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Introduction and motivation

Building the Evidence on Forced Displacement and Education
Building the Evidence on Forced Displacement and Education: Research Question and Objectives

**Overarching Research Question:**

*How can education systems be prepared and strengthened to become inclusive and resilient, and thus expand and deliver education services to both displaced and host-country children and youth in the short and long term of a crisis?*

- **Phase I:** Examine existing evidence on the effectiveness of interventions to support education access and retention, as well as cost-effectiveness, scalability, and replicability;

- **Phase II:** Conduct five country case studies to review policies and programs that support the refugee and IDP inclusion in national education systems.
Phase I: Systematic Review

Design, evidence, evidence gaps
What is a systematic review?

• Search strategy to obtain comprehensive overview of existing evidence
• Systematic appraisal of literature to assess quality of evidence
• Synthesis to generate lessons learned (e.g., thematic, meta-analysis, narrative synthesis etc.)
Systematic Review: Categorizing the literature

Access to education
- ECD
- Postsecondary
- Nonformal

Quality
- Technology
- Literacy and language
- Curriculum
- Systems capacity
- Teachers and teaching

Wellbeing
- SEL and PSS
- Peacebuilding and social cohesion
- Child protection
- School feeding
- WASH
- DRR

Non-intervention
- Access
- Policy and governance
- Policy vs. practice
- Teacher experience
- Student experience
- Caregiver experience

Qualitative and quantitative studies of interventions
(ToC adapted from Burde et al. 2015.)

Not an intervention
(business-as-usual)
## Systematic review findings: Evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Official policies of inclusion often contrast with the practical and sociocultural exclusion of refugee students.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social and emotional learning programs showed the potential to reduce depression and PTSD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology-in-education programs showed potential to improve learning outcomes, but refugees and IDPs often do not have access to technology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based education may be cost-effective in improving access and learning for IDPs and refugees; transferring CBE implementation from INGOs to local governments is also cost-effective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Systematic review findings: Evidence Gaps

### Forced Displacement and Education: Building the Evidence for What Works

| | | 
|---|---|---|
| ![House] | Current research focuses on education interventions that run parallel to national education systems rather than through them. |  
| ![Column] | Evidence on the effectiveness of government-supported programs for displaced learners is limited. |  
| ![Money] | There are evidence gaps in understanding the cost-effectiveness of education programs in forced displacement contexts. |  

The second phase of the study attempted to fill these evidence gaps through concrete examples of inclusion in five contexts.
Phase II: Case Studies

Case studies examined the key factors affecting the inclusion of displaced populations in national education systems, as well as the costs of these policies.

*Country selection, design summary, categories of investigation*
# Case Study Countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study Country</th>
<th>N Displaced</th>
<th>Region (WB)</th>
<th>Income Level (FY22)</th>
<th>FCS (FY22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>1,100,000</td>
<td>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</td>
<td>Upper Middle</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>476,399</td>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>3,300,000</td>
<td>Middle East &amp; North Africa</td>
<td>Upper Middle</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>1,420,673</td>
<td>South Asia</td>
<td>Lower Middle</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*FCS = fragile and conflict-affected states
# Case Study Design Summary

## Table 2. Case Study Analytical Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Analysis</th>
<th>Target Actors (Indicative)</th>
<th>Desk Review</th>
<th>KII</th>
<th>FGD</th>
<th>Stakeholder Mapping</th>
<th>Cost and Funding Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Macro (policy)</td>
<td>• Policymakers (e.g., education, refugee policy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• International actors (e.g., UNHCR, FCDO, World Bank)</td>
<td><img src="Checkmark.png" alt="Checkmark" /></td>
<td><img src="Checkmark.png" alt="Checkmark" /></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="Checkmark.png" alt="Checkmark" /></td>
<td><img src="Checkmark.png" alt="Checkmark" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meso (institutional)</td>
<td>• Sub-national officials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="Checkmark.png" alt="Checkmark" /></td>
<td><img src="Checkmark.png" alt="Checkmark" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• NGO actors (e.g., UNHCR)</td>
<td><img src="Checkmark.png" alt="Checkmark" /></td>
<td><img src="Checkmark.png" alt="Checkmark" /></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="Checkmark.png" alt="Checkmark" /></td>
<td><img src="Checkmark.png" alt="Checkmark" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Program officials/liaisons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro (school)</td>
<td>• School administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="Checkmark.png" alt="Checkmark" /></td>
<td><img src="Checkmark.png" alt="Checkmark" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Teachers</td>
<td><img src="Checkmark.png" alt="Checkmark" /></td>
<td><img src="Checkmark.png" alt="Checkmark" /></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="Checkmark.png" alt="Checkmark" /></td>
<td><img src="Checkmark.png" alt="Checkmark" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="Checkmark.png" alt="Checkmark" /></td>
<td><img src="Checkmark.png" alt="Checkmark" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="Checkmark.png" alt="Checkmark" /></td>
<td><img src="Checkmark.png" alt="Checkmark" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Case study synthesis results

*Strengths, challenges, costs*
What works to promote inclusion? (1/2)

• A clear official national policy of inclusion—one that is enforced at all levels—supports the inclusion of refugee learners
  - Colombian government explicitly prioritized and institutionalized its commitment to refugee education
  - Policies in Chad were less explicit and may have inadvertently deprioritized refugee education

• MoEs that demonstrated leadership and heavy involvement in refugee education from the start were better equipped to provide education to displaced populations.
  - Colombia showed the strongest leadership in funding education, policy roll-out, and follow-through at the local level
What works to promote inclusion? (2/2)

- **Local level efforts showed promise** to support the inclusion of displaced learners.
  
