Sustainable Refugee Education:
Identifying Best Practice Through the Lens of Social
Entrepreneurship

Elin Harm
Advisor: Nanette Levinson, SIS
University Honors in International Studies
Spring 2012

# Abstract

This study explores how the principles of social entrepreneurship can be used to promote sustainability in refugee education. Education is plays a significant role in international development as it extends beyond literacy, numeracy or vocational training. A dynamic education program will also have impacts in areas like health, finances, and community involvement. In the refugee context, education is especially important because of its capacity for conflict-resolution and peace building. The potential for refugee education programs to see major social, economic and environmental impacts makes it a perfect niche to study through the lens of social entrepreneurship. However, most of the current scholarship on refugee relief, including education, approaches the issue through the lens of charity or relief. In addition, most of the literature focuses on problems in refugee education, many of which are related to lack of sustainability, or the inability for programs to continue without assistance from non-governmental organizations.

This study investigates the research question in by reviewing the current literature in the overlapping fields and indentifying best practices. It examines academic articles, technical reports and case studies to define sustainability as it pertains to social entrepreneurship principles and to determine current sustainability practices in refugee relief. These findings are then applied to current challenges in the field to form a model for best practices for sustainability in refugee education. These best practices include community partnerships, integration into national school systems, and making sustainability or self-reliance an end goal as opposed to a means to an end.

# Table of Contents

# 1.0 Introduction

Social entrepreneurship is an emerging field that looks for new ways to address social, economic and environmental issues. Like conventional entrepreneurship, social entrepreneurship has an inherent goal of value creation. Instead of create wealth, the endeavors of social entrepreneurs focus on generating change with major impacts that last over time. This study focuses on this last aspect in a specific area of need, asking, "how can the principles of social entrepreneurship be used to promote sustainability in refugee education?"

The principles of social entrepreneurship have long been applied to education and refugee relief. Leading social entrepreneurial organization Ashoka has even given fellowships to individuals in the field (Ashoka, 2007). However, the principles have not been applied to the field as a whole or the practices of organizations as opposed to individuals. In addition, as refugee situations worldwide become increasingly long-term, it is important to look at refugee education issues though the lens of sustainability. This study investigates the research question in by reviewing the current literature in the overlapping fields and indentifying best practices. It examines academic articles, technical reports and case studies to define sustainability as it pertains to social entrepreneurship principles and to determine current sustainability practices in refugee relief. These findings are then applied to current challenges in the field to form a model for best practices for sustainability in refugee education.

# 2.0 Defining the concepts

## 2.1 Social entrepreneurship

While the term "social entrepreneurship" is relatively new, its roots extend much father into history. Any group or individual that has tried to solve a social issue beyond the capacity of the government or private could be said to have practiced a light form of social entrepreneurship. In the contemporary field, Roper and Cheney (2005) identify the shift from a focus on the welfare state to a free market economy as an integral event. As governments began selling and deregulating public institutions in areas like health, education and even disaster relief, it soon became clear that the traditional activities of the private sector could not sufficiently fulfill civil societies needs. Though many charities popped up in response, most were only able to provide reactive relief rather than solutions. As Dees (2009) explains, "only a vibrant and open local economy will be able to sustain improvements purchased with aid and charity. Charitable relief and aid may be necessary to relieve the symptoms of severe poverty long enough to pursue more sustainable strategies," (p.120). These strategies combine public partnerships, market factors and social engagement, forming what is now known as social entrepreneurship.

The key to social entrepreneurship is the word *social.* Whereas wealth creation is the central focus of traditional entrepreneurship, the main goal of *social* entrepreneurship is to generate mission related impact and social value. Also in contrast to the traditional form, social entrepreneurship is not only concerned with creating value but also with who receives it. "The social entrepreneur's value proposition," Martin and Osberg explain, "targets an underserved, neglected, or highly disadvantaged population that

lacks the financial means or political clout to achieve the transformative benefit on its own," (2007, p.35).

