

Blended Higher Education Opportunities for Refugees: A Comparative Study

by

Sarah Abuwandi

A Thesis Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Justice Studies

Approved April 2019 by the
Graduate Supervisory Committee:

Elizabeth Swadener, Chair
Jessica Solyom
Gregory Broberg

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

May 2019

ABSTRACT

This study aims to gain an understanding of higher education interventions taking place in refugee camps around the world that implement hybrid online and on-site models. Through an archival, database study, this uncovers the most salient characteristics of 8 international interventions (Australian Catholic University, Borderless Higher Education for Refugees, Jesuit Worldwide Learning: Higher Education at the Margins, InZone, Kepler, Mosaik, Global Border Studies, and Education for Humanity) in regard to logistics, academics, technology, and pedagogy. The study found multiple ways in which these programs seek to increase inclusion and success of refugee learners. These techniques include (1) free tuition, (2) nutrition, security, and transportation accommodations, (3) gender equity provisions, (4) course accreditation, (5) preparatory courses, (6) student support and development, (7) durable solutions related to employment, (8) tailored curricula, (9) flexibility of course structure, (10) critical thinking & reflection, (11) hybrid, adaptable, and portable course delivery, (12) on-site technology support, and (13) accommodations related to electricity and internet connectivity.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would first like to thank my thesis chair, Dr. Elizabeth Swadener, for always being helpful and welcoming. Dr. Swadener's office was always open whenever I ran into trouble throughout my research and writing process, and she always provided me with amazing insight and assistance. I would also like to thank Dr. Jessica Solyom for helping to steer me into the right direction. Finally, I would like to thank Dr. Gregory Broberg as the second reader of my thesis; I am incredibly grateful for his valuable comments and direction.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	Page
1 INTRODUCTION	1
Study Rationale	1
Research Questions	2
2 LITERATURE REVIEW	3
Context of Global Displacement	3
(Higher) Education as a Human Right	4
Global Investment in Higher Education (Primary, Secondary & Tertiary) ..	5
Barriers to Higher Education for Refugees	8
Benefits of Higher Education	11
Theoretical Framework.....	16
3 METHODOLOGY	19
Data Collection & Database Procedure.....	19
Screening Criteria.....	20
Coding Strategy & Analysis	20
4 FINDINGS	22
Australian Catholic University	23
Borderless Higher Education for Refugees (BHER)	29
Jesuit Worldwide Learning: Higher Education at the Margins	34
InZone.....	39
Kepler	43

	Mosaik	46
	Global Border Studies (GBS)	49
	Education for Humanity (E4H)	51
5	DISCUSSION	55
	Logistics	55
	Academics	58
	Pedagogy	62
	Technology.....	65
6	CONCLUSION	69
	REFERENCES	73

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Today, the number of forcibly displaced individuals worldwide has reached 68.5 million people (UNHCR, n.d.). Of that number, 40 million are internally displaced and 25.4 million are refugees, with the remaining 3.1 million being asylum seekers (UNHCR, n.d.). Of the 25.4 million refugees globally, only 1% of university-aged refugees attend university. In order to develop successful university education programs for refugee learners, it is imperative to understand what programs exist and exactly *how* these programs overcome barriers in order to develop successful models. This study assesses programs and technologies that reach refugee learners that have historically been barred from access to higher education opportunities. The rationale behind this study is twofold: I believe that educational institutions and practitioners can benefit from this study by understanding best practices of educational programs tailored towards refugees as well as components that lead to increased efficiency in educational programs. I also believe that this study can positively impact refugees globally by increasing exposure to the tertiary programs available and encouraging solutions which could result in greater university-level educational interventions that implement sound approaches.

In this exploratory study of a relatively recent phenomenon of university courses offered in refugee camps, I hope to understand the scope of programs that exist in refugee camps globally. In addition to surveying the number of programs that are offering university courses, I outlined the salient features that make these interventions successful and accessible. The many barriers that inhibit refugee students from receiving higher education opportunities include but are not limited to lost documentation (birth

certificates, school diplomas, examination results), interrupted education, difficulties associated with English as a second language, and high tuition costs/international student fees. Additionally, two large barriers that are associated with higher education commonly identified are power outages and issues of internet connectivity that interrupt and disrupt student learning. In my study, I identify programs that are cognizant of these barriers and work to accommodate the needs and strengths of refugee learners.

Research Questions

In this thesis, I address the following questions:

1. What specific university-level programs are available to refugee students in camps?
2. What are the salient characteristics of these programs? How do they increase accessibility to refugee learners? What technical barriers must be overcome by these programs?

In this study, I analyze current programs for the purposes of understanding how they operate, challenges they face and promising models or exemplars. I did not conduct interviews with refugee learners on the impacts of the programs, nor did I conduct a longitudinal study that seeks to understand the long-term impacts of the programs in question.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

In this literature review, I discuss the current context and institutional factors of forced displacement to provide a broad outlook on the current state of refugees globally. From there, I evaluate the current proportion of humanitarian efforts that are directed at providing higher education for displaced individuals. Then, I outline barriers of access to higher education to gain a better understanding on the types of contexts interventions should be mindful of. Lastly, to learn more about why investment in higher education for refugees is necessary, I outline the benefits and implications of higher education for this specific population.

Context of Global Displacement

Today, the number of forcibly displaced individuals who have fled war and persecution worldwide has reached 68.5 million (UNHCR, n.d.). Given this number, it is important to recognize the uneven distribution of the refugee population worldwide. In fact, the location of displaced individuals globally is unequally distributed, with developing countries being both the major source of and destination for refugees; “86 percent of refugees originated in these areas and 72 percent of the world’s refugees are provided asylum in these regions” (Lem & Barber, 2010, p 26). Severe poverty and income inequality, due in part to uneven development that is exacerbated by neo-imperial relations of power, in developing nations heighten the living conditions of refugees “no matter which economic class, ethnic group, or gender is involved” (Lem & Barber, 2010, p. 26). As a result, refugee camps, which are widely viewed as temporary shelter for those seeking to transition to third country resettlement, repatriated back home or

integrated into the host country, “often resemble poorly resourced villages and towns” (Dryden-Peterson, 2010, p. 3).

The nature of present-day conflicts has been pointing to increasingly elongated time spent by refugees inside the confinement of camps in the Global South. Reinhardt (2018) explains that today, refugees can oftentimes spend the entirety of their school-age years in displacement”. Dryden-Peterson (2010) identifies the average duration of conflicts between 1999 and 2007 in lower income countries to have lasted approximately twelve years. In 2009, 8.5 million individuals were forcibly displaced for ten years in “long-term refugee situations without prospects for returning to their countries of origin, settling locally in their countries of asylum, or being resettled to a third country” (Dryden-Peterson, 2010, p. 3). The number of ongoing protracted refugee situations that have led to the 68.5 million displaced has reached 30 throughout the world, with the average length of stay in refugee camps being close to twenty years (Dryden-Peterson, 2010). Due to the rising population of displaced persons globally, there is a growing urgency for the topic of higher education in refugee camps.

(Higher) Education as a Human Right

The right to education as a human right is acknowledged by multiple treaties and provisions published by the United Nations. Education is declared as a basic human right in Article 26 of the UN’s Universal Declaration of Human Rights (Reinhardt, 2018). The Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989), an international human rights treaty, includes the provision of “mak[ing] higher education accessible to all on the basis of capacity by every appropriate means” (Dryden-Peterson, 2010, p. 3). Furthermore, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) affirmed in their Education

Policy Commitments that the UNHCR will “safeguard the right of refugees to education [including] equitable access to appropriate learning for youth and adults” (Dryden-Peterson, 2010, p. 4; UNHCR, 2009). The UNHCR, in the 1951 Refugee Convention, emphasized the rights of refugees to “access education, earn a livelihood, and seek justice when wronged” (Dryden-Peterson, 2010, p. 5). Since the enactment of the 1951 Refugee Convention, however, more than two-thirds of refugees around the world are denied these basic rights (Dryden-Peterson, 2010; Smith, 2004). UNHCR’s Education Strategy (2012-2016) highlighted the increasing role of higher education for refugees in the future—Assistant High Commissioner for Protection, Erika Feller, explained that expanding tertiary opportunities for refugees internationally may take place through certified distance education programs, or education programs that are based in another country that provide refugee learners with accredited higher education courses (Dryden-Peterson, 2010).

Global Investment in Education (Primary, Secondary, & Tertiary)

While this discourse is encouraging due to the signal of a paradigm shift in humanitarian development, higher education is still considered a low priority for international humanitarian organizations and donors which predominantly afford this right to a small percentage of globally displaced individuals (Dryden-Peterson, 2010). While the theoretical and foundational bases of the rights of refugees are explicitly outlined in multiple human rights documents, there has been a lack of international follow-up to providing refugees with quality, inclusive tertiary education. This is due, in part, to the global education movement prioritizing immediate assistance such as food, water, shelter, and health expenditures (Crea, 2016).

The global education movement that consists of universities, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), international human rights organizations, and governments largely prioritizes primary and secondary education for refugee children (Dryden-Peterson, 2010; Reinhardt, 2018; Hakami, 2016, MacLaren, 2012). Dryden-Peterson (2012) highlights the emphasis on primary and secondary education, “with some emphasis on secondary education, life-skills training, and adult literacy and continuing education” in the Dakar Framework for Action and the Millenium Development Goals (p. 11). Within these documents, however, there is no mention of higher education. Within the global education funding for refugees, primary education “receives the majority of funding, with secondary education receiving significant less and tertiary education receiving few, if any funds” (Crea, 2016, p. 13). Dryden-Peterson (2012) explains the contemporary politics of aid that have even made acquiring funding for secondary education difficult: “the main challenge for UNHCR [in tertiary education] is to overcome donor reluctance in funding scholarship programmes” as “most donors focus on primary education” (p. 13). Within UNHCR, there are a limited amount of financial resources that are allocated towards refugee education; in 2012, the UNHCR budget only covered 39 percent of the assessed needs in refugee education (Reinhardt, 2018).

Dryden-Peterson (2010) delineates the broken pipeline that exists in refugees’ plight towards an education. This pipeline, or educational continuum, begins with early childhood education and leads into primary and secondary school. Without students’ completion of primary and secondary school, higher education is not an option. Furthermore, without the promise or existence of institutions of higher education for youth, “people are less motivated to persist in primary and secondary school” (Dryden-

Peterson, 2010, p. 4). This pipeline complicates itself with the low enrollment statistics of refugee children in both primary and secondary school. It is not a “smooth continuum”, due to the narrowing of opportunities available (Dryden-Peterson, 2010, p. 4). Data from 2009 shows the Gross Enrolment Ratio (GER) for refugees in primary school to be as low as 76 percent globally, with lower rates for secondary school at 36 percent (Dryden-Peterson, 2010). The lack of access available to primary and secondary school further narrows down opportunities of refugees to attend institutions of higher education. Due to this broken pipeline, investment in higher education programs for refugees in the Global South is conceived as being at the expense of investment in under-funded primary and secondary schooling (Reinhardt, 2018). Dryden-Peterson explains the donors dilemma as a “double-edged sword”: while investment in primary and secondary education is necessary to address the direct needs of the large number of refugee youth who do not have access, ignoring the development of higher education programs has “long-term consequences both for individuals and society” (Dryden-Peterson, 2012, p. 14). While it is imperative to invest in primary and secondary education, once these students graduate, their options would remain very limited if there are no opportunities or infrastructure for continuing into tertiary education.

Several scholars have called towards greater investment in higher education, despite this broken pipeline. Within the relief-to-develop continuum, the UNHCR has historically preferred humanitarian solutions tied to repatriation, or the return of refugees back to their home country when it is safe to do so. With long-lasting conflict that contribute to longer time spent in refugee camps, UNHCR policy has begun to adapt a development/integration approach in the country of one’s asylum, which includes

implementing provisions related to education (Dryden-Peterson, 2012, p. 213). The historic concentration on primary and secondary school investment is a representation of the temporary nature of refugee camps (Hakami, 2016; Reinhardt, 2018). Zeus (2011), however, explains that the representation of refugee camps as temporary is not an accurate reflection. Prolonged violence and insecurity in refugees' home countries as well as the reluctance of host countries to integrate refugees or offer them citizenship contributes to the elongation of time spent in camps (Hakami, 2016). Reinhardt (2018) explains that it is imperative to recognize the "illusion of temporariness" in order to successfully invest in and implement programs of higher education in refugee camps (p 213).

