> Transportation	<input type="checkbox"/> School supplies	
	<input type="checkbox"/> More education opportunities	<input type="checkbox"/> Vocational Training	<input type="checkbox"/> School uniforms	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Food or other support provided at sc	<input type="checkbox"/> Remedial Classes	<input type="checkbox"/> Language Classes	<input type="checkbox"/> Other
D.10	If other, specify: <input type="text"/>			
E NOTES / COMMENTS				