Boarding Schools – Consolidated findings from Safeguarding Surveys and Recommendations (November 2014)

Ah Len Bum (Laiza) 1.5 hrs walking distance from Way Chay IDP Camp and 3-4 hrs from Je Yan Camp

Note: most parents of boarding students stay at Wai Chay IDP camp

Local (non boarding) schools in the area are Laiza High School and another high school with connection to India

Details:

- 921 students (13-22 yrs) (mostly IDPs, a few host community children)
- 16 KIO teachers + 91 volunteer teachers, 9 support/admin staff (Staff KIO Edu Department, KBC volunteers)
- 3 hostels for boys, 3 for girls, 6 for teachers, 3 for caregivers
- KIO Edu Dpt. pays salaries, facilities, food. Students do not pay fees
- IRRC already improved living conditions (less overcrowding, establishment of middle schools = 5-6th Standard in IDP camps to limit family separation, renovations infrastructure)
- Food (WFP twice, KMS) School material (Metta, KDG), mosquito nets (HPA) Hygiene kits, cash grant for meals, renovation dormitories, water source (Metta), Renovation water storage tank (KDG)

Safety

Most important safety requirements are met

- Military facilities were removed from school premises following CP SS advocacy and IRRC/KIO instruction
- No MRE activities conducted
- No security guards but teachers patrolling on premises
- In Jan 14 school management reported abuse of drugs and alcohol by approx. 50 adolescents (reportedly improved since new school year 2014 with better supervision and less students enrolled)
- At night supervision poor: 1 caretaker for 300 boys and 1 for 400 girls in Jan 14 (considerably improved as per June 14: 3-8 supervisors per dorm)
 - Separation girls and boys hostels and according to age/grade risk of SGBV reduced

Family Separation Improvements desirable

Most students stay at boarding facilities during weekend and go home for holidays only. Family visits to school are allowed at weekends. 15 boys don't have contact with family. Students with family in IDP camp

Recommendations:

Only provision of most urgent protection interventions in order to avoid pull factors and to improve basic protection environment (safety, family separation, PSS, prevention of exploitation)

Trainings/awareness raising to be held at local school (instead of boarding facility)

- Continuous protection monitoring presence/absence of armed elements necessary
- MRE urgently needed
- CP training for supervisors (incl. basic emotional support) as well as SGBV sensitization recommended (to be held at local school)
- Need for PSS (training for teachers and caretakers on emotional support, recreational activities, adolescents programmes at IDP camp also for children in boarding schools
- Advocacy on prevention of family separation:
 - Encourage school
 management to clarify visiting
 and leave regulations.
 Established rules should be
 clear to all parties (teachers,
 parents, students)

	can walk (approx. 1.5 hours) to see family during	o Establish
	weekend if permission sought. Children with parents	allows ar
	that live far away have only sporadic contact.	linking a
	No transparency/clear guidelines about visiting rules	through
PSS needs	Most parents observe positive development of their	with fam
	children (more mature, disciplined, obedient) and that	children
Improvements desirable	they can better control their emotions	phones of
	Limited recreational activities (limited equipment to	FTR/RFL links
	play sports, no activities at weekends)	family contact
	Homesickness is a common complaint	 Advocacy with
	Signs of depression, sadness of some adolescents	management
Location and rationale	IDP middle and high school students were reportedly	children that
for establishing the	encouraged to move to the boarding school rather	Laiza (IDP can
boarding school	than attending local schools in Laiza by KIO to avoid	 Awareness ra
	overcrowding and food shortages in the camp	
	Rationale according to parents: Frequency of	
	displacement and ensure continuity of education	
Prevention exploitation	 Chores appear adequate according to FGDs 	
(incl. trafficking)	No signs of trafficking / cases reported – certain risk	
	may exist when children are moving from BS to/from	
	camp	
Other concerns		
 Food variety / Beri Beri s 	syndrome	
	and the second s	1

- Establishment of a system that allows and facilitates family linking and messaging e.g. through regular phone contact with families (→ not all children have access to mobile phones due to high charges)
- FTR/RFL links for children with no family contact
- Advocacy with boarding school management to consider reunifying children that have their parents in Laiza (IDP camp) following BIA/BID
- Awareness raising: Trafficking risk

- Water shortage and food quality main concern affecting students according to supervisors
- Equal access to services of younger children / bullying and stealing by older children
- Lack of adequate WASH facilities

La Na Zup Ja boarding school (Lwejel)

Parents of boarding students remain mainly in IDP camps in Lagat Yang near northern Shan

Walking diistance to Bum Tsit Pa from La Na Zup camp?