While most scholars agree on the underlying goals of social entrepreneurship, there is substantial debate in the field over what activities constitute social entrepreneurship, specifically regarding organizational type and the role of money. To accommodate this debate, Roper and Cheney (2005) divide the field into three distinct categories: a socially engaged private sector; entrepreneurial approaches used in the not-for-profit sector; and a combination of social engagement and entrepreneurship largely or wholly in the public sector. This division facilitates the comparison of different groups. Nevertheless, there is a general acceptance of Dees' (1998) intentionally vague description of social entrepreneurship as a combination of "the passion of a social mission with an image of business-like discipline, innovation, and determination," (p.1).  Roper and Cheney (2005) also emphasize that a target of SE is to break down barriers of social, public and business sectors by giving them the same language and tools.

By the definitions of Dees (1998) and Roper and Cheney (200%), SE is a holistic approach to social change, using all available tools to achieve the greatest possible impact. A key example of this combination comes from the best-known social enterprise activity: micro-financing. Micro financing takes the well-established practice of bank loans but targets a new group of clients. The return on investment is not only the repaid loans but also the social impacts, like poverty reduction, that could not have been achieved without the loans.

The term entrepreneur often invokes the image of an individual, like microfinance's Muhammad Yunus. Well-known leaders in the field of social entrepreneurship  such as

Ashoka and the Schwab foundation fund projects based on the potential of individuals. On the contrary, Peredo and McLean's (2006) argument that entrepreneurship is often best carried out through a team or group reflects a shift in the field towards *organizational* social entrepreneurship. This is especially important for both project longevity and adaptation to different cultures. While many of the "big ideas" in social entrepreneurship can be traced back to an individual, if the project does not work under new leadership it will eventually fail. Finally, as social entrepreneurship is applied to different environments around the world, many projects must adapt to high-context cultures that value family and community over individuals.

**2.2 Sustainability**

In social entrepreneurship, sustainability usually refers to maintaining impact. How can a project's social mission continue to be fulfilled in the long term? Can the model be applied to a new "generation" without continuously having to be re-implemented each time? Can the project become self-reliant over time? These questions are just some examples of how sustainability is identified in the field of social entrepreneurship. Many organizations that are not considered to be entrepreneurial endeavors ask similar questions in their guidelines. The United Nation's Refugee Agency (UNHCR), for examples, asks "Will the activity and its impact be likely to continue when external support is withdrawn, and will it be replicated or adapted?" (2011a, p.35), while Government's Sustainable Development Unit in the United Kingdom highlights the importance of a triple bottom line that includes *economic, social and environmental sustainability (Doherty, 2009).*

Despite the stereotype set by micro financing, financial sustainability is not a necessary element of social entrepreneurship. When social entrepreneurship does practice

innovative fund-raising or service delivery techniques, it is done to enhance the sustainability of the organization, not for rapid growth and risk taking in and of itself, as in traditional entrepreneurship organization (Weerawardena & Mort, 2006). By comparing sustainability in social entrepreneurship to environmental sustainability, Roper and Cheney (2005) argue that a focus on sustainable financing alone is actually a weaker practice. "Like social entrepreneurship," they explain, " [environmental] sustainability can favor either the social and environmental or the economic sectors, depending upon which model is adopted. The model of weak sustainability preferences the economic and so parallels the model of social entrepreneurship that seeks direct or indirect inimical reward for the business entrepreneur. Strong sustainability favors the social and environmental over economic, upholding the social values of a truly civil society based social entrepreneurialism." While it is important for an endeavor to a long term financing plan, to be considered strong social entrepreneurship, sustaining social impact must be the dominant objective.

Distinct from other fields, the drive for sustainability in social entrepreneurship is often linked to morality (Weerawardena & Mort, 2006). Individuals within an organization often feel compelled to keep their mission alive so as not to not leave their clients without healthcare, means for livelihood, education, etc. A drive to reach a social mission, however, is not enough to ensure sustainability. Projects with the boldest of intents risk falling into what Crutchfield and Grant call "the chasm of high expectations and insufficient organizational capacity," (p.181). As we will later see, this is where the other principles of social entrepreneurship become essential in reaching sustainability.

Finally, sustainability in social entrepreneurship can be understood through the lens

8

of equilibriums. Martin and Osberg (2007) argue that social entrepreneurship is about indentifying stable but unjust equilibriums and finding positive opportunities to challenge them. Sustainability is achieved by knocking the equilibrium out of balance and "forging a new, stable equilibrium that releases trapped potential or alleviates the suffering of…and ensuring a better future for the targeted group and even society at large," (p. 35).

