B | Center for Universal Education at BROOKINGS

THE ROLE OF RESEARCH *FOR* AND *ABOUT* SCALING EDUCATION INNOVATIONS
ROSIE THEMATIC REFLECTION BRIEF

BY NICA BASUEL, ROHAN CARTER-RAU, MOLLY CURTISS WYSS, MAYA ELLIOTT, BRAD OLSEN, TRACY OLSON, AND MÓNICA RODRIGUEZ

What is ROSIE?

To support and better understand how to scale effectively, in 2020, the Millions Learning project at the Center for Universal Education (CUE) at Brookings joined the Global Partnership for Education's (GPE) Knowledge and Innovation Exchange (KIX), a joint partnership between GPE and the International Development Research Centre (IDRC), to facilitate a cross-national, multiteam, design-based research and professional support initiative called Research on *Scaling* the Impact of Innovations in Education (ROSIE). Since 2021, ROSIE has brought together 15 researcher and

practitioner teams working in 30 low- and middle-income countries to study the process of scaling education initiatives for impact.

From this work, Millions Learning has developed three thematic briefs. This brief reflects on the 15 KIX teams' experiences to shed light on the **role of research in the scaling process.**

Previous research from the ROSIE project makes clear that in practice there exists a tension between the broader push to advance the implementation, or scaling, of the innovation on the one side, and pressure to focus on *collecting data and conducting research* on the other side. Because we believe that this tension is not unique to ROSIE scaling teams and likely appears in many education scaling efforts around the world, we use this brief to explore related topics and offer some clarity around using research to advance scaling.

A NOTE ABOUT THE RESEARCH FOR THESE BRIEFS

Since 2021, ROSIE has engaged in collaborative action research as well as more focused qualitative research on the scaling experiences of the 15 KIX-ROSIE teams. We have been systematic, rigorous, and reflexive about this empirical work, but there are limitations to our research. This brief is designed as an empirical essay rather than a research report. This means that we drew on our empirical work for the contents of this brief—and include examples from the research to illustrate and ground these briefs—but we also relied on our broader knowledge of scaling, research we conducted on other scaling projects, and our professional reflection. These briefs, therefore, should be used as guides filled with examples and reflections rather than strict recommendations.

What do we mean by research for and about scaling?

TERMINOLOGY: *Research* is systematic empirical study of a phenomenon or hypothesis in order to generate new knowledge or improved understandings about a thing. Research is a process that involves developing research questions, systematically gathering relevant quantitative and/or qualitative data, carefully analyzing and making meaning of the data, and sharing findings.

It can be helpful to distinguish between **research for scaling**—collecting and using data in service of a particular scaling effort—from its close cousin **research *about* scaling**. Though different researchers likely frame these distinctions differently, we find the following definition helpful.

Research *for* scaling is done in support of a scaling process and includes collecting data for ensuring the particular innovation is suitable for scaling; adopting the best scaling process for the situation; using data to adapt the scaling process as it unfolds; and strategically sharing data with government decisionmakers and other stakeholders to increase support for the scaling and to address emergent challenges.

Research *about* scaling, however, is a little different. It is collecting and using data to study, understand, and share with others the broader contours of scaling and "what works" in scaling as a general process of implementing and embedding a promising innovation in a location for sustained impact. Research *for* scaling is focused on learning in service of scaling a particular impact or change into the system. Research *about* scaling is studying the phenomenon of scaling so the world better understands the process.

TABLE 1

The following table illuminates this subtle but important distinction.

