



Knowledge hub
-
Collection of best practices

Summary of the best practice

1. Title of the best practice (e.g. name of policy, programme, project, etc.) *

Selecting, Scaling Up, Sustaining & Coordinating Intersectoral Policy/Program Coordination Frameworks (IPPCFs)

2. Country or countries where the practice is implemented *

All countries

3. Please select the **most relevant** Action Track(s) the best practice applies to *

- Action Track 1. Inclusive, equitable, safe, and healthy schools
- Action Track 2. Learning and skills for life, work, and sustainable development
- Action Track 3. Teachers, teaching and the teaching profession
- Action Track 4. Digital learning and transformation
- Action Track 5. Financing of education

4. Implementation lead/partner organization(s) *

FRESH Partnership, International School Health Network, leaders of over 20 intersectoral frameworks on disabilities, violence, education in emergencies, social & emotional learning, human rights, global citizenship, ESD, bullying, food & nutrition, health promoting schools, mental health etc, etc.

5. Key words (5-15 words): Please add key descriptive words around aims, modalities, target groups etc. *

Intersectoral partnerships, policy-program coordination frameworks

6. What makes it a best practice? *

All countries and UN agencies have developed Intersectoral Policy-Program Coordination Frameworks (IPPCFs) to address the many barriers to inclusion and equity. IPPCFs such as Child Friendly Schools, Education in Emergencies Standards, Health Promoting Schools, Safe Schools, and many others. However, these frameworks almost never scaled up beyond the school level. Better practices are required. These include: 1. Measuring & Monitoring the Capacities of IPPCFs 2. Identifying the Priority Issues to Select the Most Relevant IPPCFs 3. Ensuring that IPPCFs Address a Learning-Relevant, Realistic & Related Cluster of Issues and Programs 4. Positioning IPPCFs within Whole of Government Policies/Action Plans on Child & Youth 5. Formal Inter-Ministry Mechanisms to Coordinate IPPCFs 6. Comprehensive Inter-Ministry Agreements to Implement IPPCFs 7. Joint Sector Reviews to Assess the Implementation, Effectiveness of IPPCFs 8. Structures and Staffing to Coordinate IPPCFs. This submission provides country examples, research, reports and the rationale for each of these eight practices on this web page: https://docs.google.com/document/d/132UqBHjzZg0hbqLGIMDH_22g0PIQfzcp/edit?usp=sharing&ouid=107574601683603788470&rtpof=true&sd=true.

Description of the best practice

7. Introduction (350-400 words)

This section should ideally provide the context of, and justification for, the practice and address the following issues:

- i) Which population was affected?
- ii) What was the problem that needed to be addressed?
- iii) Which approach was taken and what objectives were achieved? *

The Concept Note and related materials of the UN Transforming Education Summit (TES) state that given the interconnectedness of education and development, the national consultations and action tracks of the Summit should ensure cross-sectorial participation beyond the education sector to include health, social protection, agriculture, labour, environment, public safety, finance and heads of government. The TES documents also suggest that national consultations should leverage existing sector coordination mechanisms and that the global action tracks use existing coalitions, platforms, and tools to support the engagement of many sectors and stakeholders in education. This multisectoral approach is a key part of the TES invitation rethink and reimagine the purposes, content, and delivery modes of education to transform education toward inclusive, equitable and sustainable futures.

Bluntly stated, transforming school systems to better promote inclusion and equity is simply not be possible without significant commitments of funds and staff from other public sectors to work with or within school systems. All countries and UN agencies recognize this and have developed multi-component approaches (MCAs) to coordinate policies and programs across sectors. In most cases, these mechanisms have evolved into evidence-based and experience-tested Intersectoral Policy-Program Coordination Frameworks (IPPCFs) such as Child Friendly Schools, Education in Emergencies Standards, Health Promoting Schools, Safe Schools, and many others. Similarly, multi-intervention programs are also widely used to address more specific issues such as bullying, child abuse, HIV/AIDS, extreme violence and many others.