## 2.3 Innovation, partnerships, capacity and culture

As this literature review has so far shown, most academics agree that sustainability is an inherent component social entrepreneurship . At the same time, there are many other principles within social entrepreneurship that enhance a project's sustainability. The first is innovation. Social entrepreneurs must have a "big idea," which, as in conventional entrepreneurship is related to creating a new modeling for creating and distributing products and services (Seelos & Mair, 2005). Similarly, Phills, Deiglmeir and Miller define social innovation as "a novel solution to a social problem that is more effective, efficient, sustainable or just than existing solutions and for which the value created accrues primary to society as a whole rather than private individuals."(Phills, Deiglmeir & Miller, 2008 in Auerswald, 2009, p.52). Nevertheless, Weerawardena and Mort (2006) caution that "whilst innovativeness is important, it will be bounded by the need for survival," (p.29). No innovation is sustainable if it is so radical that its failure or misapplication risks the longevity of the organization or project.

Another key principle that promotes sustainability is the creation of partnerships. For example, partnerships between a community and an NGO are important factors for development in the community at various levels (Doherty, 2009). This is important for

sustainability because it integrates change in a culturally appropriate way and helps develop leaders who can take over the project at the imminent departure of the NGO. Another important type of partnership for sustainability is partnership between NGOs. As competition for funding increases, inter-NGO partnership, from the grass roots to the international level, increases sustainability by allocating capital more effectively.

Third, through their study of six high-impact non-profit , Crutchfield and Grant (2008) identify people, capital and infrastructure as areas in which organizations must build their capacity in order to sustain long-term impact. This includes developing a strategy to identify, hire and retain top performers and understanding that funding and fundraising do not stand-alone but rather is integrated in their programs, strategies, and underlying mission. Building organizational capacity  is the most challenging principle for many projects because donors often specify that their contributions must directly finance programs, not administration. Nevertheless, these investments are key for reaching sustainability because they allow organizations to operate and disseminate innovation more efficiently.

Finally, one cannot look at sustainability without also taking culture into consideration. "In the context of stakeholder dialogue," Doherty (2009) explains, "sustainability is a locally derived concept," (p.174). There can be no universal definition regarding what exactly makes a project sustainable. Definitions will even vary between clients, donors, administrators, etc. Any project must therefore take these cultural contexts into careful consideration in order to discover what practices will lead to a form of sustainability that is accepted by all stakeholders.

# 3.0 Social Entrepreneurship in Refugee Relief

## 3.1 Micro finance in Kenya

Before applying the sustainability principles from social entrepreneurship to refugee education, one must first examine where social entrepreneurship has taken place in other areas of refugee relief and why these endeavors have or have not been sustainable. One key example is the micro financing program run by the International Rescue Committee (IRC) in the Kakuma refugee camp in Kenya. Started in 1993, this program was disbanded in 2002. Philips (2002) lends the program's failure to its inability to meet the numerous minimum conditions needed for successful implementation. First, there was a lack of organizational capacity on the part of the IRC. The microfinance program had a subsidiary importance, for example, compared to health promotion. As a result, those in charge of microfinance did not have the proper expertise or resources to run the program, and there was often a breakdown in communication between different levels of the IRC.

The second major issue was the difficulty in benefiting the micro-finance program's target clients. The IRC's goal was to reach the vulnerable and marginalized refugee population, without taking into account the competing factors of extreme poverty within the camp and successful microfinance programs' focus on minimizing loan defaults. If there was any success, the overall positive impact on the refugee population was questionable (Philips, 2002). In the end, the IRC program could not operationalize its goal of sustainability. No general definition of sustainability was set for the project, let alone adapted to the refugee camp context. The program simply tried to apply a definition for sustainability that had worked in a Balkan context, where "achievement of sustainability was defined as the building of a local, independent microfinance institution that could

11

continue operations in the absence of IRC," (Philips, 2002, p.7). This was an impossible standard to meet as refugees in the Kakuma camp relied on the IRC in every aspect of the lives from food to shelter to security.

## 3.2 "Self-reliance" in the camp context

Hunter (2009) extends a much deeper criticism toward self-reliance goals in refugee camps under the jurisdiction of the UNHCR. She argues that "...refugees are expected to exercise rights they do not have to achieve a degree of independence which is not even expected of local populations in the same context and without access to the bare minimum of resources," (p.2-3). Hunter (2009) also sees the UNHCR's self-reliance initiatives as self-serving; their main goal is not achieve sustainable-self reliance because it is in the best interest of the refugee population, but because it relieves funding pressures.