Details:

- At La Na Zup IDP camp the boarding school and premises (houses) are for primary school children only (5-10 yrs).
- La Na Zup IDP camp is 15 min walking distance from boarding school/houses
- Children staying at the boarding house do not have parents at La Na Zup IDP camp but were sent for safety by parents staying in remote villages (not IDP children)
- In close proximity of IDP camp the local high school (primary, middle, high) is located and attended by IDP and host community children
- Total of 467 students in boarding house 1 (144) and boarding house 2 (323 newly displaced students from Nam Lin Pa, Mansi township) and 67 teachers (32 for 1 BH and 35 for 2 BH) One building was moved to Bum Tsit Pa (elaborate more)
- BH 1: middle school students only, BH 2: primary and middle school students
- Food (WFP, donations from churches, China), small vegetable garden

Safety Girls and boys occupying different floors in one building Each room housing 4-8 students and rooms have attached Most important bathrooms safety requirements Supervision: Supervisors at BH 1 sleep in the same are met dormitories but in different rooms What is the caretaker/student ratio? Students have never received MRE Gates close at 6 pm – students no longer allowed to leave There appears to be no active recruitment at the boarding school. According to parents the risk of recruitment is high for children not attending school **Family Separation** Most children have sporadic contact with family, a small number has no contact. **Improvements** Ad-hoc system in place to organize family visits for children desirable who have relatives close-by (e.g. Bum Tsit Pa, Lwejel township) → Children that wish to visit their parents in Bum Tsit Pa will be put on a list that is shared/communicated to Education Focal Point in Bum Tsit Pa camp

Recommendations:

Only provision of most urgent protection interventions in order to avoid pull factors and to improve basic protection environment (safety, family separation, PSS, prevention of exploitation)

Trainings/awareness raising to be held at local schools (instead of boarding facilities)

- Advocacy on no enrolment of children below 6th standard (10 years)
- MRE (for students, teachers, and IDP population)
- CP training for supervisors (incl. basic emotional support) as well as SGBV sensitization recommended (to be held at local school)
- Need for PSS (training for teachers and caretakers on emotional support, recreational activities, adolescents programmes at IDP camp also for children in boarding schools
- Advocacy: Children that have relatives in the IDP camps to stay with relatives rather than at boarding house (better monitoring through relatives) – following BIA/BID
- Awareness raising trafficking:
 School management to ensure

Location and rationale for establishing the boarding school	 No facilities for recreational activities but students play football Children as well as teachers report that many students feel hopeless and sad, increased number of drop-outs, alcohol and drug abuse. Boarding school predates the conflict but has taken in many IDP students since the conflict IDP students were mainly studying at Nam Lin Pa boarding school where not only primary school but also middle school students could study. When Tatmadaw troops advanced they fled to Lagat Yang (Mansi township). Students were relocated to Lana Zup (Lwejel township) by IRRC and WPN due to absence of education facilities in Lagat Yang. No signs of pressure placed on parents to send children to the boarding school. Case of a parent who is discussing with school management transfer of her daughter (to IDP camp in Bum Tsit Pa) 	students travelling are moving in groups, accompanied by elder students or a caretaker Increase number of caretakers (esp. at night) possibly through volunteer caretakers from IDP camp or host community Advocacy on prevention of family separation: Encourage school management to clarify visiting and leave regulations. Established rules should be clear to all parties (teachers, parents, students) Establishment of a system that allows and facilitates family
Prevention exploitation (incl. trafficking)	 Chores at boarding school seem to be reasonable Children walking from La Na Zup to Bum Tsit Pa are not accompanied. Major security concern of teachers, parents (trafficking risk). Recently visits of children put on hold due to security concerns Trafficking a major concern given limited supervision According to parents the trafficking/exploitation risk is high due to high dropout rate and young students searching for employment in China. Absence of (local) livelihood opportunities and parents living in IDP camps increases the risk 	linking and messaging e.g. through regular phone contact with families (→ not all children have access to mobile phones due to high charges) • FTR/RFL links for children with no family contact Increased (educational) support to local high school • EiE sector to assess opportunities of supporting and expand primary
Other concerns;A few cases of suspensionNot all bathrooms of	ected Beri Beri can be used (insufficient water, broken pipes)	school in Bum Tsit Pa (so to avoid family separation) and educational