	DEFINITION	EXAMPLES
Research FOR scaling	Collecting and analyzing information to help make informed decisions about scaling a particular innovation	• Pilots to test out a shortened training approach • Feedback from teachers, families, and key government stakeholders • Observations of teachers who complete a training (to understand effects of the training) • Comparative cost analyses of the two different training approaches • Assessments of current government policies (to identify potential avenues for institutionalizing the new training approach) • Periodic trackers or reports assessing scaling progress across preset indicators
Research ABOUT scaling	Collecting and analyzing information about the scaling process	• Notes, reports, and other scaling outputs from monitoring, evaluation, and learning (MEL) planning and other meetings that generate and share insights into how scaling goals and strategies shifted over time • Reflections from team members about inflection points in the scaling journey that resulted in adaptations or updates to the scaling strategy or goal • Research synthesis reports on approaches that enabled effective innovation adjustments or scaling adaptations in different contexts, translated into semi-generalizable principles for change • Case studies and cross-case analysis of how scaling works

Both types of research are important for scaling impact in education. The second type, however, is less common because it is less incentivized outside of academia and, as a result, the field does not have as full a body of knowledge as it could. We recommend funders and education improvement organizations find ways to incentivize more research about scaling in education.

Understanding tiers of research for scaling

There are many different types and categories of research used to support the scaling process. Cooley and Howard frame research for scaling inside three tiers:[1]

TIER 1:
Proof of Concept: Working to demonstrate that a particular innovation is useful and feasible. This tier seeks to answer questions like: Is this innovation effective? Is it worth considering scaling?

TIER 1
Working to demonstrate that a particular innovation is useful and feasible.

Proof of Concept

TIER 2
Evaluating how easy or difficult it will likely be to scale the innovation in the particular context, and refining and adapting the innovation to the realities of the location.

Scalability Assessment

TIER 3
Analyzing how to encourage people, processes, and systems to adopt the innovation in ways that transform current practices and last the test of time.

Change Management

TIER 2:
Scalability Assessment: Evaluating how easy or difficult it will likely be to scale in the particular context and refining the innovation to the location (as well as possibly making systemic changes in the location to make it more receptive to scaling). This tier seeks to answer questions like: Under what conditions is the innovation likely to take root in the everyday practice of users? How does the innovation need to be adapted to address constraints and opportunities in the broader environment (such as power dynamics, cultural practices, financial constraints, and capacity details)? How can conditions within the educational system be transformed to open space up for scaling?

TIER 3:
Change Management: Analyzing how to encourage people, processes, and systems to adopt the innovation in ways that transform current practices and institutions and last the test of time. This tier seeks to answer questions like: How can the innovation's impact be scaled sustainably? Are we staying true to the core components of the innovation as we scale? How does the scaling strategy need to change based on what we are learning? What adaptations are needed to support sustainability as we move on to later scaling phases?

Research on scaling[2] has found that this first tier is common (although—interestingly—not always connected to the actual scaling considerations), the second one less common, and the third one quite rare. As we share in this brief, we found this same allocation to be true in our review of the ROSIE teams' work.

These three tiers need not be necessarily construed as sequenced phases, nor should they be carried out independently from one another. As Cooley and Howard note about the work of scaling, "It is tempting to view these tiers as a sequence of information needs over time as the focus of scaling moves from effectiveness to efficiency to expansion." Instead, however, they recommend conducting all three tiers of scaling work concurrently so that interdependent learning is generated during the whole scaling journey. In terms of sequencing the research phases specifically, though, this point is more nuanced. There are likely pros and cons to approaching the research sequentially or concurrently. For example, one approach is to conduct research sequentially from beginning to end: prove the concept, evaluate scalability, and then study advancement toward the scaling goal during the journey. Another sequential approach is backward mapping: start with the end in mind and frame the research in reverse by studying the extent to which the scaling is on-track toward its ultimate goal. A third approach is to engage research in all three tiers concurrently and view each line of empirical work as interdependent. At present, there is no clear evidence arguing for one of these approaches being superior and, additionally, there is still the overall point that, in general, no matter what, scaling teams are well served to consider all three tiers as influencing each other along the way. Cooley and Howard implore scaling teams to resist the urge to defer scalability assessment and change management work until proof of concept is well established, warning of the "serious risk of adding to the graveyard of 'proven' but unscalable technologies.[3]"

How are ROSIE scaling teams conducting research to support scaling efforts?