Despite these issues, are social entrepreneurial endeavors still valid in the refugee context? The answer is yes, as long as the range of definitions and requisites for social entrepreneurship and sustainability as described in the previous section are applied. This includes Crutchfield and Grant's (2008) emphasis on an organization's commitment to hire qualified staff and allocate sufficient resources to the administration side of programming, while also recognizing program limits and understanding impact holistically. The nature of refugee camps mean that complete "self-reliance," especially financially, might not be an appropriate element of sustainability to focus on.

# 4.0 Refugee Education

## 4.1 Refugee education as an important field of study

The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural (UNESCO) organization estimates that 45% of refugees, internally displaced people and asylum seekers are less than 18 years old (2011). This makes up over 19.5 million children who's access to quality at quality education is at risk or non-existent, not to mention millions more adult refugees who lack basic education. Refugee education is an important field to study because of the inadequacy of the "trickle down effect" in development education. "Left to market forces alone," Kagia (2006) explains, "…the benefits of education would reach only a few people." For this reason a conscious effort must be made to ensure education reaches marginalized populations such as refugees.

Refugee education is also an important field because of the rampant negative effects of mass displacement. UNESCO describes these as "[depriving] those most "displacement deprives those most immediately affected of shelter, food, basic services and productive resources, and can lead to marginalization, abject poverty and loss of independence," (2011, p152). Not only is education one of the services lost in displacement, it is critical part of mediating other losses and starting the rebuilding process.

## 4.2 Parameters

This study looks at refugee education beyond those who hold legal refugee status or meet the formal definition of a refugee. Instead, it uses a more conventional definition of a refugee as anyone who is forced to migrate by any natural disaster or social conflict. This

study includes Internally Displaced People (IDPs), those who are forced to migrate within the borders of their home country, in this definition. Their inclusion is important because the number of global IDPs exceeds the number of refugees twofold (UNESCO, 2011). IDPS also experience many of the same cultural and political challenges as they are forced from one region to another.

As nearly 85% of refugees are received by neighboring developing countries (UNESCO, 2011), this study focuses of refuge education in the context of development and mass migration (as opposed to relatively small groups of refugees seeking education developed countries). In theory, all refugee education should be transitional education. Nevertheless, as more than half of refugees have been so for over five years (UNESCO, 2011), it is clear that planning for refugee education must extend beyond the short term. For these reasons, this study looks at best sustainability practices in transitional, reconstruction and long-term education.

## 4.3 Correlation to development education

As refugees come from and arrive in developing countries, refugee education shares many of the same objectives, impacts and challenges as the broader field of development education. There are two main perspectives on the importance of education in the context of development, similar in that they both view education as its own goal and a tool to achieve other goals. First, the human rights approach defines education as a gateway to human rights, as well as a human right in and of itself (Dryden-Petersen, 2011; UNESCO, 2002). Education has intrinsic importance by " "adding meaning and value to everyone's lives without discrimination," (UNESCO, 2002, p.30) while unlocking rights such as health, liberty, security, economic well-being, participation. The second perspective stems from

Amartya Sen's capability approach to development, which argues that "development occurs when people are more able to achieve what makes their lives valuable," (UNESCO, 2002, p.32). This approach sees skills gained through education like reading and writing as valuable themselves, and as important instruments for displacing negative barriers and empowering disadvantaged groups, like refugees. A third humanitarian approach exists specific to emergency education, viewing education as part of rapid-response protection for children (Dryden-Peterson, 2011).

The recent UNHCR report *Refugee Education: A Global Review* explains that no approach is currently dominate; rather, the view of education varies between organization, donor, host country, parent and student. However, the prominence of the Education for All (EFA) movement, which holds strong moral and legal basis for providing primary education worldwide, shows that the human rights approach has a strong influence in contemporary refugee education (Dryden-Petersen, 2000; McCormick, 2012).