Not all bathrooms can be used (insufficient water, broken pipes)

facilities in Lagat Yang

Htang Nya	Details:		Recommendation:
Boarding House,	• Five temporary shelters (one unfinished) serve as staff house, boys sleeping space,		Interventions by agencies on HOLD
Htang Nya is located in the outskirts of Lwejel	 Boarding school comi 163 students (83 male All students come fro 1-8 graders currently (Lwejel BEHS) 	study room and a kitchen mittee comprises of 7 staff (2m/5f) e, 80 female) between 6-17 years and 6 teachers (1m/5f) m 30 villages in Momauk township study at a temporary school in a Lwejel high school compound are no longer accepted as the BS committee fears to be	Safety of location of boarding school needs to be assessed with CPSS / PWG and possibility of relocation discussed. Advocacy on safety and prevention of family separation
In Lwejel town there is RC	overwhelmed and iss	ues of security could emerge. Some IDP high school students and RC boarding school in Lwejel town	 Advocacy on no enrolment of children below 6th standard (10 years)
(Roman Catholic) boarding school and Lwejel high school	Safety Crucial safety requirements are not met	 Boys and girls have separate sleeping places, latrines and bathing places No adult caregiver at night Only one supervisor managing the BH In 2014 especially high school student girls experienced incidents of harassment and threats. BS committee reported the cases to the local authorities but no action followed. Up until today the school continues to have security issues BS does not have specific security system (guards, patrolling) but strangers coming to the compound must meet with the headmaster Girls do not feel safe at night as the sleeping space has no doors and the schools fence is not safe Never received MRE 	 Only one supervisor managing the BH. There is need to increase the number of supervisors and to ensure that female supervisors are available to provide support for girls Security to be improved (patrolling by teachers, volunteers, night guards) CP safeguarding survey also to be conducted at RC boarding school in Lwejel
	Family separation	 30 registered children are below 10 years old School committee regularly registers students Students are allowed to go to their villages once a month and parents are permitted to come and visit their children whenever they want. Children whose families 	

PSS needs Improvements desirable	live far maintain contact through telephone. The headmaster allows children to talk with their parents once a month. • Some students see their parents only once in 6 months • Many students have learning difficulties, many do not pass exams • Limited recreation activities, especially for girls who do not have any equipment for sport • Children do not revert to the dormitory supervisor when they face problems	
Location and rationale for establishing the boarding school/house Reportedly unsafe location	 Boarding school was established in 2011 as a response to the displacement of students According to BS committee the location of the boarding school is not safe (boarding school or house?), and situated between Government and KIA and at risk to be in crossfire when fighting breaks out. According to boarding school committee the boarding school should be transferred to Lwejel 	
Prevention exploitation (incl. trafficking)	 No indication daily chores of students are inadequate Children who stay at the boarding school during summer holidays work as daily labourers at sugar plantations Corporal punishment frequent Human trafficking is a protection risks in the area (reported cases in Lwejel IDP camp) 	
Basic needs: Inadequ	inisation that supports some limited shelter and food items. ate sleeping place for small children, only 4 latrines for 80 girls ry poor WASH facilities r quality	

Zim Lum Boarding House, Lwejel

Details:

- Zim Lum BH is situated in a church compound near the BEHS (Basic Education High School) Lwejel. It is not attached to a boarding school (children study at BEHS Lwejel or temporary IDP school)
- 156 children 77 boys and 79 girls (grade 3-11) and 30 IDP households living in the compound. 90% of students are IDPs
- Students age between 6-19
- 8 staff (3 teachers, 5 caretakers). 5 caretakers stay at the BH overnight in the same rooms with students
- Student can pay voluntary fees to boarding house committee

Safety	 Students feel reportedly safe in the church compound Children have never received MRE Same bathing facilities for boys and girls but separations are not very secure/private Construction site employees working at the compound have free access and also stay overnight 1 watchman
Family separation	 More than 10 children are under 10 years old Visits allowed and principal of boarding schools plan for students to meet with their parents twice in a year. If students live not far they can visit their home once every 2-3 months. Visitors need to register when entering boarding house
PSS needs	 Students have possibility to play inside boarding house compound after school hours Students say they feel comfortable seeking emotional support from teachers and caregivers

Recommendation:

Interventions by agencies on HOLD

Safety of location of boarding school needs to be assessed with CPSS / PWG.