Even with relatively low rates of enrollment in higher education when compared to other populations, there is an upward trend amongst refugees' access to higher education that "reflects a new emphasis on education in refugee situations" (Dryden-Peterson, 2009, p. 12). Donald (2014) and Reinhardt (2018) explain this upward trend that can be due, in part, to the fact that refugees can now spend years or even decades displaced in camps. The developmental approach that pioneers education is also reflected by refugees' interests and demands. A refugee from Kenya describes this interest by stating that "In the olden times, you could give your children land as an inheritance [...] Now in Africa [...] there's no land, people are many. So the only inheritance you can give a child is education" (Dryden-Peterson, 2012, p. 13).

Barriers to Higher Education for Refugees

Higher education in protracted refugee situations, or situations in which refugees remain displaced five or more years after their initial displacement, must confront a

multitude of barriers, both theoretical and technical. Zeus (2009) highlights three widely-held theoretical contradictions and paradoxes that infringe upon access to tertiary education for refugees in camps. Zeus (2009) describes that universities are associated with the notion of freedom, and refugees are generally viewed by the public eye to be unfree since many spend their time living in camps in which many of their choices and freedoms are restrictive. Furthermore, while institutions of higher education are considered “long-term, sustainable institutions”, refugee camps, on the other hand, falsely connote “temporariness” (Zeus, 2009, p. 7). Lastly, Zeus (2009) asserts that institutions of higher education are largely existent within a nation-state (as the nation-state is dependent on research that higher education produces), while refugees’ existence within a camp is viewed as lacking a relationship with a nation-state, which further inhibits the growth of higher education institutions in protracted refugee situations. In the presence of the above theoretical assumptions, however, Zeus (2009) offers a compelling argument that supports the development of higher education in refugee protracted situations as a means of

Revers[ing] this narrative and help[ing] shape a new narrative of refugees as agents of their own and their communities’ development, and as such act as a subversion of power structures from within, rather than adopting approaches that envisage imposing aid on refugees in order to empower them. (p.84)

Zeus additionally (2011) proposes the “camp as campus” concept that could “facilitate the process of opening up the camps and foster exchange with the outside world” (p. 68) This approach, by extending higher education beyond the confines of a

nation-state, could serve as an example of higher education institutions providing equitable opportunities to access.

Technical barriers to higher education programs are exceedingly common within refugee camps. These barriers include (1) a shortage of available information about opportunities to refugee students, (2) students who have had their education interrupted, (3) high tuition costs, (4) lost documentation (i.e.: birth certificates, school diplomas, examination results), (5) difficulties with English as a second language, and (6) lack of proficiency in local languages (Gladwell et al., 2016). If important documentation is lost, refugee students are oftentimes unable to be admitted into a higher education institution due to strict application requirements. Many universities also practice the use of enrolment quotas that prioritize citizens of the country (Dryden-Peterson, 2012). Other restrictive practices are put into place by universities to limit refugee enrollment; for example, Makerere University in Uganda refused to accept translated high school diplomas “making it impossible for anyone educated in [Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC)] with a French language diploma to enter the university” (Dryden-Peterson, 2012, p. 13). Moreover, refugees are oftentimes fined at higher tuition rates due to the fact that many universities consider them to be international students (Donald, 2014). The lack of resources available in refugee camps serves as a challenge to both refugees who seek higher education and for NGOs in the challenge of implementing them (Crea, 2016). These barriers will become critical when looking at specific cases in this study, as tertiary education interventions for refugees that succeed must transcend these barriers and create a space in which higher education can flourish despite the impediments.

Benefits of Higher Education

Empowerment & Voice

Higher education for refugee students is highly regarded as an investment that can contribute to empowerment and voice in an era of uncertainty. Crea (2015) explains that “education can be seen as a means of personal empowerment and efficacy by providing a sense of purpose amidst the ‘uprootedness’ of refugee status and being indefinitely contained in a camp-like setting” (p. 12). Throughout the process of forced displacement and the subsequent encampment in refugee camps, resource depletion oftentimes leads to mental distress (Crea, 2015). Refugees residing in camps are often encouraged to participate within a system that regards them as vulnerable victims who are in need of aid in order to facilitate a greater international humanitarian response (Crea, 2015). The labeling of refugees as “passive victims” is especially prevalent in the context of refugee camps, where choice is seemingly limited and they are deprived of having a voice within their political community while simultaneously becoming “non-persons with respect to justice” (Fraser, 2005; Dryden-Peterson, 2010, p.5).

Zeus (2011) states that in order to effectively reframe this narrative, higher education is integral to re-labeling refugees as their own, autonomous agents who are self-empowered. Additionally, Zeus (2011) emphasizes the role of higher education in playing an important role “in psychosocial, physical, and cognitive protection” that facilitates families’ plight of “coping with their fate and providing meaning in life” (p. 271). Crea (2015) and Pumanaki (1996) indicate that having ideological commitments through education can serve as a protective factor in relation to their survival during their

time in refugee camps. Ideological commitments can be utilized as a tool to “reframe the meaning of these events” to view themselves as “fighters” rather than “victims” (Crea, 2016, p. 13; Dawes, 2990; Pumanaki, 1996). Increasing access to higher education in refugee camps is championed as offering refugees the means to develop a critical consciousness by “providing students with a voice in their communities and empowering them to create change” (Crea, 2016, p. 13). Education, therefore, can drive students to persevere in furthering their knowledge, self-efficacy and quality of life while also providing an avenue through which refugees can strategize on the future of themselves and their family (Crea, 2015; Dryden-Peterson, 2010; El Jack, 2010). Benefits of higher education also extend within refugee camps by allowing them to contribute in various ways towards the development of the camp by finding employment opportunities that serve their community (Hakami, 2016; Reinhardt, 2018). The confidence and pride that results from refugees contributing positively within the camp promotes internal strength to continue fighting for a better future in a place where resources as basic as food, water, and clothing can be difficult to come by (Crea & McFarland, 2015; Reinhardt, 2018).

On the topic of voice and empowerment, it is necessary to listen to the desires and demands of refugees in respect to higher education. In a study analyzing educational programs for Sudanese refugees in the Kakuma camp, El Jack (2012) found that educational programs “enable refugees, particularly women, to gain knowledge, voice, and skills [...] and provides a context within which to understand and make visible the changing nature of gender relationships and power” (p. 19). Another refugee student of higher education residing in the camp stated that he “began to see education as necessary for [his] survival in the world. Neither dust nor hunger nor disease would stop us” (El

Jack, 2010, p. 23). In relation to higher education specifically, most Iraqi refugees in Jordan who have successfully completed secondary education express their desire to attend a university (Women's Refugee Commission). Additionally, Hakami (2016) found that refugees speak of the ways in which education can serve as a benefit to their lives through finding work, easily assimilating into host cultures, and allowing them to contribute to their home country upon return. Lastly, refugees view education as a mechanism through which they can safeguard their futures and “preserve their cultural traditions” (Crea, 2016, p. 13).

Social Capital & Reconstruction

Higher education for refugees is linked to the advancement of individuals, communities, and entire nations. Wright & Plasterer (2012) explain that

As an investment, it is essential in refugee contexts as in development contexts [as] higher education and training can provide refugees with the skills and knowledges needed to increase the effectiveness of durable solutions, be they repatriation, local integration, or third-country resettlement. (p. 43)

The *Task Force on Higher Education and Society*, an arm of the World Bank and the *United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization* (UNESCO) to explore the future of higher education in the developing world, related the benefits of higher education to “increased tax revenue, better national health, stronger government, and improved technology” that apply to both to repatriation and local integration (Wright & Plasterer, 2010, p. 43). By increasing access to skills crucial to the development of social capital, access to education has also been linked to an increase in quality of life, mental health, and greater livelihood and work opportunities (Crea, 2015; Crondahl and Eklund,

2012; Mitschke et. al., 2013). Wright & Plasterer (2010) additionally cites a report by the NGO *Network of Integration Focal Points* that links efforts of “education, vocational training, and language learning” to assist refugees in integration by enabling them to be active members of their societies (p. 44). Zeus (2010) states the importance of looking for long-term, durable solutions in protracted contexts by making available capacity building opportunities that allow for the cultivation of skills that are essential in nation-building efforts upon repatriation or local integration.

Studied benefits of higher education opportunities among refugee populations include “enabl[ing] refugees to participate in planning and policy making regarding their own situation, [and] empowering them to be no longer a ‘burden’, but agents of their own development” (Wright & Plaster, 2012, p. 44; Zeus, 2009, p. 40). More specifically, through expanding opportunities to contribute towards the workforce that subsequently assists refugees financially, they are able to contribute to their respective societies and have “a positive impact on sectors such as the government, [and] the physical health of society and economy” (Hakami, 2016, p. 19; Reinhardt, 2018, p. 214). In respect to refugees who have the ability to repatriate to their home countries, the benefits of higher education can include positively contributing to rebuild “local, regional, and national institutions” and thus, facilitate promises for future social and economic prosperity (Dryden-Peterson, 2010, p. 5). In a study analyzing the impacts of UNHCR’s DAFI higher education scholarship, a direct link was found between tertiary educational opportunities for refugees and national reconstruction, as refugees who participated in higher education were able to repatriate (Dryden-Peterson, 2012, p. 15). Specifically, the study found that approximately 70 percent of the recipients of the DAFI scholarship

became civil servants or NGO workers in their home country participating in work that is essential to post-conflict nation and community building (Dryden-Peterson, 2012, p. 15). Moreover, the study found that in 2008, approximately 6 percent of the scholarship recipients participated in teacher training in their home country, a step that is integral to the development of an educational system which is oftentimes a “central component of post-conflict reconstruction” (Dryden-Peterson, 2012, p. 15). Investment in higher educational opportunities, then, becomes necessary to the production of teachers that will then train and educate current and upcoming generations of children in primary and secondary school (Dryden-Peterson, 2012). Thus, in order to have an equitable system of primary and secondary education, tertiary education is vital.

In the developmental process of tertiary level programs in protracted situations, many scholars promote the use of adaptive, portable models that are sensitive to the movement of refugees. Dryden-Peterson (2010) states that “given the uncertainty of the future for refugees, the increasingly globalized realities that most of them face, and the promise of knowledge-based economies, education that is both adaptable and portable is critical” (p. 3). Furthermore, a report by *Save the Children* (2017) recommends the adoption of technology as “an enabling tool in pursuit of [higher] education outcomes” for refugees in protracted contexts, due to the barriers of interrupted education (p. 1). As digital accessibility and the availability of mobile devices and computers becomes more prevalent, it is necessary that online higher education courses reflect that trend (Ally and Tsinakos, 2014).

Theoretical Framework

The voices of refugees can often be diluted by institutions or organizations seeking to assist them (Hakami, 2016; Reinhardt, 2018). It is important, as Reinhardt (2018) and Hakami (2016) argue, to understand that “[refugees] have the desire for agency and volition of their own” (p. 214). Dryden-Peterson’s (2010) analysis of choice and personal autonomy utilizes Kabeer’s (1999) definition of power as the “ability to make choices” and empowerment as defined as “a process of change away from displacement” (p. 5; p. 436). Kabeer’s (1999) description of first-order choice is one that is strategic, while a second-order choice is one that has minimal impacts or consequences on one’s life. Kabeer states that empowerment, then, becomes the ability for an individual to make strategic, first-order choices in contexts where they may be denied them. The difference does not lie in the choices that one makes, but in the ability to make choices which partially depends on the use of critical consciousness to become effective. Dryden-Peterson (2010) concludes, utilizing Kabeer’s analysis, that participation in higher education is a step towards signaling a deviation from disempowerment by “expand[ing] the ability of refugees to make better strategic life choices, as the quality and quantity of information and knowledge that is accessible to them expands and improves” and contributes to their development of critical consciousness that further facilitates first-level choices (p. 5). Dryden-Peterson (2010) emphasizes this approach as being especially more powerful in situations of protracted situations such as refugee camps in which many choices may include “whether or not to join a militia group, to engage in risky or precarious types of work, or to return to the home country or put one’s energy and resources into settling elsewhere” (p. 5). Therefore, I will be viewing the programs in this

study in relation to their ability to acknowledge the agency within students' lives, while at the same time providing their students the necessary accommodations and support needed to make strategic life choices.