Through the lens of social entrepreneurship, this study agrees with both approaches, in viewing education as social value itself while creating social value in other areas. For example, the World Bank finds that education as a strong impact on both macro and microeconomics. Not only can better educational quality and quantity lead to national economic growth, it is essential for breaking the intergenerational transmission of poverty (Kagia, 2006). The UNHCR, however, warns that not development strategy is an island. Just as education alone cannot improve health or economic growth, "the education status of refugees will not be improved by education services alone;" that is, " the underlying determinants of education must also be addressed by improving livelihoods and income

generation, providing food security and nutrition, appropriate shelter and housing, health services and access to water and sanitation." (UNHCR, 2011a, p.5).

## 4.4 Current challenges

### 4.4.1 Access barriers

For education to have sustainable impacts, it must first be accessible. Refugees in particular experience a variety of barriers to access, such as discrimination, culture, lack of demand and cost. For example, refugees are often reluctant to attend schools in their host country because they of the high levels of discrimination they experience from students, teachers and administrators (Dryden-Peterson, 2011; Sheahan, 2012). Poor infrastructure or quality can also be a disincentive for attending school (Hartil, 2012; Kagia, 2006). In non-integrated contexts, the culture of the refugees can be its own barrier. For example, Afghan refugee families in Pakistan are often unwilling to send their children to schools when teachers are unknown to the community (Kirk & Winthrop, 2007). Cultural perceptions of the importance of schooling influence a refugee community's demand for education (Dryden-Peterson, 2011). Expensive tuition, uniforms, supplies or other economic costs are cited as one of the greatest barriers for refugees (Hartil, 2012; Sheahan, 2012). But even with low economic costs, if education is seen as having relatively low benefits, families will be unwilling to pay the high opportunity costs, such as lost labor, of sending their children to school (Kagia, 2006).

### 4.4.2 Focus on primary education

The majority of NGO sponsored education programs focus on providing primary education for children. Instances of secondary, tertiary and basic education for adults exist,

but are rarely the main focus (McCaffery, 2007). On the contrary, it has become apparent that primary education is not enough to create a digital, knowledge society that can compete globally and that secondary education is a minimum requirement for mid-level positions popping up in the developing world (Kagia, 2006). Secondary education also has a higher individual economic impact than primary education, adding an average of 20% to an individual's income for every year, compared to just 10% per year for formal primary schooling (Dryden-Peterson, 2011).

### 4.4.3 Teacher retention and training

Teachers are a critical component to any refugee education program. As Dryden-Peterson (2011) illustrates, "teachers are the central aspect of refugee education. Sometimes there is no building, no administration, but there is a teacher," (54). Similarly, Rutayisire (2007) found in Rwanda, teachers are culturally regarded as the most knowledgeable members of society, and therefore their influence, negative or positive, on community behavior is significant. It is therefore essential to provide teachers with sufficient resources, training and compensation (Rutayisire, 2007; Kirk & Winthrop, 2007). Nevertheless, "agencies lack the resources to pay salaries," let alone train teachers on a regular basis, "and lack the resources to pay salaries and displaced parents are too poor to cover wage costs from their own pockets, making the process unsustainable," (UNESCO, 2011, p.212). If teachers are paid at all, low teacher salaries make long-term commitments nearly impossible (Kirk & Winthrop, 2007; Hartil, 2012) .

### 4.4.4 Relationship with host government's Ministry of Education

There is a consensus among international agencies that national governments hold the major responsibility for education service delivery and monitoring (UNESCO, 2002). However, with 85% of refugees living in host countries that are developing, tensions arise from "the implication that host governments and refugee agencies have to provide education in areas where the national population itself is poorly served," (UNESCO, 2011, 153). Governments avoid this issue by refusing to recognize refugee populations and therefore removing the obligation to education them. For this and other reasons, the assumption that overall education reform in the host country would reach marginalized groups has proven false (UNESCO, 2010). Finally, in the rare cases that refugee children are integrated into national education systems, teachers and schools are not unable to meet their needs because of lack of documents, varying educational experiences, language barriers, and the physical and emotional effects of trauma (Szenete & Hoot, 2006).

### 4.4.5 Funding

Despite the high social, environmental and economic impacts that stem from development education in general, funding allocations do not reflect the important of the field. For example, Catholic Relief Services (CRS), an international relief organization that works in a handful of development areas that can benefit form education spends only 8% of its budget on education programs (2010a). Though they are the leading organization for refugee issues, the UNHCR similarly spends only 2% of its humanitarian aid on education (Dryden-Peterson, 2011). Finally, the 2008 financial crisis emphasized importance of having sustainable programs that are not solely dependent on international aid or administration.