ALL TEAMS PURSUE RESEARCH *FOR* SCALING, BUT NOT ALL THREE TIERS RECEIVE TREATMENT

As part of their KIX work, all 15 scaling teams carried out research for scaling. However, depending on where they were in their scaling journey, the types and purposes of research varied. This emphasizes the common misstep of treating the three tiers as independent from each other. In large part, the three scaling tiers of research played out across the ROSIE teams as one would expect. For example,

many teams focused on 'proof of concept' research, especially teams in the early stages of scaling. Some of these teams also conducted some initial 'scalability assessment' research related to their context, including reviewing existing education practices and models, either in their target scaling region(s) or that were related to the education problem they wished to address. This kind of work includes literature reviews of existing solutions, mapping related local work already in progress, and conducting demographic analyses of the groups and subgroups their initiative intends to serve.

Some teams, particularly those further along in their scaling process, carried out more complex forms of scalability assessment (tier two) and conducted some change management research (tier three). Given the popularity of transferring innovations from country to country, these teams frequently already had proof of concept research for their innovation in one context but were now studying its implementation in another context. They were often carrying out mixed-method, quasi-

experimental studies to assess the effects of their innovation on users and stakeholders as scaling proceeded in more locations or new contexts. In a few cases, teams were also conducting qualitative studies to better understand how teachers (or other educators such as community reading tutors, female learner guides, or school administrators) experienced either the innovation—or the process of embedding the innovation inside government (often called "institutionalization").

There were only a few examples of 'change management' research among ROSIE teams. One team was conducting participatory research in which not only the scaling researchers but also government representatives and other stakeholders participated in data collection, analysis, and sharing of findings as a way to foster collective ownership and therefore improve the sustainability of the scaling. Another team was conducting a retrospective study to examine the sustainability of their approach after the implementing NGO stopped implementing it and had handed the innovation over to the government.

These examples illustrate that while indeed research for scaling was taking place, teams were not always planning to conduct all three tiers of research needed to make informed decisions about scaling for impact. We recommend more attention be paid to developing research approaches that assess not just if an innovation works (tier 1), but also its scalability (tier 2) and its gradual embeddedness, support, and sustainability within a broader system (tier 3). We hope that for ROSIE teams and others, support organizations will offer guidance on what kinds of research to pursue and what topics or questions to prioritize—and provide ample support and funding for this research.

RESEARCH ABOUT SCALING IS LESS COMMON

From the outset, the KIX initiative wished to promote research *about* scaling, as well as research *for* scaling. This was a primary feature of the initial call for proposals, a regular emphasis of KIX messaging, and a core focus of ROSIE (including the Action Research). What our ROSIE research finds, though, is that in fact there was little emphasis among the 15 teams on conducting research about scaling. Most were focusing their research on implementation progress and challenges to the scaling of their team's single intervention. This may be because research *about* scaling is perceived as less directly valuable, consumes time, requires a different methodological focus, and is rarely incentivized by development partners and stakeholders. It also often requires a control group or comparative study. But we believe that research about scaling is essential in order for teams to (1) reflect broadly (and become experts) on scaling, (2) identify and use the many broad 'drivers' for success to choose and pursue the best scaling strategy, and (3) contribute to the global knowledge base on scaling in education. On this front, one promising structure we saw in several ROSIE teams is the researcher-practitioner partnership: a situation in which a scaling team is comprised of both a university or research institution and an implementation partner. We see that about half of the 15 teams utilized this structure as a way to localize the work and perhaps develop innovative approaches for research about scaling, too.

TYPES OF DATA COLLECTED

As part of their research for scaling, ROSIE teams collected diverse forms of data. The examples discussed below are not exhaustive but rather illustrate some of the different types of data relevant to research for scaling.