In order to be truly successful, higher education interventions for refugees must center the learners at the heart of their approaches. This approach is reflected in *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970) written by educator Paulo Freire that suggests a pedagogical shift in the relationships between teacher, student, and society within his analysis of the relationship between the colonizers and the colonized. Freire examines the “banking” approach to teaching that views students as empty minds to be given knowledge, arguing that this approach to teaching learning contributes towards the dehumanization of both the student and the teacher and reifies oppressive attitudes that extend within society (Freire, 1970). He disputes the “banking” approach to education and argues that educational pedagogies should instead utilize the “problem-posing model” that treats learners as co-facilitators of knowledge through a mutual approach to learning that fosters conscientization, or critical consciousness, which leads to a greater, in-depth understanding of the world and exposure to social and political realities (Freire, 1970). Within the problem-posing mode, “dialogue is employed as a pedagogical method in juxtaposition to the oppressive monological methods of knowledge transmission” (Couch, 2017, p. 135). The use of ‘critical pedagogy’ favors educational approaches that are “transformative, empowering, and transgressive” by encouraging a “way of thinking about, negotiating, and transforming the relationship among teaching, the production of knowledge, the institutional structures of the school, and the social and material relationships of the wider community, society, and nation-state” (Couch, 2017, p. 131;

McLaren, 1999, p. 454). Critical pedagogy “also views education as a form of cultural politics and as a means to social justice and change” and aims to “challenge unequal and undemocratic structures” (Couch, 2017, p. 132). By challenging traditional methods of learning, a critical pedagogical approach aims to give students the knowledge they need to navigate unjust structures and subsequently empower their voices and experiences to be heard and known. In relation to this study, curriculums that utilize critical pedagogy should understand that there is “no one methodology that can work for all populations [...] [because] all decisions related to curriculum and material to be studied are based on the needs and interests of students” in their respective contexts (Couch, 2017, p. 134). If critical pedagogy is implemented correctly, “the teacher can assist students to unpack the ways in which unequal social relations are reinforced by those institutionally empowered to do so” (Couch, 2017, p. 139; Kelly, 2006, p. 29).

In this study, I evaluate the programs’ pedagogical approaches based on their willingness to tailor educational content to the specific contexts of refugee students and employ empowering techniques of instruction that aim to learn from their experiences, while at the same time offering students tools for their own empowerment. In this section, I evaluated literature relating to the general context behind global displacement, higher education investment for refugees, barriers and benefits of tertiary education in order to provide necessary background needed to understand the programs that will be discussed in this paper. In the next section, I outline the methods that I used to conduct the scan of current higher education interventions for refugees living in camps globally.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

In this exploratory archival research study, I conducted a comprehensive review of the literature on higher education programs that are specifically designed for refugee learners in camps and utilize hybrid features to deliver their educational content. The field scan included a time-frame of 10 years (2009-2019) to allow for a manageable amount of data to be analyzed within the time frame.

Data Collection & Database Search Procedure

This study is guided by the following research questions:

1. What specific university-level higher programs are available to refugee students in camps? Where are these programs located?
2. What are the salient characteristics of these programs? How do they increase accessibility to refugee learners? What barriers must be overcome by these programs?

Utilizing Google Scholar, I conducted database searches to yield results of literature that discuss higher education programs for refugees. The search terms used in this study are: "refugee camp" AND "refugee education" AND "higher education" AND "online learning" OR "distance learning" OR "e-learning" (87 RESULTS) and "refugee camp" AND "refugee education" AND "higher education" AND "online learning" AND "distance learning" AND "e-learning" (9 RESULTS). After using Google Scholar to gather the names of current higher education interventions that meet the criteria, I researched the programs utilizing general Google database searches to yield more

specific results on the programs' features to find publicly available information that did not appear in the initial Google Scholar searches.

Screening Criteria

1. Time-frame: 2009-2019
2. Target population: University-aged refugees (adults)
3. Location: Refugee camps
4. Educational Model:
 - a. College-level education — courses offered that have the intention of providing a diploma or certificate at the end of the program.
 - b. Distance Learning (online and/or hybrid features)

Coding Strategy & Analysis

In order to compile the data from the literature, I created a Google Form to act as a coding sheet to compile and code the collected data. The form includes four sections: (1) Background Information, (2) Study Design, (3) Program Design, and (4) Findings of the Study (if applicable). Within this coding sheet, there are additional sections related to program type, program successes and limitations, and program recommendations. After I coded the literature, Google Forms summarized the findings through graphs, charts and text boxes to easily view the ways in which each program responded to each section and question. Subsequent to the Google Form coding sheet, I created a separate document that listed the *specific* programs that came out from the coding sheet and delineated characteristics of the programs. I created 5 *categories* to characterize the relevant programs that came out of the literature: (1) general information, (2) logistics, (3) academics, (4) technology, and (5) pedagogy. After reporting these five categories in the

Findings section, I delineated prevalent themes in the *Discussion* section that include: (1) cost, (2) entrance requirements, (3) awareness, (4) accommodations, (5) gender equity, (6) accreditation, (7) preparatory courses, (8) student support and development, (9) durable solutions/employment, and (10) contextualized curricula.

In short, once an article was marked as relevant, I filled out the Google Form respective to the piece of literature and highlighted important information necessary for further data analyses. Then, I analyzed the data and created codes in a separate document that more clearly highlighted specific salient features of the programs, allowing me to view relevant themes that emerged from the data as well as suggested recommendations from the research that I reported in the *Discussion* section.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

The search terms that I used for this report returned 33 relevant results that either a) discussed specific higher education programs for refugee students, and/or b) offered recommendations for increasing access to higher education amongst refugees in camps. Of the 33 sources, 22 discussed specific programs that are relevant to the screening criteria of this report. These programs are a) located in a refugee camp for refugee students, b) offer college-level courses with the intention of providing a diploma or certificate at the end of the program, and c) contain hybrid distance learning features. The 22, in total, covered 9 (or 12) programs, as many of them overlap in their descriptions of the programs. The programs that I will discuss in this section are: Australian Catholic University (ACU), Borderless Higher Education for Refugees (BHER), Jesuit Worldwide Learning: Higher Education at the Margins (JWL: HEM), InZone, Kepler, Mosaik, Education for Humanity, and Global Border Studies.

In this section, I will discuss the relevant programs that emerged from the database search, highlighting the salient characteristics that are discussed in the literature. Where the information is available, I will be discussing *5 categories*: a) general information; b) logistics; c) academics; d) technology; and e) pedagogy.

- The *general information* section covers: (1) the name of the program, (2) the target group, (3) the program's location, (4) program partners, (5) program goals, (6) program size, and (7) entrance quotas (gender, ethnicity, etc.).

- The *logistics* section covers: (1) entry requirements, (2) language requirements, (3) cost per student, (4) program accommodations, (5) learning environment, (6) academic support/development, (7) accessibility.
- The *academics* section covers: (1) subjects offered, (2) type of accreditation, (3) course structure, (4) contributions to durable solutions/employment, and (4) reported learning outcomes (test scores, student reflections, etc.).
- The *technology* section covers: (1) online/hybrid features, (2) technological features, (3) flexibility of technology, (4) technical support provided, and (5) portable technology features
- The *pedagogy* section covers: (1) pedagogical approach in context, and (2) teaching methodologies/practices.

Australian Catholic University

General Information

Established in 2009, the Australian Catholic University (ACU) was the first higher education institution to provide an accredited diploma to refugees in protracted situations (Couch, 2017). This program is completely funded by ACU in partnership with York University, Palms Australia, and the Marista Asia Foundation (Couch, 2017). ACU's higher education programs operate on the Thai-Burma border in Southern Thailand with programs in Mae Sot and Ranong (Couch, 2017). In the initial development of the ACU programs, the university partnered with Community Based Organizations (CBOs) to identify displaced, qualified students with the intention to remain on the border (Couch, 2017). Due to the majority of the students in ACU's programs in the past belonging to the Karen, the majority ethnic group, ACU began a

calculated effort to accept students from diverse ethnic backgrounds (Couch, 2017). This effort proved to be successful— in 2017, the programs constituted students of 8 different Burmese ethnicities (Couch, 2017). In an additional effort to aim towards gender equality within the program, 36 females and 25 males took the course in 2017 (Couch, 2017).

Logistics

In order to be accepted into the program, students must successfully finish their 12th year of schooling in the refugee camps in which the programs operate or in Myanmar, as well as pass an English language entrance exam that is given to the students by ACU in the camps (Couch, 2017). Program accommodations include students' opportunity to live in group housing subsidized by ACU for the entirety of the program (Couch, 2017).

ACU provides multiple avenues of student support and development. Beginning with the diploma program's orientation, each course begins with a session of at least a week that introduces the students to participating universities. Furthermore, these orientation sessions include topics relating to the program's expectations of the students and vice versa, as well as "critical thinking, peace-building exercises, and guides to study" (Couch, 2017, p. 130). Additionally, ACU provides students with tutoring and general student support that facilitates their university experience. On-site resident tutors are located in the camps to assist students academically on a daily basis, as well as a local Burmese advisor who prioritizes the health, well-being, and security of the students in the program (Couch, 2017). Further practices employed by ACU to increase student retention include peer support and online tutorials (Gladwell et. al, 2016).

Academics

ACU provides an internationally recognized diploma in Liberal Studies that is offered and accredited by ACU, with individual courses/modules qualifying as course credit (Gladwell et. al., 2016). The first course of the diploma track is English Communication Skills, that is designed to properly introduce the students to academic English (Couch, 2017). Subsequently, the specific subjects that are taught within the Liberal Studies diploma include: “Global Environmental Change, Introduction to Development, Introduction to Management, Introduction to International Human Rights Law and Practice, Issues in Global Health, Adolescent development and Wellbeing, and Education for Sustainability” (Couch, 2017, p. 129). In addition to providing students with a university diploma, ACU is concerned with the students’ contribution to durable solutions, as well as their successes in employment. ACU’s outlook on refugee education is not solely based on academics, but also consists of a developmental lens that emphasizes the urgency of relevant infrastructure, participation, employment, and security (McLaren, 2012).

The Memorandum of Understanding between the students who take the course at ACU requests that students dedicate “at least two years of their time after graduating to the refugee or migrant community” (Couch, 2017, p. 130). As a result, many of the students who receive the diploma move on to work on the Thai-Burma border with local organizations that are concerned with human rights, education, and health (Gladwell et. al., 2016). ACU reported that there are “over 150 graduates of the program, most of whom are now employed in non-governmental or community-based welfare

organizations such as the Danish Refugee Council, the Karen Human Rights Group, and the Mae Tao Clinic” (ACU refugee program on the Thai-Burma border, n.d.).

Pedagogy

Since the program’s inception, the ACU diploma program was pioneered on the idea of creating a curriculum that works for the Burma community—including the implementation of curriculum, pedagogy, and teaching methodologies that the Burmese refugee community itself considers useful and beneficial. Throughout the years following the programs pilot, ACU has been altering its curriculum to meet the specific needs and preferences of the students based on student reflections and recommendations (Couch, 2017).

Jen Couch, an ACU instructor in adolescent development, documented the multitude of ways that she utilized critical pedagogy to successfully engage her students in meaningful ways. Her auto-ethnographic study aimed to explore the impact of her teaching, including the ways in which her teaching approach was transformed based on the pedagogical demands of her students (Couch, 2017). Her goal was to create a classroom that was student-teacher led, utilizing approaches including “experiential activities, small-group work, student presentations, discussion, and creative expression” (Couch, 2017, p. 138). Couch identified a large theme that was present while teaching refugees with historical trauma. This included adapting her teaching to “posttraumatic cultural moments” that acknowledges the ‘consequences of the emotional complexity in conflict and post conflict situations in order to enrich the radical potential in creating transformative classrooms” (Couch, 2017, p. 133). In order to create relevant lesson plans for her students, she engaged in dialogues with the students by discussing various forms

of knowledges and experiences that youth on the border experience. Since the class agreed that issues surrounding wellbeing for young Burmese adolescents were of importance to them, Couch created lesson plans from Burmese writers and popular culture that is representative of the realities of the Thai-Burma border. She hoped that this approach would serve as a strong foundation for critical reflections of their experiences and culture (Couch, 2017).