### 4.4.6 Education as a contributor to conflict

Armed conflict and refugee education are strongly linked not only because conflict is often what forces groups to migrate, but because discriminatory education practices play a role in exacerbating conflict. In Rwanda, for example, "injustices based on discrimination and conflict were imparted through formalized rote learning in history, civic education, religious and moral education, and languages," (Rutayisire, 2007, p.117). Globally, this type of impact of education on armed conflict is widely underestimated (UNESCO, 2011). Of course, education alone does not lead to conflict; however, "when classrooms are used not to nurture young minds by teaching children to think critically in a spirit of tolerance and mutual understanding, but to poison those minds with prejudice, intolerance and a distorted view of history, they can become a breeding ground for violence," (UNESCO, 2011, p131). Creating an equitable education system that promotes peace and reconciliation is therefore essential to sustainability because the continuation of or return to conflict threatens the positive impacts of education.

# 5.0 Best Practices

The following best practices for sustainability in refugee education programs were created by combining the principles of sustainability from social entrepreneurship with best-practice models already identified by leading organizations, and applying them to available case studies. These practices aim to either to alleviate sustainability challenges, promote program longevity and sustainable social, environmental and economic impact. In summary, they are:

1.  Promote community participation while creating partnerships between the refugee community, non-governmental organizations and the host government.

2.  Integrate refugee children and schools into national school systems, advocating for their specific rights while supporting educational improvements for all students.

3.  Create a sustainability plan at the onset of crisis that avoids setting precedents that cannot be upheld.

4.  Develop culturally appropriate curriculums that also include peace-building and trauma counseling.

5.  Hire and retain qualified teachers by providing regular training and appropriate compensation.

6.  Set a clear and conceptualizable definition of sustainability that is both measureable and an end goal.

7.  Promote quality education at all levels and foster post-education options.

**5.1 Promote community participation while creating partnerships between the community, non-governmental organizations and the host government.**

Refugee communities must play an active role establishing and running education programs for sustainable programs and impacts. If in parents and other community members do not understand the importance of education they will not invest in them (culturally, financially or time-wise). Encouraging community participation in and ownership of education programs not only promotes culturally viable programs but also creates social impact by increasing participation in other areas of civil society. Schools should no only *include* parents and other community members in decision-making, but give them a pivotal role. It cannot be assumed, however, that they have the planning and management skills to do so; therefore, partnerships with NGOs are essential for providing training and initial leadership. Partnerships are also essential to build a multi-level structure of trust between the refugee community and the host-government as refugee students are integrated under the direct jurisdiction of the Ministry of Education.

**5.2 Integrate refugee children and schools into national school systems, advocating for their specific rights while supporting educational improvements for all students**

Whenever possible refugees should participate in mainstream education programs. This can be done either through the integrations of refugees into schools with local students or by the accreditation of refugee schools by the host government. Completely separate, parallel education systems should be avoided because they require inefficient, unsustainable allocation of resources and emphasize a dichotomy between refugee and host population. Due to their marginalized status, special emphasis must be placed on advocating for refugee student and school rights. Taking into account, however, that most

refugees arrive in developing countries with poor education themselves, priority should be placed on strengthening education systems to benefit all.

**5.3 Create a sustainability plan at the onset of crisis that avoids setting precedents that cannot be upheld**

For sustainable social impacts, plans for sustainability must be created at the onset of crisis, especially in protracted refugee situations. While initial relief efforts require substantial resources from aid organizations, at the same time these groups should avoid precedents for program content, administration and financing that cannot be sustained. Plans should into account local conditions as well as the skills and attributes refugees bring with them. Emergency education programs should be transitional in nature, providing quality, equitable education as soon as possible but setting an end goal of integration either into the host or home government system, (depending on the duration of the crisis).