8. Implementation (350-450 words)

Please describe the implementation modalities or processes, where possible in relation to:

- i) What are the main activities carried out?
- ii) When and where the activities were carried out (including the start date and whether it is ongoing)?
- iii) Who were the key implementation actors and collaborators? (civil society organizations, private sector, foundations, coalitions, networks etc.)?
- iv) What were the resources needed (budget and sources) for the implementation?

*

Most countries promote the use of Intersectoral Policy/Program Coordination Frameworks (IPPCFs) to address several different barriers to inclusion, equity, and student success through intersectoral partnerships in the school setting. However, in almost all cases, these IPPCFs are not necessarily selected because of documented students needs and they are not scaled up or sustained without extensive support from sources external to the school systems. Further, most jurisdictions have not established policy or mechanisms to align/coordinate the various IPPCFs operating in their territory. Consequently, they often compete for educator attention and government funding or have multiple, overlapping specific interventions which can overwhelm or confuse front-line workers.

This summary identifies several better practices that to enable the selection of learning-relevant frameworks which are scaled up and more sustainable as well as align/coordinate their use through schools as a hub. It also proposes that UN agencies jointly develop a research/knowledge development initiative to strengthen the use of IPPCFs by promoting these better practices and other systems-focused actions aimed directly at school-linked intersectoral partnerships. These better are:

1. Measuring & Monitoring the Capacities of IPPCFs
2. Identifying the Priority Issues for School-Age Children to Select the Most Relevant IPPCFs
3. Ensuring that IPPCFs Address a Learning-Relevant, Realistic & Related Cluster of Issues and Programs
4. Positioning IPPCFs within Whole of Government Policies/Action Plans on Child & Youth Development
5. Formal Inter-Ministry Mechanisms to Coordinate IPPCFs
6. Comprehensive Inter-Ministry Agreements to Implement IPPCFs
7. Joint Sector Reviews to Assess the Implementation, Effectiveness of IPPCFs
8. Structures and Staffing to Coordinate IPPCFs

The IPPCFs discussed in this submission include those that address access to schooling, early childhood development, dropping out of school, transitions to work, disabilities, health inequities & problems, safety from violence & crime, providing education & security during wars/conflicts, discrimination based on gender, orientation, race or colonization, climate change, natural disasters, and others. It is challenging to consider how these many multi-component approaches and multi-intervention programs can be sustained and coordinated. However, the many barriers to inclusion & equity do not go away if we ignore the best methods of addressing them. Consequently, this summary suggests that countries carefully select and build the frameworks most relevant to their students needs and that external funders support long term capacity development rather than short-term projects on the latest urgent issue.

Each of these approaches and programs are promoted by UN agencies and many others with excellent arguments for the burden of the problem and studies or examples. Consequently,

countries, states and provinces need to identify the IPPCFs that are most relevant to the needs of their students. Unfortunately, these choices are often influenced by external funders seeking to promote their respective frameworks and programs by offering project funding or training. Or, high profile incidents will force jurisdictions to address issues which may or may not be significant for their entire population of students.

Early findings of a global study suggest that most education ministries are using/promoting about 10-15 of these IPPCFs simultaneously in their jurisdictions. Despite strong evidence of the effectiveness of the IPPCFs at the school level, case studies, reviews and reports all note that inter-ministry coordination beyond specific short-term projects or a few single interventions is rarely practiced. The Transforming Education Summit has identified intersectoral cooperation as an essential feature for transforming school systems. IPPCFs provide a proven way to accomplish that goal.

9. Results – outputs and outcomes (250-350 words)

To the extent possible, please reply to the questions below:

- i) How was the practice identified as transformative? (e.g., impact on policies, impact on management processes, impact on delivery arrangements or education monitoring, impact on teachers, learners and beneficiary communities etc.);
- ii) What were the concrete results achieved with regard to outputs and outcomes?
- iii) Has an assessment of the practice been carried out? If yes, what were the results? *

The paper supporting this submission

(https://docs.google.com/document/d/132UqBHjzZg0hbqLGIMDH_22g0PIQfzcp/edit) provides country examples, specific descriptions and research for each of the eight better practices suggested here. Here is a list:

- Better Practice #1 – Measuring & Monitoring the Capacities of IPPCFs - The Global Partnership and Fund to End Violence Against Children has 37 "pathfinder countries" using capacity/implementation criteria to track progress
- Better Practice #2 – Identifying the Priority Issues for School-Age Children to Select the Most Relevant IPPCFs - Priority setting to ensure that resources are focused on priority student needs is part of the revised set of cross-cutting themes of the FRESH Framework. The 2009-18 strategy for Health Promoting Schools in Kosovo shows how priorities can respond to documented needs as well as system capacity
- Better Practice #3 – Ensuring that IPPCFs Address a Learning-Relevant, Realistic & Related Cluster of Issues - An American example of selecting health and social problems that are more relevant to learner needs can be found in the work of Charles Basch, who consulted directly with the White House as well as the school health organizations in that country. His research review identified seven health disparities which were not really the focus of many SH programs and discussions at that time. They were: (1) vision, (2) asthma, (3) teen pregnancy, (4) aggression and violence, (5) physical activity, (6) breakfast, and (7) inattention and hyperactivity
- Better Practice #4. Whole of Government Policies/Action Plans on Child & Youth Development/Whole Child Approach - The South Africa 2030 national development plan for all ministries presents a coherent vision of the country's hopeful future and well as a shared understanding of its past. Each ministry is presented with a vision, the components for action and priorities. All ministries are expected to work together.
- Better Practice #5 - Formal Inter-Ministry Mechanisms to Coordinate IPPCFs - Manitoba, Canada has a long-standing agency, Healthy Child Manitoba, to coordinate ministry programs from a whole child perspective. HCM is led by the Healthy Child Committee of Cabinet, authorized by a specific law, and facilitates holistic surveys on early child development and youth health.
- Better Practice #6 – Comprehensive Inter-Ministry Agreements to Implement IPPCFs - The Barbados Education Ministry Strategic Plan identifies integrated student services as a high priority. The National Plan of Action on Inclusive Education of the Lao People's Democratic Republic has descriptions of the roles of several ministries of government as well as civil society and private sector organizations as well as cost estimates and implementation arrangements. The Quebec Framework for Integrated Services for Young People develops and strengthens a continuum of integrated services among three ministries.
- Better Practice #7 - Joint Sector Reviews to Assess the Implementation, Effectiveness of IPPCFs - The GPE found that JSRs "are commonly used in the development or humanitarian aid sectors, to bring a variety of stakeholders to the table to monitor and evaluate sector progress. In 2017, the Government of Pakistan rolled out Joint Sector Reviews (JSR) in four provinces to periodically assess the (WASH) sector. UNICEF, the Government, development partners, and civil society participated in the process, using the WASH Bottleneck Analysis Tool (WASH-BAT which

included schools.

- Better Practice #8 – Structures and Staffing to Coordinate IPPCFs - The European Network of Health Promoting Schools and the Joint Consortium for School Health both require their participating countries to have SH Coordinators jointly named by two ministries. The Surrey school district in Canada has their coordinators on safe schools, community schools and healthy schools reporting to the same supervisor.

10. Lessons learnt (300 words)

To the extent possible, please reply to the following questions:

- i) What were the key triggers for transformation?
- ii) What worked really well – what facilitated this?
- iii) What did not work – why did it not work? *

Based on decades of experience, we must admit that comprehensive approaches & programs are not sustainable in school systems, unless they receive ongoing funding & staffing from other ministries or external sources. Other ministries need to bring their chequebooks as well as their checklists.

Practitioners and researchers have issued warnings about capacity, coordination and competing visions & perspectives for several years. Many case studies on comprehensive approaches have reported failure in scale up and sustainability and challenges even when building only one component of the framework (health & life skills education). Research, policy, and monitoring activities have focused only on the front lines of systems (school level) in “whole school approaches” and the actions taken by educators alone are often the primary subject of analysis and action.