Advocacy on safety and prevention of family separation

- Advocacy on no enrolment of children below 6th standard (10 years)
- Advocacy: Children that have relatives in the IDP camps to stay with relatives rather than at boarding house (better monitoring through relatives) – following BIA/BID
- Assess safety of location and advocate for removal of military or consider relocation of boarding school compound
- Infrastructure improvements (by BH committee) to increase safety desirable (bathing facilities)
- Mitigate risk of SGBV: encourage clear separation of sleeping areas of construction workers – monitoring through supervisors

Location and rationale for establishing the boarding school Safety of location needs to be assessed	 Military is situation near boarding school compound but so far the school has never been occupied or used for military activities Zim Lum was previously a missionary boarding school which started to enroll IDPs once the conflict broke out in 2011 Parents can chose freely to send their children to the boarding house and whether they send them to BEHS (local school) or IDP school
Prevention exploitation (incl. trafficking)	 Corporal punishment used for children who misbehave Daily chores include cutting wood, helping in the kitchen, cleaning the toilet. No reports of children engaging in regular jobs outside the boarding house
Gaps: • Water shortage	

Mai Ja Yang Pakataung Boarding School and boarding houses, Ung Lung boarding house and SinPraw Boarding house

Pakataung IDP camp and boarding school is about 1 hr walking distance from MJY public high school (primary, middle & high school) in MJY town.

Ung Lung and SinPraw boarding houses host IDP students from various villages of origin

Mai Ja Yang High School is in a walking distance of 15, 20 min from SinPraw and

Details:

- Pakataung boarding school (primary only) is in the vicinity of Pakataung IDP camp (two school buildings). The school hosts 698 students (4-16 years) covered by 35 teachers (1m/34f) (8 teachers act as dorm supervisors) All students are IDPs fees are voluntary (300'000 MK per year)
- 493 students (11-20 years) at Ung Lung boarding house attending MJY public high school covered by 13 teachers (13 teachers (10m/3f) act as dorm supervisors). The high school is about 15min walking distance from UL boarding house
- Expressed need for NFIs, latrines, furniture, windows and doors for dorms
- 324 students (14-21 years) at SinPraw Boarding house (2 dorm supervisors, 1m/1f) attending MJY high school (approx. 20 min walking distance)
- Expressed need for latrines, beds, drinking water

Safety	Indications that a high number of parents (mainly fathers) of	
	children staying at BH/BS are active combatants	
	 Landmine contamination (mine fields) in area between MJY 	
	and Lwejel (45 min from BH)	
	Children play in dangerous locations in Pakataung camp due	
	to limited space in camp for recreational activities (e.g. near	
	creek and on Chinese territory; risk of drowning and	
	trafficking)	
	No security gate for male and female dorms at SinPraw BH	
	Separation into gender basis and students grades	
	No windows and doors at Ung Lung BH, no gate at male	
	dorm	
	Limited bathing space for 423 boys in Pakataung BS. The	
	boys also use the girls bathing space	
	Majority of students have not received MRE	
	• Inadequate caretaker/student ratio especially at SinPraw BH	
Family Separation • A few students from remote areas of Northern Shan do no		
	have any contact with parents.	