Cost data were only being collected by a few teams, although many other teams reported a desire to do so. In our ROSIE research we find three barriers to collecting cost data: (1) government and other organizations are not always willing to share their own cost and financial data; (2) the cost data collected by projects are often different from the data that governments need to make cost projections; and (3) even though cost data are universally recognized as important, several teams perceive that funders and project leadership do not request them. Another challenge is the

time and expertise required to carry out costing analyses. Several teams reflected that while they wanted to study cost data, they believed they did not know how to do it well and had to focus on other, more pressing priorities. As one team stated: "We just didn't have time. We discussed that we wanted to do a cost analysis—and we got to attend a ROSIE workshop on it—[but] because of all the other things happening, we never had the time to go deep into costing out the innovation." In response, we recommend that engaging in cost data exercises for scaling be popularized and that useful costing tools be made readily available. An example of a tool that can be useful for this kind of research is the Childhood Cost Calculator. This does raise the question of whether (and for whom) it is worthwhile to engage in cost analysis; we do not have sufficient data to weigh in on this.

Regardless of which scaling tier of research is being pursued, many teams reported the desire to collect and use *data related to gender, equity, and social inclusion* in their research for scaling. This emphasis was likely a result of KIX priorities and perhaps also the particular sectoral backgrounds of the affiliated researchers (trained in education or rights-based approaches). Some teams were collecting data on how specific subpopulations are impacted by the scaling of the innovation and using these data to study effects of the innovation on the subpopulations and make comparisons across schools and locations. Subpopulations most often cited were girls and students in hard-to-reach/rural locations and, occasionally but less frequently, children with disabilities, "indigenous children," teachers from marginalized groups, and teachers with low digital skills. The successes of these efforts, however, were reported less often than the challenges, which included: limited availability of disaggregated data, social norms that discourage prioritizing subgroups, and funding limitations that preclude teams from doing more than descriptively scratching the surface of these areas. The financial issues related to data collection for specific subgroups are a particular challenge. It is expensive to train educators and researchers to collect and make productive use of data on specific

subpopulations—such as students with learning or physical disabilities, teachers coming from outside the location or with atypical backgrounds, edtech users unfamiliar with technology, or participants from cultures other than the dominant one in a location. In most cases, these costs increase as the innovation scales and therefore increase the overall budget and complexity of the scaling. While this equity research is surely useful (especially in the long run), it can be hard to prioritize disaggregating data and studying equity effects when short-term project incentives do not support it. For more on how teams incorporate equity into their research, see the related brief in this series on "Equity Considerations when Scaling."

Another type of data that can be useful in support of scaling efforts is information about the *conditions* that enable or hinder scaling. However, we did not observe as much focus on collecting this kind of data as we did about structures, processes, and environmental influences affecting the scaling process itself.

DATA USE

Regardless of the research purpose (i.e., *for* or *about* scaling), we found that data generated were not always used in a way that actually informs scaling. Sometimes this was because the data collected could not answer the scaling questions posited. Other times it was because data were collected but never analyzed—instead used only to describe implementation progress. This reality appears to be a response to teams feeling obligated to use their data to meet program and funding accountability mandates or highlight success to stakeholders (and potential stakeholders) inside or outside government. While perhaps useful, these data uses neglect the potential for investigating deeper dimensions of scaling—such as whether the innovation is having an impact that is related to initial objectives, how impact changes during scaling, whether subgroups are benefitting more or less as the scaling proceeds, what scaling effects remain after implementation ends, and whether optimal scale has been reached. Using data to examine

dimensions of scaling's impact or sustainability seems to us more important than using data to count or demonstrate tangible activities and intermediate outcomes. Additionally, we believe that how data use is conducted, incentivized, and supported by the broader system will benefit from honest critique, conceptual clarity, and acknowledgement of the often-untapped potential of innovative qualitative, longitudinal, and indigenous research methods.

Some findings about research processes

DIGITAL TECHNOLOGY FOR DATA COLLECTION

Tablets for recording field data malfunctioned for two teams and data had to be recovered and input manually, requiring extra time and causing frustration. Also, innovation software being tested sometimes misinterpreted data entered by enumerators. However, teams also reported that technology allowed survey data to come in quicker and with fewer errors than data input by hand, which meant that clean datasets could be constructed faster. One team reported that using open-source software for data analysis not only makes the work easier but also teaches researchers new digital skills that transfer to other aspects of their work. Although we did not find examples of teams using digital data collection to inform rapid-cycle improvements of program design or scaling approach, we consider that this real-time adaptivity may be an additional value of digital research tools.