Recent reports on other comprehensive frameworks describing approaches & programs on other aspects of child/youth development also report a lack of scale up and sustainability. The Schools for Health in Europe (24 of 40 member countries responded) found that while most countries implement individual health activities in schools, only one country reported in the survey that most schools use the HPS framework. A south-east Asia desktop review found that most countries had school health programs. but they suffered from weak leadership and inadequate funding, and any intersectoral coordination is often focused on specific topics and was rarely sustained. The Global Survey on school meals reported while school meal programs were often accompanied by programs on handwashing & clean water, this “entry point” strategy was not truly able to expand to other services such as dental cleaning, eye care or menstrual health. A 2009 evaluation of Child Friendly Schools in six countries found that CFS principles were well-accepted by educators, but schools and education ministries lacked resources, training and sustained leadership to implement the entire CFS framework. A 2017 survey of Disaster Risk Reduction in 68 higher risk countries reported that fewer than one-half of responding countries had the full range of DRR policies.

A 2020 systematic review of 9677 controlled trials of school-based programs that included sustainability as a major feature was used to determine if they were sustainable after start-up funds end. The review found that none of selected programs maintained all their components after funding ended. Consequently, systems-focused, whole of government approaches are needed to select, scale up, sustain and align/coordinate the IPPCFs.

11. Conclusions (250 words)

Please describe why may this intervention be considered a “best practice”. What recommendations can be made for those intending to adopt the documented “best practice” or how can it help people working on the same issue(s)? *

The UNESCO Commission on the Futures of Education has called for transformations based on a rethinking of the purposes of education. A commentary from one of the lead contributors to the report elaborating on this need to revise or rebalance the purposes or functions of schooling has updated the four pillars or purposes defined by the UNESCO Delors Commission. In many ways the report and the commentary support a return to the basic purposes of schooling established when community schools were first developed by churches, charities and local communities. The emphasis of these first public or community schools was on the care and custody of children, especially the most vulnerable, when their parents went to workplaces created by industrialization and urbanization. The second purpose, what Delors would call “learning to live together” and was focused on the social or socialization role of schooling. When governments assumed the responsibility for public schooling and schools became or were intended to be universally accessible, the purposes, ironically, narrowed to emphasize intellectual/academic and vocational purposes. The UN Transforming Education Summit is a significant opportunity to rebalance the purposes of school systems.

To achieve a paradigm shift to value the care/custody and social/socialization roles of schools, school systems must be able to count on sustained contributions of time, staffing and funding from other publicly funded ministries and agencies. Extensive checklists of tasks that educators and schools should do are not sufficient, even if they are evidenced-based. The other ministries and agencies need to bring their chequebooks, in the form of staffing of front-line workers in schools (nurses, social workers, relief workers etc.), ministry and agency staff to coordinate the implementation of inter-sectoral action plans using different frameworks and funding for essentials such as purchasing food, clean water, security staff and other aspects related to their respective core mandates for children and youth.

Intersectoral Policy-Program Coordination Frameworks (IPPCFs) have proved to be the best practice for all ministries to use when schools are to be the hub of programming and services. Better selection, scaling up, sustaining, and coordinating the frameworks to overcome the many barriers to inclusion and equity. If this is done then education ministries and agencies, working with their counterparts in other public sectors, will be able to transform themselves in ways that the UN Summit hopes that they can accomplish.

12. Further reading

Please provide a list and URLs of key reference documents for additional information on the “best practice” for those who may be interested in knowing how the results benefited the beneficiary group/s. *

The paper supporting this submission has 65 specific citations to research reviews, reports and the country examples noted above. The paper can be found at (https://docs.google.com/document/d/132UqBHjzZg0hbqLGIMDH_22g0PIQfzcp/edit)

For additional background, please go to:
www.fresh-partners.org and www.schools-for-all.org

Please note that UNICEF, UNESCO, ISHN and Simon Fraser University are conducting a Fact-Finding Survey and Policy/Curriculum Document Analysis in all countries, states and provinces. The preliminary findings of this study were used to provide the country examples. See <https://www.fresh-partners.org/fact-finding-survey-policycurriculum-analysis.html>