To further engage students in productive, critical dialogue, Couch found it necessary to construct a space of “critical emotional practice” in which critical thinking and production of knowledge can occur within the context of healing, restoration, and reconciliation (Couch, 2017, p. 136). Couch (2017) explains the necessity of this safe space where “common feelings of vulnerability and empathy emerge, and we can relate our stories, we set up better conditions for new relations” (p. 136). In order to create this space of critical emotional praxis, Couch engaged in discussion within a circle, reminding all of her students that their experiences were important avenues of knowledge, as well as establishing confidentiality through the usage of their native language. She told the students that confidentiality is important in discussing sensitive topics (Couch, 2017). Throughout the introduction of new course materials, Couch (2017) would always ask students questions such as: “Is this useful for your community? How will your community react to this information? What will happen if a young person does this? How would you change or improve this topic?” (p. 139). This approach helped Couch understand students’ perspectives on a diversity of topics, as well as to better inform the production of new course materials and lesson plans.

Technology

ACU's diploma courses are taught through a hybrid model, including on-site facilitators as well as online components taught by faculty members (Gladwell et. al., 2016). The online portion of the courses are taught by staff from North American Universities, while the in-person teaching is taught by specialist tutors who visit the refugee camps to assist students as they are going through the course content. This approach is claimed to increase student retention since it "humanize[s] the program and brings that necessary component of human contact to people who, in many cases, have suffered severe trauma" (McLaren, 2012, p. 106).

The technological features of the ACU diploma program include updated computers, USBs provided to students, as well as an adequate internet connection that allows students to download videos necessary for the course (McLaren, 2012). Giving the students the option to download course content in advance is a solution to a large barrier of unreliable and slow internet connection, since students can access the content at any time and place. Additionally, the program utilizes Blackboard as an e-learning system, as well as social networks such as Facebook to develop contact with the students taking the course (McLaren, 2012). In 2012, the program began introducing Moodle to the students, since it would be used as the main e-learning and e-library system in the future. It is unknown if ACU now uses Moodle or Blackboard. In regard to student success with e-learning, since much of the course is taken online and in English, all the students in the program were reported to have come out of the experience with improved English language skills and an exceptional knowledge of online learning (McLaren, 2012).

Borderless Higher Education for Refugees (BHER)

General Information

Borderless Higher Education for Refugees (BHER) is a project located in the Dadaab refugee camp in Kenya that provides refugee students with the opportunity to gain accredited university certificates and diplomas. BHER is a consortium of Canadian and Kenyan universities—including York University, Kenyatta University, Moi University, and the University of British Columbia (Borderless Higher Education for Refugees, n.d.). Many teachers in the camp “possess insufficient training, most of whom having completed only elementary or secondary school themselves” (Borderless Higher Education for Refugees, n.d.). Specifically, in Dadaab, there is a “35 percent shortfall of the quantity of teachers needed to meet the demands of 179,578 school-aged children” (Abdi, 2016, p. 29). Additionally, there is a stark disparity in the amount of trained female teachers in the camp. Young women face additional barriers to pursuing an education, including a greater number of domestic responsibilities in the household compared to their male counterparts, early marriage, and lack of sanitary products causing women to stay home during their periods (Gladwell et., al., 2016; Sabriye, 2017). As a result, BHER’s central focus is to provide certified teacher training with the goal of increasing the quality of education for students in the refugee camp. Through providing certified teacher training to refugees in Dadaab, it is BHER’s goal to increase 1) the quality of education in Dadaab, and 2) the opportunities of the teachers themselves and 3) increase gender equity in the higher education process.

Logistics

BHER has instituted a “gender equity committee with representatives from all participating universities, who have made suggestions about recruiting and retaining women in the program” (Gladwell et. al., 2016, p. 16). BHER employs affirmative action to increase gender equity within higher education in their program. Specifically, BHER prioritizes the recruitment of women, people with disabilities, and individuals of ethnic/religious minority backgrounds (Sabriye, 2017). To increase the recruitment of women in the programs, they are accepted into the program with lower grades than men, with additional considerations placed on their applications due to the greater barriers refugee women in higher education face.

Funds are allocated towards all BHER students living far from the learning center to live with relatives that live close by (Gladwell et. al., 2016). In congruence with their efforts to increase gender equity, transportation and food stipends are allotted for women throughout the duration of the course (Gladwell et. al., 2016). All BHER students have access to remedial courses that are created to ease students into the certificate and diploma courses, and students have the opportunity to retake the courses if they fail (Sabriye, 2017). This policy immensely benefits women taking the course since many of them are mothers that are put at a disproportionate disadvantage of meeting course requirements and deadlines to their men counterparts (Sabriye, 2017). Additional accommodations are provided to women with children, as they are able to bring them into the learning centers, with additional space allocated to nursing mothers who nurse their children and subsequently return to class (Gladwell et. al., 2016; Sabriye, 2017).

BHER has a mentorship program specifically tailored towards helping women tackle obstacles pertaining to academic success and employment (Gladwell et. al., 2016). In general, there is on-ground support to all students in the program who are vulnerable to dropping out; this support focuses on keeping the students engaged in the material and assisting them with technological challenges that inhibit the progress of their work (Gladwell et. al., 2016). The course structure of BHER is accommodating of the students' schedules, since many of the students are primary/secondary teachers in the camp (Gladwell et. al., 2016). Thus, the courses are concentrated during school breaks during the months of April, August, and December (Gladwell et. al., 2016). In addition to academic components, BHER is devoted to the development of students by “equip[ping] students to gain access to further study or employment in their country or if resettled” (Gladwell et. al., 2016, p. 19). BHER is currently examining the possibility of allowing repatriated students to complete the program from Somalia, including meeting teaching certification requirements in their home country (Gladwell et. al., 2016).

Academics

The programs are offered to BHER students through cohorts that each consist of up to 200 students, lasting from 4 to 5 years (Borderless Higher Education for Refugees, n.d.). Students in each cohort first enroll in a preparatory program called “Increased access and skills for tertiary education program” (InSTEP) for the purposes of preparing students for the university courses by offering English courses, Information and Communication Technology (ICT) courses, and research skills. Upon completing the InSTEP program, students interested in continuing their education pursuit may apply to either the Certificate or Diploma track in Education, choosing either the primary or

secondary education track (Borderless Higher Education for Refugees, n.d.). Students who successfully complete the Certificate and Diploma programs can then apply to the bachelor's degree program offered by one of the partner universities, with their previous credits contributing towards their degree requirements (Borderless Higher Education for Refugees, n.d.). The Bachelor's degrees that are offered are: BSc in Community Health Education, BEd in Education, and a BA in Geography. All credits earned through these programs are internationally accredited and transferable (Martin, 2018).

Pedagogy

BHER actively aims to incorporate “inclusive approaches and active-learning methodologies” (Gladwell et. al., 2016, p. 22). Before its inception, BHER conducted a study that included “participatory research assessing context-specific needs and exploring which subjects potential students regarded as useful” (Gladwell et. al., 2016, p. 22). The BHER modules are flexible, allowing for the possibility of courses being modified to meet the demands of students while encouraging critical thinking and relevant coursework through the use of “reflection, discussion, and practical work” (Gladwell et. al., 2016, p. 21). In addition, a substantial number of instructors have on-site experience teaching Dadaab refugees in the camp, with experience in the field (Gladwell et. al., 2016).

To ensure that the courses meet students' interests, BHER elicits feedback from students following each course to learn about the students' perceptions and comments regarding the of the course 's delivery as well as its content (Gladwell et. Al., 2016). Additionally, BHER interviews students for more information on the ways in which the students process the course content as well as the impact the courses have on the

students' lives. Specific examples of tailored curriculum include a class that offered Paulo Freire's *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* as a reading, and including culturally relevant math activities (Abdi, 2016). In alignment with BHER's commitment to gender equity and inclusion, instructors at BHER offer the opportunity for women to participate in separate lectures for the purposes of feeling comfortable discussing topics related to sex education and self-defense (Sabriye, 2017). This way, "the rights of women and girls can be discussed and challenged in an environment that reinforces traditional notions or beliefs regarding females" (Sabriye, 2017, p. 29).

Technology

The BHER courses are taught through a hybrid model, including on-site course facilitators/instructors and online components taught by faculty members (Gladwell et. al., 2016). The Learning Centre provides students with a computer lab (Sabriye, 2017), with access to "a learning management system comprised of learning textbooks, videos, and articles" (Hatamaya, 2018, p. 8). BHER utilizes technologies that students already use. For example, "WhatsApp is used for instruction, to distribute course materials, to keep in touch with students and update them on assignments" (Gladwell et. al., 2016, p. 20). One of the benefits of BHER's technology is that it allowed for "transnational and interregional online social networks over mobile phones, specifically those related to higher education for refugee women living in camps" (Sabriye, 2017, p. 25). Sabriye (2017) found that when she visited Dadaab, a female only WhatsApp message group was created to "discuss coursework, writing support, and shared personal struggles" all of which contributed towards student support (p. 25).

Electricity and internet connectivity are two critical barriers that students in the Dadaab camp face in accessing the online components of the courses (Sabriye, 2017). Unreliability and inconsistency of internet connection inhibits students' access to the online portion of the course, and lack of electricity means students may not be able to complete their coursework on time without lighting outside of class. In an attempt to combat the challenges of internet connectivity, BHER offers CDs and USBs for the ability to download course content for later access (Gladwell et. Al., 2016). To overcome the barrier of electricity, The Solar Lamps Initiative was created "to provide solar-powered desk lamps to refugee university students in Dadaab, giving them the freedom to complete coursework at home". The solar lamps are especially helpful for women in the program, as they are able to complete their coursework after finishing their household duties (Gladwell et. Al., 2016).

Jesuit Worldwide Learning: Higher Education at the Margins (JWL:HEM)

General Information

Jesuit Worldwide Learning: Higher Education at the Margins (JWL:HEM) is a global alliance established in 2010 (Hatamaya, 2018) and sponsored by the Society of Jesuits in partnership with the Jesuit Refugee Service (JRS) consisting of universities, institutions, and organizations that provide free tertiary education to refugees in camps (Lewis & Thacker, 2016). JWL: HEM operates in the Dominican Republic, Haiti, India, Nepal, Sri Lanka, Myanmar, Malawi, Kenya, Iraq, Chad, Afghanistan, and Jordan (Lewis & Thacker, 2016). The goal of JWL: HEM is "to provide high-quality tertiary learning to people and communities at the margins of society and facilitate the formation of a global

community of learners to build a more peaceful and humane world” (Hatamaya, 2018, p. 7).

Logistics

The entry requirements for JWL: HEM is three-fold: prospective students must complete an interview to showcase their English language comprehension, their community involvement and service to others, and their ability in time management (Gladwell et. al., 2016). Once accepted, JWL: HEM students are provided with accommodations such as bus services in Amman, Jordan that pick-up and drop off students to learning centers (Gladwell et al., 2016). Additionally, JWL: HEM provides their students with “onsite staff, peer-to-peer support, and online tutorials and support from tutors (Gladwell et. al., 2016, p. 22).

In the Kakuma camp (Kenya) students face issues with security and safety; thus, JWL: HEM provides security guards to patrol the learning centers (Crea & Sparnon, 2017). Other factors such as “food riots, cholera outbreaks, security restrictions, and curfews” hinder students’ access to the site due to increased travel times, lack of safety, and concern for their health (Crea & Sparnon, 2017, p, 8).

Academics

JWL: HEM is multi-faceted, with a number of community learning centers that provide both formal and non-formal educational opportunities through tertiary and vocational opportunities for refugees (Loo & Jeong, 2018). The programs include the Global English Language Program (GEL), Professional Certificate Program, and the Diploma in Liberal Studies Program. The professional vocational certificate subjects include primary teacher training, youth worker, psychosocial case management,

community healthcare provider, community and development business, peace and reconciliation, and sustainable agriculture (Jesuit Worldwide Learning: Higher Education at the Margins, n.d.). Upon completion, students receive certificates “based on the UNESCO standard of Technical Vocational Education and Training (TVET)” (Jesuit Worldwide Learning: Higher Education at the Margins, n.d.). While the certificate programs are certified by JRS and partners, they are not university-level accredited (Gladwell et. al., 2016).

The Diploma in Liberal Studies is a three-year program of 45 internationally-recognized, transferable credits that is accredited by Regis University in Colorado upon completion (Loo & Jeong, 2018). JWL’s diploma program is located in the Dzaleka refugee camp in Malawi, Kakuma camp in Kenya, and in Amman, Jordan (Loo & Jeong, 2018). The Diploma program begins with a non-credit “Bridge to Learning Course” followed by 30 credits of courses in liberal studies and 15 credits of courses in the concentrations students pick (Jesuit Worldwide Learning: Higher Education at the Margins, n.d.). The concentration areas offered by JWL are: Business, Education, and Social Work (Jesuit Worldwide Learning: Higher Education at the Margins, n.d.). JWL reported that “among those students who completed the Diploma program, over 25% transferred these credits to other Universities in different countries” (Jesuit Worldwide Learning: Higher Education at the Margins, n.d.). Additionally, JWL negotiates agreements with universities around the world to transfer credits towards a bachelor’s degree, and they are currently working towards efforts of expanding the Diploma program towards an associate degree (Jesuit Worldwide Learning: Higher Education at the Margins, n.d.).