  - NGOs in Pakistan support Afghan refugee children to access the Pakistani education system through outreach to local communities, advocacy with education authorities, and provision of materials, e.g., books and uniforms

- **Government education financing is most likely critical** for the effective inclusion of refugees into national education systems

  - Colombia case study highlights the importance of adequate financing to support inclusion
What inhibits inclusion? (1/2)

• Even when legislation and official policies support the inclusion of displaced learners in national education systems, **coordination failures inhibit the flow-down of policies at the local level**
  - All four countries struggled with coordination between national and local government actors

• **Lack of resources and services** presents an obstacle to full inclusion
  - All four countries lacked physical space in classrooms and TLMs
  - In Chad, only 11% of refugees enrolled in secondary school compared to 24% of Chadian learners (UNHCR, 2021)
What inhibits inclusion? (2/2)

• Displaced learners face practical problems accessing education, such as documentation requirements and learning in a language they do not speak
  - Afghan refugees in Pakistan required to show registration cards
  - LOI was a barrier for some refugee groups in Chad, Pakistan, and Sudan

• Teachers in all four case study countries expressed need for more training and support to address the psychosocial needs of forcibly displaced learners

• Lack of data on the participation of displaced learners in national education systems makes it difficult to understand exactly who is sitting in classrooms, how many students are out of school, and how students of different displacement statuses are progressing and performing in the system
Education expenditures are critical to understand but data are difficult to obtain

Lessons learned about education expenditures and refugee education

1. Larger education expenditures likely contribute the ability of countries to include refugees into national education systems

2. UNHCR allocates a larger amount of education to low-income and lower middle-income countries, likely because of their weaker education systems

Data limitations

1. Detailed education expenditure data are difficult to obtain and are challenging to link to specific education policies and programs

2. Governments generally do not distinguish between education expenditures per student for host populations and refugees
Costs of including refugees in national education systems differ considerably across countries

Figure 1. Unit Costs of Government Education for Refugee Children if They Were to Receive the Same Government Education as Host Populations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Overall Cost for Primary Schools and Secondary Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>$1,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions

• Clear official national policies of educational inclusion—when promoted and enforced at all levels—support inclusion of refugee learners

• Sufficient government education financing is required to effectively include refugees in national systems

  » But, to date there has been limited evidence generated on the effectiveness of government-supported programs supporting inclusion and learning

• Promising policies and programs exist to support inclusion of displaced learners, but they are often small-scale and plagued by resource and accessibility challenges

• Education expenditure data are difficult to obtain and interpret
Questions from UNHCR

1. What are some of the ways you envision that the findings and recommendations coming out of your recent research will be used by practitioners and policy makers in the four countries of interest?

2. What are some of the main obstacles that you think researchers face in ensuring uptake of evidence by practitioners and policy makers? In your experience, have you seen that a particular mode of dissemination works better?

3. We often hear the phrases ‘evidence-based policy’ and ‘evidence-based decision making’? What is their importance and why are they increasingly emphasized?
Annexes
Annex 1: Theory of Change (Adapted from Burde et al. 2015)

Inputs
- Interventions that provide support to administration, infrastructure, and resources
- Interventions that target educational content and practices

Early-Term Outcomes: Domains of Change
- System level: National education systems have better capacity, providing equitable and inclusive education.
- Community level: Communities have access to opportunities and the skills and resources to participate.
- School level: Formal and nonformal education provide innovative, inclusive, and quality learning opportunities.
- Individual level: Key stakeholders have tolerant and inclusive attitudes, as well as the skills and resources for forced displacement contexts.

Intermediate Outcomes: Access, Quality, Well-Being
- Access: Increased enrollment, retention, and attainment
- Quality: Improved academic achievement and prosocial behavior
- Well-Being: Improved physical, mental, and emotional well-being

Final Outcome
- Improved learning and social cohesion among the displaced and host populations

Moderators
- Type of target population
- Type of crisis
- Displacement context
- Duration of displacement

## Annex 2: Inclusion Continuum (early UNHCR draft)

### Typologies of Refugee Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Typologies of Refugee Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>UN and/or NGO led, financed and managed Child Friendly Spaces / non-formal education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>UN and/or NGO led, financed and managed formal schools using non-accredited curricula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>UN and/or NGO led, financed and managed non-segregated formal schools using home country curricula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>UN and/or NGO led, financed and managed refugee-hosted formal schools using host country curricula, with access to exams and cycle promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>MoE registered, UN or NGO led, designated to finance and manage refugee-hosted formal schools using host country curricula, with access to exams and cycle promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>MoE registered, UN or NGO led, designated to finance and manage refugee-hosted formal schools using host country curricula, with access to exams and cycle promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>MoE registered, UN or NGO led, designated to finance and manage refugee-hosted formal schools using host country curricula, with access to exams and cycle promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>MoE registered, and managed refugee-hosted formal schools using host country curricula, with access to exams and cycle promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Children attend public schools but UNHCR or others pay for some of the school costs (additional teachers, TLMs etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Children attend public schools with the same rights and financing as host children. UN and/or NGOs liaise with government for wrap around support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tigray influx in Sudan Standard early EiE</td>
<td>Bangladesh, Tanzania, Mauritania, Niger)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya camps, Ethiopia, South Sudan camps</td>
<td>Mozambique, Rwanda, Some Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>Lebanon, Pakistan, Jordan, Somalia, Cameroon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana, Nigeria, Kenya, urban Mali, Niger, Indonesia, Colombia</td>
<td>Some Uganda (returnees) Turkey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Non- or quasi-State funding, delivery and management of education including recurring costs of school buildings, teacher remuneration etc.

- Development partner and Government negotiation to include refugees and ensure roll out of all education funding to refugee hosting schools

---