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• Generate rigorous evidence to inform the scale-up of innovations in education in protracted humanitarian crisis settings
• Provide evidence on what works in education in humanitarian settings
• Provide M&E mentorship to teams with the aim of improving the organizations’ evidence based decision making culture.
Motivation: Scaling and the Missing Middle

Figure 1. Unpacking the innovation lifecycle (McClure & Gray, 2015)
The Missing Middle & Evaluation

Design of Program → Pilot program implementation at a small scale → Program implementation at a larger scale → Implementation at scale

Feasibility study → Process Evaluation → Impact Evaluation → Impact evaluation at scale

Modify program based on findings → Modify program based on findings → Modify program based on findings

Scaling can benefit from Comprehensive Theory of Change + Impact Evaluation + Process Evaluation

Decision about how to scale up or adapt program
• Literature review will inform the design of the evaluations of the programs we are evaluating under the Humanitarian Education Accelerator

• Synthesize common barriers and facilitators to scale through literature review and across innovation teams

• Build a conceptual framework to determine how to scale innovations in education in protracted humanitarian crisis settings
Initial Conceptual Framework

Design Phase
- Define Overall Goal of Program
- Design of Program
- Pilot Program Implementation at Small Scale

Scaling Up
- Program Implementation on Journey to Scale Up
  - Impact Evaluation (not at full scale) to understand pathways and program's effect on outcomes
  - Process Evaluation to identify new strengths and weaknesses stemming from increased implementation complexity
- Implementation at Scale
  - Impact Evaluation at scale to decide how to scale up or adapt program
  - Process Evaluation to identify new strengths and weaknesses stemming from characteristics of new key stakeholders at scale

Scaling Out
- Replicable Solution on Journey to Scale Up in New Contexts
  - Impact Evaluation (not at full scale) to examine replication in new context
  - Process Evaluation to identify new strengths and weaknesses stemming from characteristics of new context

- Redesigning high-potential pilot programs with areas for improvement before scaling up (if necessary)

Factors in contextual environment
- Considering context and implementation challenges

Distilling Complexity
- Sufficient capacity
- Replication or adaptation to new context
- Return to scaling up phase start

Increasing Complexity
- Expansion or new collaborations
- Do original theory of change assumptions remain valid?
- Are new assumptions required?
- Does the effect(s) of moderators remain the same?
- Do new moderators exist?
• Thematic terms: education/livelihoods/ICT/health
• Population terms: refugees/displaced/IDPs
• Technical terms: scale/scale up/scale out/evaluation/study/case study
• Programmatic terms: project/program/intervention
• Geographic terms: low income countries/middle income countries/developing/underdeveloped/less developed
Included Studies

Initial search

272 studies found

207 excluded

Final

12 Conceptual

29* Research

26* Implementation

65 final

*2 papers are counted as research and implementation
• Gender norms, security concerns, and high mobility limit effective programming in design phase
• Reliable funding streams are imperative in protracted humanitarian crisis settings where funding is often short term
• Coordination within government programming may present challenges for scale-up of education programs in refugee settings
  • It is nonetheless imperative to engage with governments to ensure refugees will be included in national education systems
• Crucial to have flexibility to include iterative programming adaptations as needed
  • It is important to pilot solutions with beneficiaries and adapt based on contextual and beneficiary needs
Next steps: Integrating Innovation Teams’ Findings

• How can findings from the innovation teams’ work build on the findings from the existing scaling evaluations?

Let’s discuss:
• Key questions of scaling evaluation
• Potential frameworks of analysis
• Potential hypotheses
• Contextual considerations

Design Phase
- Define Overall Goal of Program
- Design of Program
- Pilot Program Implementation at Small Scale

Formalize theory of change to hypothesize how connections in causal chain interact to reach program goal

- Feasibility Study to see if inputs can be delivered and to understand context and how context affects implementation
- Process Evaluation to identify strengths and weaknesses in a program’s operations, implementation, and service delivery

Redesigning high-potential pilot programs with areas for improvement before scaling up (if necessary)

- Have flexibility to include iterative programming adaptations as needed
- Ensure labor market opportunities for refugees

Factoring in contextual environment
- Considering context and implementation challenges

Need to address main barriers, such as traditional gender norms, security concerns, and high mobility of refugees

Scaling Up
- Program Implementation on Journey to Scale Up
- Implementation at Scale

- Program Action
- Impact Evaluation (not at full scale) to understand pathways and program’s effect on outcomes
- Process Evaluation to identify new strengths and weaknesses stemming from increased implementation complexity
- Process Evaluation to identify new strengths and weaknesses stemming from characteristics of new key stakeholders at scale

Scaling Out
- Replicable Solution on Journey to Scale Up in New Contexts

- Impact Evaluation (not at full scale) to examine replication in new context
- Process Evaluation to identify new strengths and weaknesses stemming from characteristics of new context

- Do original theory of change assumptions remain valid?
- Are new assumptions required?
- Does the effect(s) of moderators remain the same?
- Do new moderators exist?

- Distilling Complexity
- Sufficient capacity
- Increasing Complexity
- Replication or adaptation to new context → Return to scaling up phase start

Willingness to work within context of government bureaucracy and political economy concerns

- Have flexibility to include iterative programming adaptations as needed
- Ensure labor market opportunities for refugees

Ensure reliable funding streams
- Maintain quality teachers and educational inputs
Inform Evaluation Design

• Examine barriers toward program participation associated with gender
  • Girls’ participation in remedial education program in refugee settings in Kenya
  • Girls’ participation in tertiary education program in refugee setting in Rwanda

• Incorporate flexibility in program designs
  • Redesign training programs based on needs assessment in Jordan

• Examine engagement with the government
  • Assess degree of engagement between each innovation and ministries of education.
Discussion

• Different challenges in different phases of scale-up process
  • Conceptual framework helps lay out those challenges

• Flexibility is imperative in scaling-up innovations in education
  • Continuous monitoring & evaluation can guide iterative program designs
  • Partnerships with organizations with different strengths can also incentivize flexibility in program design

• Crucial to consider political economy concerns in scale-up process
  • Important to consider government engagement

• Impact evaluations will be important to determine effectiveness and cost-effectiveness
## Baseline Results WUSC Remedial Program in Kenya

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Balance Test</th>
<th>SMD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>N1</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>N2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>16.91</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>17.18</td>
<td>559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk to school</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live with parent or guardian</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of meals typically consumed in a day</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of rooms in compound</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can access water at our plot</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can access electricity at our plot</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Origin: Democratic Republic of Congo</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Origin: Ethiopia</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family origin: Somalia</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Origin: South Sudan</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Origin: Sudan</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion: Christian</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion: Muslim</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in a WUSC remedial program</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in catch up program</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in a school club</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in mentorship program</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>562</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Baseline Results Kepler

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Balance Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>N1</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently enrolled in school: Age between 12 and 15</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently enrolled in school: Age between 16 and 18</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently enrolled in school: Age between 19 and 21</td>
<td><strong>0.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>117</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.61</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently enrolled in school: Age between 22 and 24</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth currently enrolled in school</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male youth currently enrolled in school</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female youth currently enrolled in school</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth completed primary School</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth completed lower secondary School</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth completed upper secondary school</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults completed primary education</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults completed lower secondary education</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults Completed upper secondary education</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>