Durable Solutions

JWL: HEM’s programming extends beyond a focus on academics—there is particular attention paid to the engagement of students in the community. The program “encourages engagement in camp structures, with learners participating in camp youth boards or volunteering in leadership roles in the camp” (Gladwell et. al., 2016, p. 23). Students reflect positively on the impact JWL’s communication and leadership classes in increasing their communication skills with their community (Crea & Sparnon, 2017). These skills help facilitate students’ transitions into employment opportunities that serve the camps. A JWL stakeholder in Kakuma reported that “students have started applying the skills in different NGOs as teachers, social workers, work supervisors and managers [...] health workers, community leaders, translators, and interpreters” (Crea & Sparnon, 2017, p. 12). In addition to employment opportunities, JWL students also reported a “renewed sense of hope in their future due to their ability to further their education” (Crea & Sparnon, 2017, p. 13).

Pedagogy

Contextualization of courses and lesson-plans is essential to JWL: HEM programming. Following the Ignatian pedagogical method, the Diploma and CLST programs are cultivated to meet the needs of each refugee community (Gladwell et. al., 2016). Since the Diploma program is offered in 5 different locations, each location follows a differing approach based on the specific needs, experiences, and interests of the refugee community (Gladwell et. Al., 2016). The Bridge to Learning introductory course to the Diploma program was created to introduce students to Ignatian pedagogy and “help them appreciate different cultures and perspectives” (Gladwell et. al., 2016, p. 21).

Specifically, the courses integrate three components of “knowledge, reflection, and action” in each week’s lessons that aim to contextualize the courses to each target group and “allow students to [...] contextualize the content for themselves” (Crea & Sparnon, 2017, p. 7).

Technology

The Diploma program is delivered through a hybrid approach, with an online component taught by US-based instructors, and in-person facilitation is led by staff in the refugee camps (Gladwell et. al., 2016). The online components of the Diploma program can be accessed both online and offline, with computer labs in the learning centers for students to access (Hatamaya, 2018). The digital learning center provided by JWL includes: a computer lab, internet connectivity, and an IT officer to facilitate technical operations (Dankova & Giner, 2011). Even with the added assistance, internet connectivity still serves as a large barrier due to power cuts and technical issues (Dankova & Giner, 2011). To circumvent this barrier, many students download readings and lectures to local servers in order to allow for greater flexibility to access the material at night (Dankova & Giner, 2011). To transcend the barrier of electricity power outages, solar panels were installed in the Dzaleka camp. However, solar panels were still damaged by power surges and the lack of local expertise on solar energy resulted in a long waiting period for the products to be fixed (Dankova & Giner, 2011). Currently, JWL’s Language Program includes a “toolbox that contains all physical elements needed to help students read, write, speak, and listen in English both inside and outside the classroom” which is also battery-operated and can be used in places with unreliable electricity (Jesuit Worldwide Learning: Higher Education at the Margins, n.d.).

InZone

General Information

Established in 2009, InZone is a tertiary-level education provider located in refugee camps in Afghanistan, Kenya (Dadaab and Kakuma camps), Sudan, and Jordan (Azraq camp) (Gladwell et. al., 2016). Facilitated by the University of Geneva and Kenyatta University, InZone offers both formal and non-formal education options, with particular focus on art, peacebuilding, medical training, and humanitarian interpreter training (Gladwell et. al., 2016). The mission of InZone is “to design, develop, and scientifically validate higher education in emergency models that respect humanitarian principles” by tackling identified challenges such as “access to education, quality of educational programs, relevance of programs, and management of programs in the field and remotely” (Moser-Mercer et. al., 2016, p. 42). InZone’s entry requirements include proof of basic knowledge of the English language and the ability to learn online (Colucci et al., 2017; Gladwell et. al., 2016).

Academics

Formal, credit-bearing offerings of the InZone program include: Certificate of Advanced Studies (CAS) in Humanitarian Interpreting, Certificate in Community Interpreting, Basic Medical Training for Health Workers, Global History Lab, and an engineering course. The CAS in Humanitarian Interpreting is accredited by the University of Geneva’s Continuing Education Service and is designed to train refugee humanitarian interpreters in the field to utilize their language and cultural skills to facilitate humanitarian communication with the hopes of providing them with the opportunity of employment upon certification (Gladwell et. al., 2016). Located in the

Dadaab and Kakuma refugee camps, The Certificate in Community Interpreting is a year-long course that is accredited by the University of Geneva and Kenyatta University (InZone: Higher Education for Refugees, n.d.). InZone’s Basic Medical Training for Healthcare Workers is located in the Dadaab Refugee Camp, and “aims to provide healthcare workers with high-quality, medical education certification to complement their practical work” (InZone: Higher Education for Refugees, n.d.). In the Azraq Camp in Jordan, The Global History Lab is a degree-level course in partnership with Princeton University that offers MOOCs to refugee students in the Azraq camp that examines the history of the world from 1300 to the present day, discussing the roots of statelessness and forced displacement (InZone: Higher Education for Refugees, n.d.). Refugees learn alongside Princeton students, sharing their insights, experiences, as well as collaborating with each other throughout the course (InZone: Higher Education for Refugees, n.d.). The Engineering and Innovation course that is offered by Purdue University and MIT in the Azraq camp seeks to train refugee learners in engineering and design skills “that can be directly applied in their community”; for example, training them on developing mobile learning platforms for their communities (InZone: Higher Education for Refugees, n.d.)). To complement the learning that takes place within InZone’s programs, employment opportunities are facilitated between Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and refugee students to participate in employment that serves displaced communities (Gladwell et. al., 2016).

In addition to InZone’s formal, accredited course offerings, there is an emphasis placed on non-formal educational programs that are offered in the Kenyan camps of Kakuma and Dadaab, and the Azraq camp in Jordan for the purposes of creating a

collaborative learning environment for students (Moser-Mercer et al., 2016). The Higher Education Spaces located in the three refugee camps are centers that include the necessary hardware and software to implement InZone’s programs. InZone’s Learning Hub in Dadaab and Kenya are refugee-run and feature “learning stations and solar-powered hubs that support virtual and blended learning for a wide range of formal and non-formal higher education courses” (InZone: Higher Education for Refugees, n.d.)). MOOCs4Peace, the idea of an InZone refugee learner, was “designed to help refugees acquire knowledge related to conflict resolution, which they can apply to their communities using applied drama approaches developed as part of the Center’s training program” (InZone: Higher Education for Refugees, n.d.). In MOOCs4Peace, students “participate in a series of forums and workshops on interpersonal and intercultural conflict management” (InZone: Higher Education for Refugees, n.d.)). InZone’s non-formal programs include workshops in the arts (“dance, movement, applied drama, storytelling, and creative writing”) for the purposes of “unleash[ing] [students’] creative potential to co-design their learning environment and amplify[ing] the knowledge acquired through higher education opportunities through sharing it with the entire refugee community” (Hostettler et al., 2018 p. 48). Non-formal educational workshops and programs are amplified through InZone’s Student Café, a place in which students can come together through “student discussion groups, community performances, and learning groups” and participate in debates, meetings, and art performances in a collaborative learning environment that encourages and supports students’ creativity and expression (Moser-Mercer et al., 2016, p. 48).

Pedagogy

Prior to the development of InZone’s courses, the camp contexts are studied in-depth in accordance to the belief that no two refugee camps are the same—with each one facing distinct challenges that must be addressed (Hostettler et al., 2018). InZone develops contacts with refugee learners themselves in order to engage them in the development of the courses, following a bottom-up approach to innovation (Hostettler et al., 2018). InZone is explicit in their aim to provide targeted, culturally-sensitive pedagogical approaches, and showcases their curricular flexibility through their openness to redesigning courses that align with refugees’ contextual preferences (Hostettler et al., 2018). The Kakuma InZone Higher Education Space is managed by refugee learners and InZone alumni, rather than on-site, organizational partners (Hostettler et al., 2018). This approach allows refugees themselves to construct learning spaces that adhere to their communities’ preferences.

The Open Educational Resources that are utilized by InZone “encourage experimentation with information and invite adaptation to local contexts and languages” (Hostettler et al., 2018 p. 46). InZone builds on their formal educational programs to extend into non-formal programs that “enable individual and collaborative learning [...] encouraging learners to creatively use their wider learning space” (Hostettler et al., 2018 p. 48). Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs) utilized by InZone “challenge traditional assumptions and practices about teaching and learning, most notably by putting the learner at the center of the design and using technology to enable the learning process” (Hostettler et al., 2018 p. 44).

Technology

InZone courses are taught through an online and on-site blended approach, with faculty members traveling to the camps to facilitate small, in-person lectures (Gladwell et. al., 2016). The learning hubs established in Dadaab, Kakuma, and Azraq refugee camps are solar-powered, including laptops, allowing students to access course material from within them (InZone: Higher Education for Refugees, n.d.). Furthermore, the learning hubs are supplied with ICTs and on-site support to assist with technological challenges (Gladwell et. al., 2016).

Kepler

General Information

Established by Southern New Hampshire University in 2013, Kepler is a tertiary-level educational program that operates in the Kigali and Kiziba camps of Rwanda (Gladwell et. al., 2016). Kepler's target group in the Kigali camp is not refugee specific, while the target group in the Kiziba camp specifically targets refugee students (Gladwell et. al., 2016).

Logistics

Admission requirements into the Kepler program include strong knowledge of the English language, participation in an interview, an admissions test, and must showcase strong leadership skills (Gladwell et. al., 2016). Kepler is not free for admitted students; students are required to pay an annual tuition fee of approximately \$1,000 (Gladwell et. al., 2016).

Since many of the refugee learners experience psychological trauma, Kepler is increasingly aware that students need “adequate health, emotional, nutritional, and

psychological support” (Brown & Russell, 2017, p. 3). Due to the lack of access to basic sustenance in the Kiziba and Kigali camps, Kepler students receive lunch and snacks, in addition to an on-site nutritionist that works with the students to understand their diets (Brown & Russell, 2017). Kepler also provides students with counselors that make routine visits to the refugee camps to provide mental health and counseling services (Brown & Russell, 2017). To encourage student retention and success, Kepler implemented a teacher fellow program through which Kepler alumni mentor new students into the program (Martin, 2018)

Academics

In both Kigali and Kiziba camps, Kepler offers an associate’s and bachelor’s degree track (Brown & Russell, 2017). First, students receive their associate degree in General Studies (two years), then can choose to receive a Bachelor of Arts degree in either Communications, Healthcare Management, or Business Management (three to four years) (Brown & Russell, 2017). All of the courses offered by Kepler are stackable, which means that students are able to receive certificates or qualifications upon completion while working towards their associate’s and/or bachelor’s degrees. Both the associate’s and bachelor’s degrees are internationally accredited by College for America.

In support of students’ professional and academic development, Kepler offers students comprehensive education-to-employment support, which includes “intensive job training and coaching, work-study programs and structured internships with local employers” (Gladwell et. al., 2016, p. 23). Kepler requires an internship for students in their programs before graduation and assists students by matching them to internships with local employers (Gladwell et. al., 2016; Martin, 2018). Through internship and job

opportunities, as well as entrepreneurial training, students are able to explore employment options after receiving their degrees. Kepler graduates have a 90% post-graduation internship employment rate as a result of the education-to-employment support (Gladwell et. al., 2016).

Pedagogy

Kepler's pedagogical approach is based on contextualized learning dependent students' contexts (Brown & Russell, 2017). Furthermore, Kepler is definitive in its commitment to provide comprehensive and inclusive educational curriculum for its students through "encouraging critical reflection, applied learning, and non-academic development" (Gladwell et. al., 2016, p. 23). The Kepler course structure was developed to encourage contextualization of the course content to students' experiences through "reflection, discussion, and practical work" (Gladwell et. al., 2016, p. 21). Kepler's online courses take place in the evenings, with in-person classes during the day that allow the students to reflect on the material that they learn online (Gladwell et. al., 2016). Kepler monitors student performance through test scores, student assessments, and students' critical thinking improvements (Gladwell et. al., 2016). The performance data is then utilized to inform Kepler's future programming based on students' recommendations and progress—inherent in this approach is the flexibility of the program to adhere to methods that work best for the students (Gladwell et. al., 2016).