**5.4 Develop culturally appropriate curriculums that include peace-building and trauma counseling**

In order for education to have sustainable social values, curriculums, as well as administrative structures, must coincide with the culture of the refugee community and that of their host. Community participation plays a huge role here, as the stakeholders themselves are better equipped than outsiders to determine what is culturally appropriate. This ranges from providing classes in both the host and home language, to using local materials that are both relevant to students and economically and environmentally sustainable. Overall, curriculum should "develop an inclusive learning environment" (UNESCO, 2010) without negative images or stereotypes. Unless peace and reconstruction is achieved, no education system is truly sustainable. While equal education in itself

promotes peace, all programs should also contain peace building and conflict resolution teaching. Finally, because refugee students are likely to have experienced dramatic traumas, teachers and schools must be trained to approach students sensitively, while helping to counsel them and rebuild their trust with society.

**5.5 Hire and retain qualified teachers by providing regular training and appropriate compensation**

Quality teachers must be identified and trained on a regular basis. This training should cultivate high-quality skills and leads to basic qualification that is recognized in home and or host counties. Even the best curriculums or school structures are unsustainable if teachers cannot implement them successfully. In return, teachers must be appropriately compensated. This can be monetarily or with in-kind resources, as long as it allows them to focus on teaching without having to seek other income. The level of compensation should be agreed upon by all stakeholders and paid on time. In addition to retaining current teachers, this practice increases sustainability by encouraging other community members to become teachers.

**5.6 Set a clear and conceptualizable definition of sustainability that is both measureable and an end goal**

As sustainability is a culturally derived concept, all refugee education initiatives must set their own definition of sustainability. This definition should account for the general principles as outlined in this study while at the same time is practice and feasible for the local environment. For example, while completely self-reliant financing appropriate in many refugee contexts, self-reliant administration is often possible through community participation and training.  All sustainability objectives as well as the processes leading

toward them must be measurable. Programs should replace or supplement conventional, counting methods of assessment (for example, how many students served) for qualitative assessment that focus on capacity building and long term social, environmental and economic impacts.  Finally, sustainability  and sustainable impact should be a goal in itself, not a means to other ends .

**5.7 Promote quality education at all levels and foster post-education options**

All refugee education programs should focus on providing quality, accessible education that meets the standards of general development education programs. This should include primary education and basic skills as well as secondary, tertiary and vocational schooling. Schools should provide complementary inputs that both encourage school attendance and lead to impacts in other spheres as part of a "joined-up national strategy" (UNESCO, 2010) for larger issues such as poverty reduction and de-marginalization. Finally, initiatives must also work to create post-education opportunities that offset the costs of education and make participation worthwhile.

# 6.0 Conclusion

Social entrepreneurship and education go hand in hand because of their shared relationship to impacts. In development, education is well recognized not only as important in and of itself, but also as away to impact other fields such as health, community participation and peace-building. Meanwhile, the principles of social entrepreneurship combine innovation, capacity building and culture to not only increase these types of impacts and but to make sure the benefits are sustainable and received by marginalized populations, like refugees. Sustainability is not the only issue in refugee education nor is

education the only way to create social, economic and environmental value for refugees. However, as resources from governments and NGOs become increasingly limited, focusing on education is a crucial way to target challenges in multiple areas.

While all development education programs should implement best practices for sustainability, this is particularly important in the refugee context. Not only do refugees face unique challenges to education and education sustainability, as periods of displacement grow longer and the likeliness of groups returning home declines, it is clear that programs can no longer be just emergency-based or transitional. Best practices for sustainable education specific to refugees like the ones outlined in this study are therefore appropriate and necessary.

# 7.0 References

Auerswald, P. (2009). Creating social value. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 7(2), 51-
    55.

Crutchfield, L. & Grant, H. (2008). *Forces for good: The six practices of high-*
    *impact nonprofits.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

CRS (2010a). *Annual Report: If you could only see.* Baltimore, MD: Catholic Relief Services.

CRS (2010b. *A Holistic and Sustainable Approach to  Improving Education Access and*
    *Quality.* CRS.

Dees, J. G. (1998). The meaning of "social entrepreneurship". Stanford University: Draft
    Report for the Kauffman Center for Entrepreneurial Leadership.

Dees, J. G. (2009). Philanthropy and enterprise: Harnessing the power of business and
    social entrepreneurship for development. *Innovations*. Special edition for the Skoll
    World Forum. 223-236.

DeVoe, D. (2012) Darfuri students return to school. Catholic Relief Services.

Doherty, B. (2009). *Management for social enterprise*. Los Angeles: SAGE.