Recommendation:

Interventions at Ung Lung BH on HOLD: Safety of location of boarding school needs to be assessed with CPSS / PWG. Advocacy on safety and prevention of family separation

For Pakataung and SinPraw BH:
Interventions possible but <u>ONLY</u> provision of most urgent protection interventions in order to avoid pull factors and to improve basic protection environment (safety, family separation, PSS, prevention of exploitation)

Trainings/awareness raising to be held at local MJY high school or IDP camp instead of boarding facilities)

- Protection monitoring of presence/ absence of armed elements in vicinity of school
- Advocacy on no enrolment of children below 6th standard (10 yrs)
- MRE for students, teachers & caregivers as a priority
- CP training for supervisors (incl. basic emotional support) as well as SGBV sensitization recommended (to be held at local school)
- Need for PSS (training for teachers and caretakers on emotional support, recreational activities, adolescents programmes at IDP camp also for children in boarding schools

Ung Lung boarding houses	Improvements desirable	Students are only allowed to visit their home if their parents pick them up and the visits are recorded	Upgrade of infrastructure to improve security (gates) by BH committee
	PSS needs	 Limited space for recreational activities PSS given through peer support, teachers and caregivers 	 Separation of bathing space girls/ boys (or use at different hours) Caretaker/student ratio should be improved
	Location and rationale for establishing the boarding school	 No military facilities in proximity of Pakahtang BS and Sinpraw BH However, KIA Division 4 Command Centre located between boys and girls dorms at Ung Lung Boarding house (potential GBV risk) 	Advocacy: Children that have relatives in the IDP camps to stay with relatives rather than at boarding house – following BIA/BID + assessment on how many children stay at BH within IDP camp
	Prevention exploitation (incl. trafficking)	 Students at Ung Lung BH are obliged to carry heavy WFP bags nearly as big as their bodies (middle and high school students but not primary school students) Trafficking risk high (proximity to border) 	 despite having relatives in camp Awareness raising: trafficking Advocacy on prevention of family separation: school management to clarify visiting and leave regulations. Established rules
	Ung-Lung Boardi Sin Praw Boardir → In Pakhatang BS UN	Is (blankets, soap, uniforms, beds) ng House: school kits, uniforms, sanitary kits for girls ng House: Toilets, beds, study room, drinking water ICEF provided school kits (backpack and stationaries) and text ng food aid to all boarding houses and schools	should be clear to all parties (teachers, parents, students) • Establishment of a system that allows and facilitates family linking and messaging e.g. through regular phone contact with families • FTR/RFL links for children with no family contact and explore possibility of students who are
			from NSS to attend school/boarding school near their village of origin e.g. Muse, Lashio and Kut Khai

Je Yang boarding house

Is the boarding house inside the IDP camp?

Details:

- Boarding house established in June 2014
- Boarding house committee (4 males, 3 females) 3 staff in charge at BH at a time
- Children from different villages in Putao township (non IDP)
- 8 girls and 17 boys (7-15 years old) attending Je Yang School grade 1-5
- Schooling is free of charge
- WFP food distributions

Safety	Visitors/people entering BH need to seek permission from IRRC	
	Adequate student/supervisor ratio	
	Boys, girls and staff sleep in same bamboo structure	
	One bathing space for both boys and girls	
	Children have not received MRE	
Family Separation	Phone available and all children are allowed to use it when	
	they want to talk to their parents	
	Children will be allowed to visit their homes in the summer	
	holidays	
	 According to boarding house committee, transportation will be covered by the committee 	
PSS needs	Limited recreational activities. No playground	
	Homesickness as main emotional problem the students face	
Location and	Students are not IDPs but were sent from Putao by their	
rationale for	parents for EDU which is perceived to be better than in the	
establishing the BS	area of origin $ ightarrow$ Rationale is problematic; Establishment of	
	BH can not be seen as a positive coping mechanism and	
	promotes separation of non-conflict affected minors	
Prevention	Girls help in the kitchen (cooking and washing dishes)	
exploitation, incl.	No children are engaging in work outside school	
trafficking)		

- Only one small shelter (sleeping space) made of bamboo
- Blankets, mosquito nets, sleeping mats

Recommendations:

No interventions at the boarding house

Supervisors/teachers of the BH to be included for trainings/awareness raising at IDP and local schools

- Advocacy on no enrolment of children below 6th standard (10 years)
- Interventions such as MRE, CP training for supervisors, adolescent programming only if identified as priority for IDP children (to avoid pull factors, considering small number of boarders) and to conduct trainings/interventions at IDP or local school only
- Advocacy on prevention of family separation: school management to clarify and formalize visiting and leave regulations. Established rules should be clear to all parties (teachers, parents, students)

Comment: Non-IDP children having access to food at boarding house in an IDP camp. The number of beneficiaries is small (25 students) but could constitute massive pull factor.