Technology

Kepler employs a hybrid approach in its educational programs, with a combination of an online component that is facilitated by on-site instructors in the camps (Gladwell et. al., 2016). Kepler provides its students with free, reliable internet

connection as well as a laptop; however, due to security reasons, students are unable to take their laptops home (Gladwell et. al., 2016). To ease students into the e-learning environment, Kepler provides bridge courses where students learn the basics to online learning, including how to type, introduction to Microsoft Office, and research skills (Brown & Russell, 2017). To ensure adaptability with fluctuating internet speeds, Kepler's open education resources that are composed of required lectures, readings, and projects, can be accessed by students with low-internet bandwidth (Brown & Russell, 2017). Additional connectivity accommodations include back-up solar energy generators in case of power-outages in the camps (Brown & Russell, 2017).

Mosaik

General Information

Mosaik, formerly known as Jamiya, is a project established in 2016 that aims to provide Syrian refugees with tertiary-level education (Colucci et. al., 2017). Mosaik's target population is currently for Syrian bachelor level students in the Za'atari refugee camp in Jordan; however, Mosaik hopes to expand their program in the near future to accommodate a larger population of refugees from different backgrounds (Loo & Jeong, 2018).

Logistics

While Mosaik does not individually fund the program for students, once accepted, students receive assistance in crowd-funding to collect money for their tuition expenses and their living expenses. Mosaik is currently planning, however, to expand accessibility to their program by partnering with organizations to offer scholarships to the students (Mosaik: Supporting Refugees into Higher Education, n.d.). To raise awareness to the

target population regarding their programs, Mosaik utilizes peer digital content, including videos, podcasts, and blogs, that are shared on social media that discuss accessing higher education (Mosaik: Supporting Refugees into Higher Education, n.d.). In preparation for the courses, Mosaik offers guidance workshops, peer mentorship, and English and academic preparation courses to their students. The guidance workshops assist students in assessing their higher education options in relation to their specific academic and career goals, as well as helping them develop a plan for their journey through tertiary education (Mosaik: Supporting Refugees into Higher Education, n.d.). Mosaik connects students with each other through peer mentorship with the hopes of participants engaging with each other and sharing their experiences with higher education (Mosaik: Supporting Refugees into Higher Education, n.d.). The academic skills workshops assist new students with “time management, presentation, independent study and extended writing skills” in order to prepare the students for the journey ahead (Mosaik: Supporting Refugees into Higher Education, n.d.). To account for the psychological trauma that many refugees confront, Mosaik partners with refugees to create “videos, podcasts, and blogs addressing social and psychological challenges faced by refugees adapting to life as students” (Mosaik: Supporting Refugees into Higher Education, n.d.).

Academics

Currently, Mosaik is offering students one-year college-level courses that contribute towards the first year of a university degree that is accredited by the University of Gothenburg in Sweden in partnership with the Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) (Gladwell et. al., 2016; Loo & Jeong, 2018). Courses offered by the program include

“two 12-week blended learning Small Private Online Courses (SPOC) in Applied IT and Global Studies” (Gladwell et. al., 2016, p. 61).

Pedagogy

Mosaik’s pedagogical approach is informed by refugee students’ experiences and contexts. On their website, they state that “over 100 young refugees were involved in helping shape what we focus on and how activities are delivered” (Mosaik: Supporting Refugees into Higher Education, n.d.). For example, Mosaik creates digital peer content alongside refugee student ambassadors that volunteer with the program and assist new students throughout the program (Mosaik: Supporting Refugees into Higher Education, n.d.). Moreover, Mosaik’s English courses utilize a “dialogic” method that centers on the students’ language and expands upon their own experiences (Mosaik: Supporting Refugees into Higher Education, n.d.). Lastly, Mosaik partners with local refugee-led organizations to “support students’ leadership and adaptation of programs” (Mosaik: Supporting Refugees into Higher Education, n.d.). To account for Arabic speaking students, Mosaik partnered with the University of Gothenburg to create accredited Arabic courses to be delivered to students at the Zaatari camp (Colucci et. al., 2017). In an additional effort to increase community-centered learning and provide students with instructors that understand their backgrounds and experiences, Mosaik hires Syrian refugee teachers to facilitate on-site, in-person courses (Gladwell et. al., 2016). By teaching most of the courses in Arabic and having Syrian instructors deliver the courses, Mosaik hopes that their students will be able to benefit from culturally sensitive teaching (Colucci et. al., 2017).

Technology

While most of the learning within the Mosaik project takes place online, the hybrid approach is also employed through “intensive in person sessions taught by Syrian academics” in the Zaatari camp (Gladwell et. al., 2016, p. 61). Additional technological features utilized by Mosaik include open-source educational materials that were created to be replicated by other programs that offer higher education in protracted situations (Gladwell et. al., 2016). Mosaik “us[es] a combination of digital content, connected learning systems and social media to ensure these programs are accessible and scalable” (Mosaik: Supporting Refugees into Higher Education, n.d.).

Global Border Studies (GPS)

General Information

Global Border Studies (GBS), established in 2010 by World Education in partnership with Dundalk Institute of Technology, is a program that offers university degrees and/or diplomas in social science subjects in refugee camp settings (Gladwell et. al., 2016). GBS is a cross-border program located in the Nu Po refugee camp in Thailand, targeting displaced Burmese students (Gladwell et. al., 2016). As of 2016, the program was fairly small, encompassing a total of 15 students. GBS’ learning environment includes full time on-site tutors that are available to mentor students within an environment where students “live, study and work together in a cross-cultural, English immersion environment” (UNHCR, 2011).

Academics

GBS’ academic programs entail a year of coursework relating to “human development, colonization to conflict in Africa, and ethnic conflict case studies”, with

year two including courses related to “conflict transformation and reconciliation, development education, sustainable development, and environment” (UNHCR, 2011). While the accreditation component of GBS is unclear, GBS was started with the intention of offering accredited online learning (UNHCR, 2011). To supplement the academic portion of the program, GBS supports students’ critical thinking abilities in relation to their roles within their communities, as well as emphasizing the importance of applying their knowledge of the learning material to local sustainable development projects that impact their communities. To support students’ local engagement and increase their opportunities of employment, GBS matches students with a local community-based organization for a year-long internship after their coursework is completed (Gladwell et. al., 2016).

Pedagogy

The pedagogical approach that is implemented by GBS is informed by their willingness to cater their courses specifically towards displaced Burmese students in Thailand. GBS’ courses and curriculums are based on the idea of providing students with knowledge that will aid in long-term sustainable development solutions for their communities, building students’ skills in hopes of repatriation to Burma to “promote peace and reconciliation and assist in their country’s development” (UNHCR, 2011). GBS’s goals include giving students the opportunity to “participate in internationally recognized educational programming that is relevant to their lives” (UNHCR, 2011). To offer greater opportunities of course contextualization, GBS enhances collaboration through implementing activities such as “group tutorials, student centered teaching, experiential learning and online discussions” (UNHCR, 2011). The experiential learning

approach is implemented within the program to provide students with the opportunity to engage theoretical concepts with local contexts (UNHCR, 2011).

Technology

GBS is taught in a hybrid format, with on-site facilitators that travel to the Nu Po camp to instruct the in-person courses, with online components students access on their own time (Gladwell et. al., 2016). GBS' technological accommodations include a laptop for each student to access online courses and complete their homework assignments, as well as receive feedback through Moodle, a "virtual learning environment developed to help educators create online courses" (UNHCR, 2011). All of GBS' online courses and curriculum are recorded and delivered through Moodle (UNHCR, 2011).

Education for Humanity

General Information

Education for Humanity (E4H), an Arizona State University (ASU) initiative established in 2017, offers free access to higher education programs for refugees residing in Iraq (25+ students), Lebanon (35+ students), Jordan (200+ students), Uganda (25 students), and Rwanda (50+ students) utilizing online learning, in-person support, and transferable credits (Arizona State University, n.d.). Programs taking place specifically in refugee camps include the Za'atari and Azraq camps in Jordan, Adjumani camp in Uganda, and Kiziba camp in Kigali (Arizona State University, n.d.). E4H partners with on the ground organizations such as the Beirut Center for Self-Reliance, Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC), Windle International, and Kepler to deliver the courses. Ed4H's objectives include: "deliver accessible, high quality tertiary education to refugees, address barriers refugees face in accessing and completing tertiary education, and

advance refugee integration through university and workforce partnerships” (Arizona State University, n.d.).

Logistics

Prospective E4H students must showcase their English language capabilities; otherwise, no formal documentation such as proof of secondary school completion is needed. In regard to gender equity of the programs, Ed4H’s *Be A Successful Online Learner* (BSOL) course in Amman, Jordan saw an exceptional enrolment of female students at 83% (Arizona State University, 2018).

Since E4H is operated by ASU, students in the program have full access to the university’s academic success programs. The support includes access to online tutoring, academic skills, and supplemental instruction (University Academic Success Programs, n.d.).

Academics

The current programs offered by E4H include English, university preparation, and undergraduate courses (Arizona State University, n.d.). E4H’s program begins with preparation and skills modules that aim to prepare students for the courses by developing their “English, information literacy, and professional competencies” (Education for Humanity, n.d.). Then, students begin the Global Freshman Academy, accredited university courses accessed online that act as a bridge towards enrollment in local universities (Education for Humanity, n.d.). Education for Humanity employs a 1 + 3 model; students participate in a year of in-person and online coursework, then choose from two paths to complete their degree (Education for Humanity, n.d.). Once a student finishes the year of the Global Freshman Academy, they have the choice of either

matriculating at a local partner university that will accept their first year of credits from ASU, or they may continue their degree through ASU online (Education for Humanity, n.d.). If the student chooses to pursue their degree through ASU online, they have the choice of picking from a wide range of “175 fully-online degree and certificate programs” (Education for Humanity, n.d.).

Current programs that are being piloted by E4H on a small scale include an Agribusiness Certificate Course, Entrepreneurship, MicroMasters in International Business Management, and an Online Master of Applied Leadership & Management (Arizona State University, n.d.). Looking to the future, E4H is hoping to “facilitat[e] the matriculation of learners into degree programs in the countries where they reside, teacher training for educators working in crisis contexts, and continuing education options for NGO staff” (Arizona State University, n.d.).

Pedagogy

E4H’s modules “have been created specifically to meet the needs and ambitions of refugees and displaced learners [as] the course offerings are based on what the refugees and the local partners want” (Education for Humanity, n.d.). E4H’s courses are flexible, since much of the program’s implementation is heavily centered on the experiences of the students that are enrolled in them. In the Uganda camps Ayilo and Nyumanzi, E4H administered a student survey upon the completion of the first course to learn from the experiences of refugee learners and subsequently accommodate to their specific needs and challenges associated with taking the course (Arizona State University, 2019). E4H elicited feedback from all students who remained in the course upon completion, with the survey including open-ended questions relating to personal

(family, financial, travel) and external (power, network, computers, time) challenges associated with taking the course to gain a holistic understanding on ways in which the course offerings could improve to enhance student success and retention (Arizona State University, 2019). Prior to the changes made from the recommendations of the survey, 6 of 23 students passed the course; the most recent development of the course had a success rate of 15 of 19 students completing the course with a passing grade and receiving college credit (Arizona State University, 2019). It is noteworthy that E4H is currently looking to “extend [their] reach through expanding course options in more languages” to accommodate to refugee students’ native languages.

Technology

One of the biggest challenges that Education for Humanity has faced in the Uganda project is poor, unreliable internet connectivity. To account for this barrier Education for Humanity is currently piloting an Agribusiness certificate course in Uganda through SolarSPELL, “a solar-powered, offline digital library that provides localized education content” (Faller, 2019). SolarSPELL provides offline access via open educational resources in a blended learning format and in-person facilitators.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

In this section, I consolidate the findings and delineate cross-case promising practices that should be implemented by programs who wish to offer inclusive higher education programs for students in refugee camps. The salient characteristics to be discussed in this section will follow the same categories as my *findings* section did: logistics, academics, pedagogy, and technology. Within each section, I will discuss down common themes that emerged out of the eight programs.