TRAINING LOCAL RESEARCHERS ON NEW APPROACHES

Research assumptions held by local researchers presented an important challenge for some teams. Sometimes in-country researchers—trained in traditional evaluation research and hired by global

or regional scaling teams for short-term work—presumed their role was to act as outsiders who receive a research design and apply it faithfully to evaluate implementation of the innovation. However, the (laudable) research goal for some ROSIE scaling teams was instead to generate emergent understandings about scaling impact during the scaling journey. This contextualized, inductive approach sometimes confused local researchers because they did not realize they were actually being invited to work alongside teams to co-design the study and offer expertise regularly. Such a transition in research methodology—empowering local researchers as authentic partners rather than mere enumerators—was a shock for many but, over time, will likely be good for the field. However, this requires that local researchers be engaged authentically, explicitly, and supportively for such partnerships to work.

Given that ROSIE teams are often operating on methodological assumptions aligned with the more progressive views of education their innovations are promoting—such as gender equity, student-centered learning, and culturally relevant pedagogies—there could be a need for local researchers to shift their longstanding views of education in order to collect data in ways that the scaling teams desired. One team reported that, in order to collect viable data around gender equity and inclusion related to their scaling, local enumerators had to be explicitly taught to ask direct but careful questions about gender during data collection because gender is not often publicly talked about in this way in these locations. This required not only training enumerators how to ask strategic questions about gender but also providing sensitivity training on gender and inclusion in general. Although this necessitated additional time and travel, the team reported that it resulted not only in richer equity data but also appeared to teach local enumerators to think differently about gender in education.

This reminds us that education improvement around the world is not only about improving technical systems and school policies but also about shifting mindsets in how everyday people think about learning, classrooms, and education institutions in the 21st century.

How teams are using research findings to inform scaling

Research does not stop when data collection and analysis are complete. Understanding how and when to use the findings generated is just as critical as designing and carrying out quality research. In the aggregate, ROSIE teams are collecting and using data for five primary reasons:

1 To demonstrate to government or other stakeholders the value of scaling the particular innovation.

2 To learn how to adapt or contextualize the innovation to better meet teachers' needs and work in new locations.

3 To present to project funders or consortium partners how the scaling process is proceeding (sometimes as an accountability function).

4 To increase visibility or reputation of the scaling organization.

5 To unsderstand for themselves and interested stakeholders how the scaling is occurring.

Alongside these five reasons, individual teams are using their findings in other ways. For example, in order to engage government support for the innovation, one team used its data to demonstrate to Ministry of Education partners how to "do more" with existing student assessment data than is currently being done by the government alone and how to highlight Education Management Information Systems (EMIS) inconsistencies to push for structural improvement in their education system. Several teams used data to illuminate student and teacher realities (including high rates of children and families unenrolled in the education system) for local stakeholders who were previously unaware. One team used its intervention's impact data to successfully negotiate large-scale provider discounts on internet data plans for educators in a rural area.

Additional uses for data once collected and analyzed could include: grounding conversations with consortium partners and stakeholders for collective reflection on successes and challenges inherent to the scaling model; promoting broader learning for stakeholders about what works and what does not in scaling; and encouraging governments to center data in their decisionmaking about what education interventions to adopt and adapt for scale.

Additional challenges and learnings

FRAGMENTED DATA AND INCOHERENCE

One team lamented that its affiliated researchers collected and submitted "fragmented data," making it difficult for the team to assemble a coherent dataset. This is consistent with a challenge other teams mentioned regarding the incoherence of data they received by way of decentralized data collection processes that involved different people in different locations. Also, several teams reported that

they had no idea how the data they collected would be used once they passed it on or to what extent the data were actually used to inform future scaling phases of the innovation. For them, this confusion was disconcerting. In this way, ROSIE teams may be missing a prime opportunity to include researchers in the overall vision for the work.