Dryden-Peterson, S. (2011). *Refugee Education: A Global Review*. Geneva:  UNHRC.

Etefa, A. (2007). Thousands of refugee children start school in Egypt with UNHCR help.
    UNHCR.

Hartil, L. (2012). Congo challenge: Food or school. Catholic Relief Services.

Hunter, M. (2009). The failure of self-reliance in refugee settlements. *POLIS Journal, 20,* 1-
    46.

INEE (2004) *Minimum Standards for Education in Emergencies, Chronic Crises and Early*

*Reconstruction.* Paris: Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies.

Kagia, R. (2006). Securing the future through education: A tide to lift all boats. In V.K.

Bhargava (Ed.), *Global Issues for Global Citizens: An Introduction to Key Development*

*Challenges*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.

Kirk, J. and Winthrop, R. (2007). Home-based schools: A transitional education model in

Afghanistan. In Leach, F. & Dunne, M. (Eds.) *Education, Conflict and Reconciliation:*

*International Perspectives* (pp.99-113). Oxford: Peter Lang.

Kirchhof, A. (2009) Secondary school support gives former refugees a chance in Burundi.

UNHCR.

Martin, R.L. & Osberg, S. (2007). Social entrepreneurship: The case for definition. *Stanford*

*Social Innovation Review,* 28-39.

McCaffery, J. (2007). Transformative literacy, conflict resolution and peace-building:

Examples from Sierra Leone and Sudan. In Leach, F. & Dunne, M. (Eds.) *Education,*

*Conflict and Reconciliation: International Perspectives* (pp.131-150). Oxford: Peter

Lang.

Peredo, A.M. & McLean, M. (2006). Social entrepreneurship: A critical review of the

concept. *Journal of World Business*. 41. 56-65.

Philips, J. (2002) Challenges to the effective implementation of microfinance programmes

in refugee settings. *Forced Migration Review*. 20. p5-8.

Phills, J., Deiglmeier, K. & Miller, D. (2008). Rediscovering Social Innovation. *Stanford Social*

*Innovation Review*. 6(4). 34-43.

Priyanka, P. (2011). At a glance: Liberia - Creating opportunities from crisis. UNICEF.

Pruthi, P. (2011). Displaced by political conflict, Ivorian child refugees attend school at

Liberia's Bahn camp. UNICEF.

Qahir, K. & J. Kirk. (2007) INEE minimum standards: A tool for education quality assessment in Afghan refugee schools in Pakistan. *Current Issues in Comparative Education, 9*(2), 20-32.

Relief International. (2012a). Azerbaijan: Refugee education. Relief International.

Roper, J. & Cheney, G. (2005). Leadership, learning and human resource management: The meanings of social entrepreneurship today. *Corporate Governance, 5*(3). 95-104.

Rutayisire, J. (2007). The role of teachers in the social and political reconstruction of post-genocide Rwanda. In Leach, F. & Dunne, M. (Eds.) *Education, Conflict and Reconciliation: International Perspectives* (pp.115-130). Oxford: Peter Lang.

Seelos, C. & Mair, J. (2005). Social entrepreneurship: Creating new business models to serve the poor. *Business Horizons*, *48,* 241-246.

Sheahan, L. (2012).  A new chapter for refugee students in Egypt. Catholic Relief Services.

Szente, J. & Hoot, J. (2006). Exploring the needs of refugee children in our schools. In Adams, L. & Kirova, A. (Eds.) *Global Migration and Education: Schools, Children, and Families* (pp.219-237). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

UNESCO. (2002). *Education for all: Is the world on track? EFA Global Monitoring Report 2002.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

UNESCO. (2010). *Education for all: Reaching the marginalized. EFA Global Monitoring Report 2010.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

UNESCO. (2011). *The hidden crisis: Armed conflict and education. EFA Global Monitoring Report 2011.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

UNHCR (2011). *Ensuring Access to Education: Operational Guidance on Refugee Protection*

*and Solutions in Urban Areas*. Geneva: UNHCR.

UNHCR. (2012). Encouraging self-reliance. *UNHCR Global Appeal 2012-2013,* 41-43.

Weerawardena, J. & Mort, G. S. (2006). Investigating social entrepreneurship: A

multidimensional model. *Journal of World Business, 41*, 21-31.