Logistics

Costs

Six of the eight programs discussed in this study are free of charge for the students, except for Kepler and Mosaik. Kepler's annual tuition is \$1,000. While Mosaik's program is not fully funded, students receive assistance to crowd-fund for their tuition fees and are working towards partnerships to offer scholarships to their students. As discussed in the literature review, refugees face a large barrier of access to higher education programs in regard to high tuition fees, as often times they are viewed as international students and are fined at higher rates than the country's nationals (Donald, 2014). Since high tuition costs serve as a large barrier for refugee enrollment in tertiary education programs, I suggest that interventions aim to make their offerings free of cost.

Entrance Requirements

JWL and Kepler are the only two programs that explicitly mentioned their entry requirements. JWL and Kepler both require English language comprehension, and JWL seeks to recruit students who are involved in community involvement and service. Kepler

additionally interviews prospective students and requires an admissions test, as well as recruiting students who exhibit strong leadership skills. E4H does not require prospective students to show proof of previous credentials or examination results in order to enroll—the only requirement is for students to showcase their English language capabilities. In order to overcome the barrier of lost documentation (birth certificates, school diplomas, examination results, etc.), interventions should follow the lead of E4H and allow the admission of students who do not have access to particular documentation that are traditionally required to be admitted.

Awareness

One of the barriers to students accessing higher education programs is the lack of awareness of opportunities amongst refugee students interested in pursuing higher education (Gladwell et al., 2016; Watkins et al., 2010). To increase awareness of their higher education programs within the refugee camps, Mosaik publishes videos, podcasts, and blogs on social media that are created by and for refugee students that discuss higher education options. Mosaik’s approach is the only one found in this study that specifically aims to address the barrier of awareness. For this reason, I believe that interventions should become increasingly cognizant of spreading the word throughout the locations in which they are operating.

Accommodations

Refugees living in camp structures can regularly face harsh living conditions related to access to adequate shelter, food, and water. In Dadaab, Kenya, for example “43 percent of the population lack adequate dwellings, 82 percent were lacking household latrines, and almost all were being affected by water shortages” (Wright & Plasterer,

2010, p. 45). Additionally, security concerns within refugee camps can be a prominent impediment for students and instructors to operate within camps (Abdi, 2016). Kepler and BHER both provide their students with nutritional support throughout their duration in the programs. Kepler additionally provides students with snacks and lunches during in-person instruction, and a nutritionist to assist students with understanding their specific diets. BHER provides stipends to their students for food. Transportation accommodations are offered by BHER and JWL. BHER offers stipends to students for transportation, and JWL provides students who live far from the learning centers with drop-off and pick-up transportation services. Housing accommodations are offered by ACU and BHER; ACU implements subsidized group housing while BHER supports students to live with family close to the learning center. Lastly, JWL is concerned with the safety of their students—as a result, security guards patrol the learning centers to ensure student’s security. For future implementation, higher education programs should provide accommodations for refugees in relation to food, nutrition, transportation, shelter, and security through the implementation of school meals, security patrols (when necessary), transportation services, and housing accommodations.

Gender Equity

A large barrier towards refugee students’ success throughout their higher educational journeys is the large amount of responsibilities that are placed on them, especially women as “household duties and childcare responsibilities impede women from devoting the time necessary to pursue education” (Crea, 2017, p. 14). Young women additionally face barriers including a “greater number of domestic responsibilities in the household compared to their male counterparts, early marriage, and lack of sanitary

products causing women to stay home during their periods” (Gladwell et., al., 2016; Sabriye, 2017). Of the eight programs evaluated, BHER is the only program that explicitly outlines gender equity as a goal for the program. To work towards inclusion of women into the program, BHER implemented a gender equity committee “with representatives from multiple universities who make suggestions on recruiting and retaining women in the program” (Gladwell et. al., 2016, p. 16). BHER prioritizes the recruitment of women, people with disabilities, and individuals of ethnic/religious minority backgrounds (Sabriye, 2017). To increase the recruitment of women into the program, they are accepted with lower grades than their male counterparts, and additional considerations are placed on their applications. Additional accommodations for women with children are made by BHER, which allows women to bring their children into the learning centers, with allocated spaces for nursing their children. Following the lead of BHER, interventions should aim to incorporate holistic approaches to increasing gender equity by implementing gender equity committees that are committed towards the inclusion of women in the program, incorporating accommodations for women with children, and women-specific mentorship programs that address their concerns related to success within the program.

Academics

Accreditation

Seven of the eight evaluated programs offer internationally accredited certificates, diplomas, and/or degrees that are transferable to other universities. Only three programs offer pathways to receiving a bachelor’s degree: BHER, Kepler, and Education for Humanity. JWU, ACU, InZone, and Mosaik offer certificates and diplomas to their

students that are internationally accredited and transferable for continued learning towards a bachelor's degree at universities. Education for Humanity's structure is unique as it operates on a 3+1 model; it offers the first year of a bachelor's degree, and students have the option of matriculating into a local partner university to complete their degree or opt to continue their learning with ASU online, with the option of choosing from over 175 degree and certificate tracks. Based on my findings, I recommend that higher education interventions offer internationally accredited courses to students, while at the same time offering pathways towards a bachelor's degree – either within the program itself, or offering students the option of matriculating into a local university.

Preparatory Courses

Education for Humanity, JWU, BHER, Kepler, and Mosaik all offer preparatory courses for the purposes of easing students into the diploma/certificate/degree programs. BHER preparatory courses include English, ICT, and research skills development. Kepler introduces students by engaging them with the basics to online learning, including lessons on typing, Microsoft Office, and research. Mosaik's preparatory courses include English and academic preparation, with professional development workshops that assist students in developing a plan for their higher education tracks and future careers

Student Support & Development

Due to the large amount of responsibilities that are associated with living in a refugee camp, many of the evaluated programs utilize multiple avenues in their hopes to increase student success and retention throughout the program. JWU, ACU, BHER, GBS, Mosaik, and E4H all offer on-site academic tutoring and general support for their students. JWU, ACU, and Mosaik all connect their students together to participate in

peer-to-peer support and mentorship, allowing students to engage with each other throughout the duration of the program. Additionally, Mosaik offers academic skills workshops to assist students with “time management, presentation and writing skills, and independent study” (Mosaik: Supporting Refugees into Higher Education, n.d.). BHER has a mentorship program that is tailored towards the specific challenges refugee women face in accessing education, as well as on-site support for students who are vulnerable to dropping out of the program. In addition, BHER offers remedial courses to students before beginning the diploma courses; if students fail the remedial courses, they have the option of retaking it. This policy highly benefits women students since they are put at a higher disadvantage to meet the program’s requirements. ACU begins their programming with an orientation that introduces students to the program’s expectations, critical thinking, peace-building exercises, and guides to studying at a tertiary education level. To increase student retention, Kepler instituted a teacher fellow program through which Kepler alumni offer support to new students in the program to facilitate student achievement.

Many scholars report that refugees’ access to higher education has been linked to an increase in quality of life, mental health, and greater livelihood and work opportunities (Crea, 2015; Crondahl & Eklund, 2012; Mitschke et al., 2013) and increasing “psychological, physical, and cognitive protection” (Zeus, 2011, p. 271). However, many refugees living in protracted situations have experienced or experience psychological and/or historical trauma (Couch, 2017). In order to reap the benefits of higher education, it is necessary that programs implement psychological and mental health support for students who continue to be impacted by traumatic life events and need help coping with

them. In addition to academic support, ACU, Mosaik, and Kepler offer mental health services, acknowledging the need to address social and psychological effects that refugees encounter. ACU appoints local advisors for the health and well-being of their students, Kepler sends mental health professionals to visit the camps to offer students with psychological support and counseling, and Mosaik works with refugee students to create social media content regarding “social and psychological challenges faced by refugees adapting to life as students” (Mosaik: Supporting Refugees into Higher Education, n.d.). Future implementation should utilize on-site academic tutoring, academic and professional skills workshops, peer-to-peer mentorship, and mental health support to provide students with the support they need to persist throughout the duration of the program.

Durable Solutions/Employment

In an effort to extend their programs beyond academic coursework and into durable solutions and employment, ACU, JWL, Kepler, GBS, and BHER all offer additional programming that assists students with their professional development and community service. ACU explicitly highlights their commitment towards a developmental lens that advocates for students’ community involvement and participation as well as their future employment. Specifically, the Memorandum of Understanding between students in the program and ACU requires students to commit to two years of working with their respective refugee/migrant communities upon graduation; as a result, “students have improved working conditions at their NGOs and communities [and] other students have taken jobs as “health workers, community leaders, translators and interpreters” (Crea & Sparnon, 2017, p. 12). JWL encourages students’

community engagement by supporting their involvement in the camp youth boards and volunteering within the camp (Gladwell et. al., 2016). Kepler and GBS both match students with community-based organizations for internship opportunities during and after coursework is completed. Kepler instituted an intensive “education-to-employment” program that includes “job training and coaching, work-study programs, and structured internships with local employers” (Gladwell et. al., 2016, p. 23). In order to graduate from Kepler, students are required to complete an internship, and GBS students are matched with internships after completing the program. Lastly, BHER is devoted to the development of students by “equipping them to gain access to further study or employment in their host country or if resettled”, but no specific approaches were found related to this type of engagement (Gladwell et al., p. 19). Interventions should be concerned with holistic, non-academic student development related to employment, professional development, and community service. Connecting students to community-based organizations to participate in work relevant to their interests and their communities is an exceptional effort of linking education and employment. Additionally, job training and coaching should be a large component of these interventions.

Pedagogy

Tailored Curriculum

In designing curriculum for refugee students, “perhaps the most significant challenge for international online education is the need for instructional designers to be sensitive and responsive to cultural differences” (Crea, 2017, p. 3). Instructors must be mindful of the needs of the students, since

The education needs of youth in refugee camps range far beyond the scope of what is included in traditional education systems, such as issues related to psychosocial challenges, health, education for peace and citizenship, and specific vocational skills, making it difficult for teachers unfamiliar with daily life in refugee camps to deliver appropriate education. (Crea, 2017, p. 3)

The programs' designers should be mindful of the experiences, preferences, and needs of refugee students, and implement a type of critical pedagogy that mirrors that of Paulo Freire's Pedagogy of the Oppressed—one that gives learners the ability to participate and co-create a space for themselves in their education.

ACU, InZone, Mosaik, GBS, Kepler, JWL, BHER, and E4H all offer tailored course offerings that reflect context-specific preferences of their students. ACU, InZone, BHER, Mosaik, and Education for Humanity have all developed their pedagogical approaches through collaborative engagement, research, and conversations with their students early on in the development process. BHER, InZone, E4H conduct participatory studies to assess the context-specific needs and challenges in each camp before beginning operations and assessing course offerings that the students themselves find useful. : Through the use of collaborative research and participatory studies in each specific site, interventions should give students the ability to co-create courses relevant to their contexts through participatory studies for each site.

Flexibility of Courses

To ensure that the pedagogical approaches remain consistent throughout the duration of the students' journey through the program, InZone, Kepler, ACU, and BHER are all flexible in modifying their pedagogical approach based on student feedback and

preferences. Since the program's inception, ACU "has been altering its curriculum to meet the specific needs and preferences of the students based on student reflections and recommendations" (Abdi, 2016), InZone's pedagogical approach is open to redesign to reflect students' preferences and BHER and E4H elicits feedback from students to learn from their experiences regarding content and delivery (Gladwell et al., 2016) through interviews, and Kepler monitors test scores and critical thinking progression and uses the information to modify their programs (Gladwell et al., 2016). InZone and Mosaik have exemplary approaches towards incorporating refugee students in managing aspects of the program or offering insight on the program's implementation. InZone's Higher Education Spaces are "managed by refugee students and alumni rather than organizational partners" and Mosaik's pedagogical approach was informed by over 100 refugees involved in helping shape the focus and delivery of the courses (Mosaik: Supporting Refugees into Higher Education, n.d.). Additionally, Mosaik partners "with local refugee-led organizations to support students' leadership and adaptations of the programs" (Mosaik: Supporting Refugees into Higher Education, n.d.). In relation to course delivery, Mosaik has created accredited courses in Arabic at the Za'atari camp in Jordan that are taught by Syrian refugee instructors who understand the experiences and backgrounds of the Syrian students. BHER hires instructors with experience teaching in the same context/location in order to maintain culturally-sensitive pedagogy. Courses can implement greater flexibility by continuing student evaluation and altering their programs when necessary. Additionally, programs should hire instructors who are experienced teaching the specific refugee population. Mosaik is the only course that has

offerings in the students' native language – this practice should be explored by more programs in an effort to increase culturally relevant education.