TIMELINES, CAPACITY, AND RESOURCES

Several teams expressed frustration with elongated timelines for national research council approval that delayed the start of their work. Further, teams saw their research timelines disrupted by such things as national elections, climate catastrophes, and COVID-19. COVID-19 also impacted data collection intended to be done in-person that instead had to be conducted remotely, creating a potential sampling bias because those with less internet connectivity were under-sampled or left out completely. Some teams reported underestimating the time required to contextualize their existing data-collection tools for use in new locations. And finally, many teams found that limited financial capacity constrained their ability to conduct the broader, deeper, or more robust data collection they desired. Again, we suggest that research not be deprioritized when funders set or approve scaling budgets. Quality scaling requires quality research.

GOVERNMENT PARTNERSHIPS AND STAKEHOLDERS

Including decisionmakers (not just beneficiaries) as participants in scaling research is good practice. It offers richer data (and data particularly suited for the decisionmakers' needs), educates policy makers about the topic, and strengthens interest (and hopefully support) in the innovation and its scaling. However, government officials with decisionmaking power rarely have the time to actively participate in research or the interest in doing so (for more on this, see the Engaging Champions brief). Several ROSIE teams reported that keeping government stakeholders engaged in collaborative research was difficult. One team addressed this by shifting participation away from

central-level government to mid-level officials. It turned out that that mid-level actors had more time, were more vested in the results on the ground, and were proud to report back to high-level officials on findings and scaling progress. Other teams looked for ways to strategically establish working groups that could accommodate busy stakeholders and were flexible enough to maintain participation as conditions changed. Like so many aspects of scaling, the key was finding creative solutions for specific situations. Although difficult, it is likely valuable to engage government representatives in meaningful research participation (such as co-designing research questions and co-analyzing data), and not reduce participation to simply informing them of the work along the way. Because authentic engagement requires working toward consensus, this can also provide a way to establish multi-stakeholder groups of sectoral experts alongside policy makers and various constituencies with different perspectives on education goals and a focus not only on the scaling but also the nuts and bolts of job creation, electoral politics, and financial considerations.

Accurate education data often reveal gaps, inconsistencies, or areas for improvement and therefore it can be politically sensitive for government and other high-level stakeholders like external funders and NGO leadership. As a result, some teams confronted challenges with the political nature of their data collection. One example was a country government that closely monitored which data NGOs can collect and disallowed any data that might show the government in a negative light. Another example was several teams reporting that extensive time and sensitivity were required to establish trust with public officials before the government was willing to share with "them the things that aren't perfect." We also regularly heard the need for scaling teams to be sensitive to cultural customs and hierarchical norms around requesting government assistance.

Many teams expressed a contention that, across the world, data-based government decisionmaking in education is rare and therefore no matter how careful their research is and how strategically they share it, their research may have little impact. This sentiment—whether true or not—illustrates that establishing good relationships with members of

national and district education offices (both officials and the technical experts supporting them) and earning their trust are endeavors worth prioritizing. Lasting relationships increase opportunities to build the trust that can enable decisionmakers to make good use of data. Additionally, as many constituencies around the world call for increased data use in government decision-making,[4] ROSIE teams' on-the-ground data efforts are a valuable piece of the global puzzle.

for scaling success, can aid funders, researchers, decisionmakers, and scaling practitioners as they pursue and promote effective research and data-use approaches for increased scaling success.

Concluding Observations

In any human endeavor, people act in accordance with their understandings of the world. Education and scaling are no different. And education actors' understandings of their situations—that picture, essentially, of their world—derives from many sources. Some of the sources are personal and experiential, biased and partial; others we hope are objective and systematic. Replacing more of the personal and idiosyncratic knowledge sources with careful collection and use of data and evidence can offer a fuller and more accurate picture of the education world so as to better inform actors' decisions and efforts. That is a primary value of research for and about scaling. And it is a priority that aligns with the current global push for more and better data in education improvement efforts and for increasing the capacity and willingness to disaggregate, analyze, and use data effectively. Impressively, the KIX initiative has centralized data use and research in scaling and the ROSIE teams' efforts to foreground data use in their work reflect that. Even still, however, we find that challenges and barriers remain. These include teams' uncertainty about which types of data and data use are best suited for which aspects of scaling, difficulties working in locations that have different norms and capacities for research, and competing incentive structures around how to conduct and use research in scaling. It is our hope that this brief, by illuminating several of the nested and sometimes hidden dimensions of engaging data

Guiding questions on research for and about scaling

The following guiding questions can help those interested in developing or refining their research frameworks for increased scaling success:

RESEARCH DESIGN

1. **Why are you doing this research?** What is the purpose of the research and what questions do you want to answer or explore? In what ways is your research *for* scaling and/or in what ways is it *about* scaling?

2. **What knowledge already exists?** Have you conducted a review of relevant literature to understand what has already been studied and learned about your topic, location, and innovation? Have you reviewed the relevant literature to learn what kinds of study methodologies have been used in ways that relate to your research goals?

3. **Which tiers of scaling research are you engaging in?** Even if you are in the early stages of scaling, are there ways not only to examine impact but also look at scalability and change management factors? How are you being systematic in documenting what you are learning about scaling as you conduct your research?

RESEARCH PROCESS

1. **Who will be your on-the-ground researchers or enumerators?** What do you know about them? What needs, assets, and special features about them can you predict—and how will you address those? How might partnering authentically with them offer increased value (and what challenges will this produce that require addressing)?

2. **What is your specific context for data collection?** Consider the political climate and cultural dimensions of education, social life, and research norms in the location. Consider available time and financing, logistics around how data can be collected (including use of technology), and capacity to collect coherent, similar kinds of data across locations. Predict and proactively address data challenges.

3. **What is your project management framework?** For example, how do your measurement, evaluation, and learning (MEL) data or other grant requirements align with your research goals? How can you use the data you collect for MEL purposes in your research?

④ **How can you incorporate specific equity considerations into your research plans?** What data gaps exist in research about specific marginalized groups and communities? How can you address these gaps through your own research plans? How can you collect data in a way that includes members of these groups as actual partners in the research process? What additional training will you need to provide for research teams working with these groups? How will you share your findings with these groups during and after data analysis?

RESEARCH USE

① **Who is your audience?** Perhaps posit 3-4 different audiences, because it is likely that there are several and they will want different aspects of the research and final products for their use. What do you know about how they make decisions or engage with data? Understand that government decisionmakers may be more focused on non-education outcomes such as job creation, cost-benefits, or demographic voting blocks. Knowing particulars about the individuals or groups you are targeting can help tailor your outputs and modes of dissemination/delivery.

② **What activities, modes, and products for sharing results of your research with target audiences will you privilege?** Why do you believe these choices will work best? Are there other formats or modalities for sharing your findings to target audiences that you might want to try for sharing your findings to target audiences that you might want to try?

③ **To what extent are your data collection and research sharing methods ethical and inclusive?** How will you use this research to "give back" or share in useful ways to the local populations expected to benefit from your work? Who are you missing, and can you find ways to include their voices and experiences?

④ **How will you measure impact?** What kind of tracking system will you adopt or develop to capture and measure the ongoing impact of your scaling research on predetermined audiences and populations? How will you use this system to identify successes and gaps in your ability to mobilize your knowledge to the right people in the right ways?

References

1 Cooley, Larry, and Julie Howard. Scale Up
   Sourcebook. Vol. 1. Indianapolis, IN: Purdue
   University & African Development Bank Group,
   2019.
2 Monitoring and Evaluation Working Group
   Series Webinar June 8. 2021. Scaling Up
   Community of Practice, 2021. https://youtu.be/
   hgvEdCztW78?si=YBE42uAntvHRl90k.
3 Cooley, Larry, and Julie Howard. Scale Up
   Sourcebook. Vol. 1. Indianapolis, IN: Purdue
   University & African Development Bank Group,
   2019, p. 22.
4 Parkhurst, Justin O. The politics of evidence:
   From evidence-based policy to the good
   governance of evidence. Abingdon, Oxon:
   Routledge, 2017.

BROOKINGS