Critical Thinking & Reflection

Best practices of the implementation of critical thinking and reflection include those of Kepler, BHER, and ACU that explicitly state their commitment towards pedagogical approaches that encourage critical thinking and reflection. BHER and Kepler encourage critical thinking through the use of reflection, discussion, practical work and non-academic student development that emphasizes applied learning in their specific contexts (Gladwell et al., 2016). In the past, ACU's instructors have engaged students in critical emotional praxis in which critical thinking and production of knowledge can occur within "restoration of humanity, healing, and reconciliation" (Couch, 2017, p. 136).

Technology

Hybrid, Adaptable & Portable Models

The proper implementation of technology can provide refugee students a solution to the barrier of access to higher education. If used correctly, online educational content can reach students in isolated communities; as digital accessibility becomes more widespread in isolated areas, distance higher education offerings should increase mobile, online offerings to mirror this trend (Ally & Tsinakos, 2014). Due to the adaptable and portable nature of online learning and the "uncertainty of the future for refugees [...]" education that is both adaptable and portable is critical" (Dryden-Peterson 2010, p. 3). Through the use of offline educational content, portable devices, and open educational resources, distance learning can make higher education increasingly accessible for refugee students in camp settings (Moser-Mercer, 2018). In a focus group of preferred

educational material delivery, hybrid programs were regarded by refugee students in a positive light as they claimed they are able to “raise questions in case of difficulty understanding certain concepts or regulations that may affect inclusion and settlement” and being in a classroom environment allows students to establish a social network amongst themselves (Colucci et al., 2017, p. 24). As aforementioned, all of the eight programs evaluated in this study utilize hybrid models of instruction—a combination of online learning that is complemented by on-site facilitation in the refugee camps.

On-site Technological Support

Programs that offer technological components should implement on-site technological support to ensure that technological operations are flowing smoothly throughout the duration of the course. Technological support accommodations are provided by 7 of the 8 programs—GBS, Kepler, JWL, ACU, BHER, Mosaik, and Education for Humanity. These accommodations include free laptops (GBS, Kepler, ACU), learning centers with computer labs (JWL, InZone, BHER), CDs and USBs to download course content for later access (BHER, ACU), and on-site technological support (JWL, Ed4H).

Internet Connectivity

To work around prevalent barriers of unreliable internet connectivity in the refugee camps, ACU, JWL, Kepler, and Ed4H have adapted innovative solutions. ACU and JWL allow students the ability to download the online course content when internet connectivity is available in order to access it at a later time with no internet connection. Kepler’s online open educational resources can be accessed with low-internet bandwidth, meaning students can interact with the course content with the

presence of unreliable internet speeds. Additionally, Kepler and Ed4H provide students with packaged and portable methods of online-content delivery that can be accessed without any internet connection or electricity. Kepler uses an offline battery-powered box that contains all elements students need in order to take the course. Instead of altering course media content to make it accessible on low-bandwidths, Education for Humanity's SolarSPELL is a "solar-powered, offline digital library" device that is currently being used to offer an agribusiness course in an unconnected refugee camp in Uganda. Students within range of the SolarSPELL device can download the course content onto their mobile devices or laptops without the presence of an internet connection. In areas that do not have access to durable internet connectivity, interventions should follow the lead of programs such as E4H and Kepler, where innovative adaptable, packaged, and portable models are utilized to confront the barriers of connectivity.

Electricity

The lack of electricity within the refugee camps means that students may not be able to complete their coursework at home with no light source, and classrooms and computer labs could be inaccessible to both students and instructors due to lack of light and power to run the computers. To overcome this barrier, BHER created the Solar Lamps Initiative, "enabling women to study after household work has been completed" for those that have frequent power cuts in their households or those that do not have electricity (Gladwell et al., 2016, p. 16). Moreover, Kepler and JWL use back-up solar energy generators and panels as a source of electricity and in the case of power outages within the camps.

The use of social media for students to develop learning support and peer mentorship throughout the program is practiced by BHER. BHER uses WhatsApp, a popular instant messaging application that students already use before taking the course, “to distribute course materials and to keep in touch with students to update them on assignments” (Gladwell et al., p. 20). A study of higher education programs in the Dadaab refugee camp has found that the use of social media is related to the success of refugee women pursuing higher education in camps as they are able to build cohesive online communities wherein students can discuss coursework, receive and provide writing support, and share personal accomplishments and struggles (Dahya, 2017).

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

Over the process of evaluating the eight educational programs for their most salient features, large themes relating to logistics, academics, technology, and pedagogy have arisen. Exemplary approaches utilized by the programs encompass a large range of operational activities that aim to increase inclusion, student retention, and adaptability to local contexts. Logistical considerations relating to cost that should be implemented by organizations seeking to offer higher educational opportunities for refugees are multifaceted. In order to overcome barriers that refugee students face in relation to high costs of higher education, program implementers should follow the lead of the many programs discussed in this study and aim to fully or partially cover the tuition costs to alleviate the financial burden for the students. Furthermore, accommodations such as living expenses, food, and transportation expenses should also be considered. Moreover, to accommodate for refugee students who have lost their secondary school examination and completion records, programs should follow the lead of Education for Humanity in allowing students to apply regardless of the documentation that could not be presented due to the high likelihood of them being missing. To increase awareness of programs within refugee camps, programs should also consider Mosaik's approach - to include refugee students and alumni in the process of discussing their journey throughout higher education and producing content over social media to spread the word.

A large barrier that has not been holistically addressed by many of the programs in this study is that of gender equity. BHER, the only program that has publicized their comprehensive approach to achieving gender equity in their programs, has refined their

techniques to address the unfortunate reality that many women in refugee camps are not able to pursue higher educational opportunities at the same rate as men. BHER implemented a gender equity committee that aims to recruit women into their program and have instilled affirmative action into the selection process. Additional accommodations provided by BHER to increase enrollment and retention of women include allocating space for women to bring their children to class and providing stipends to students relating to living expenses, food, and transportation.

In regard to academics, it is important for program implementation to be mindful of the importance of offering internationally accredited certificates, diplomas, and/or degrees that can be identifiable by future employers and/or schools upon the students' completion of the courses. Through internationally accredited offerings, students are able to make use of their education in spaces that recognize and value their success. By offering refugee students an education that can impact their lives in the long-term, programs can make a more meaningful impact. Other steps towards durable solutions undertaken in some of the programs include encouraging and sometimes requiring the participation of the students in internships and leadership positions within their communities, giving them an opportunity to integrate into and positively contribute to the host communities. By applying the knowledge learned in their coursework to community-building activities, these programs remain consistent in their goals to provide their students with a holistic experience in students' their academic, professional, and leadership potential. In order to provide true empowerment and fulfilment of potential, however, it is essential that programs seek to learn from the experiences of their students

throughout the entire process—from program development all the way through the implementation.

Interventions must be able to mirror students' context-specific strengths, passions, and challenges in order to create offerings that are relevant to what students desire in ways that benefit them. Programs evaluated in this study showcase commendable qualities relating to contextualized curriculum that is rooted in bottom-up approaches. Specifically, engaging with the local refugee population through focus groups and discussions to customize relevant approaches related to educational production and delivery, and maintaining a flexible model that is able to adjust pedagogical approaches based on students' feedback and reflections. Through sound pedagogical approaches that are informed by extensive on-site planning and continued student assessments, programs are able to increase the capacity building of the beneficiary population.

Understanding local cultural attitudes towards teaching and learning does not only facilitate interventions' pedagogical approach but can also serve to inform the necessary technological approaches to implement in the sites. Two of the most salient approaches outlined in this study that aimed to transcend barriers of internet connectivity and electricity are packaged solutions, offline, mobile learning and Open Education Resources (OER).

Implications for Future Research

In this study, I was able to answer my research question and learn more about the steps that programs take to design and implement higher education programs in refugee camps that seek to transcend large barriers that have historically hindered access to education in that setting. What I also found, however, is that there is a lack of information

that is publicly available relating to specific results and successes of programs' in relation to the concrete impacts they have on refugee students' lives. Key information such as program size, number of students, and studied benefits/outcomes of student success are not available to learn from. In order to properly develop successful interventions that build off of each other's successes and fill in each other's gaps, there should be more easily accessible information for program implementers to learn from. In short, "more is needed to understand which actors are doing what, to what extent, and for how long in order to avoid overlap and to learn from one another" (Loo & Jeong, 2018). Future research should be concerned with the refugees' personal experiences navigating tertiary education interventions. Specifically, there is a need for qualitative research to explore the experiences and perceptions of students in these programs and interventions. In closing, questions related to this study include: What are the implicit and explicit visions of the future of these interventions? What are the institutional motivations of these interventions? What are their long-term goals? Do they include provisions that assist in increasing the movement of refugees within their host countries and advocating for integration policies?

REFERENCES

- Abdi, F. A. (2016). Behind barbed wire fences: higher education and twenty-first century teaching in Dadaab, Kenya. *Bildhaan: An International Journal of Somali Studies*, 16(1), 8.
- ACU refugee program on the Thai-Burma border. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.acu.edu.au/giving-to-acu/what-you-can-support/acu-refugee-program-on-the-thai-burma-border>
- Ally, M., & Tsinakos, A. (2014). Increasing access through mobile learning.
- Arizona State University. (2018). Education for Humanity: Be A Successful Online Learner Series. Unpublished Manuscript.
- Arizona State University. (2019). Education for Humanity: Earned Admission Program - First Course Reflection. Unpublished Manuscript.
- Arizona State University. (n.d.). Education for Humanity: Expanding Refugee Access to Higher Education. Unpublished Manuscript.
- Borderless Higher Education for Refugees (BHER). (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.bher.org/>
- Brown, S., Saint, M., & Russell, C. (2017, October). Education in an extreme environment: A university in a refugee camp. In *Global Humanitarian Technology Conference (GHTC), 2017 IEEE* (pp. 1-10). IEEE.
- Colucci, E., Smidt, H., Devaux, A., Vrasidas, C., Safarjalani, M., & Castaño Muñoz, J. (2017). Free digital learning opportunities for migrants and refugees. An Analysis of current initiatives and recommendations for their further use. JRC Science for Policy Report. Luxemburg: Publications Office of the European Union. doi, 10, 684414.
- Couch, J. (2017). On the borders of Pedagogy: Implementing a critical pedagogy for students on the Thai Burma Border. *Australian Journal of Adult Learning*, 57(1), 126.
- Crea, T. M., & McFarland, M. (2015). Higher education for refugees: Lessons from a 4-year pilot project. *International Review of Education*, 61(2), 235-245.
- Crea, T. M. (2016). Refugee higher education: Contextual challenges and implications for program design, delivery, and accompaniment. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 46, 12-22.

- Crea, T. M., & Sparnon, N. (2017). Democratizing education at the margins: Faculty and practitioner perspectives on delivering online tertiary education for refugees. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 14(1), 43.
- Cron Dahl, K., & Eklund, L. (2012). Perceptions on health, well-being and quality of life of Balkan Roma adolescents in West Sweden. *Romani Studies*, 22(2), 153-174.
- Dahya, N., & Dryden-Peterson, S. (2017). Tracing pathways to higher education for refugees: the role of virtual support networks and mobile phones for women in refugee camps. *Comparative Education*, 53(2), 284-301.
- Dankova, P., & Giner, C. (2011). Technology in aid of learning for isolated refugees. *Forced Migration Review*, (38), 11.
- Donald, H. A. (2014). Preparing for Uncertainty: Exploring Access to Higher Education in Dzaleka Refugee Camp, Malawi.
- Dryden-Peterson, S. E. (2009). *Where is the village? Pathways to integration for African migrants to the United States*. Harvard University.
- Dryden-Peterson, S., & Giles, W. (2010). Introduction: Higher education for refugees. *Refuge*, 27(2), 3-10.
- Dryden-Peterson, S. (2012). The politics of higher education for refugees in a global movement for primary education. *Refuge: Canada's Journal on Refugees*, 27(2).
- Education for Humanity. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://edplus.asu.edu/what-we-do/education-humanity>
- El Jack, A. (2010). "Education is my mother and father": The "invisible" women of Sudan. *Refuge*, 27(2), 19-31.
- Faller, M. B. (2019, March 08). ASU offering rapidly deployable online courses to refugees, displaced people.
- Fraser, N. (2005). Reframing global justice. *New left review*, 36, 69.
- Freire, P. (2018). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Bloomsbury Publishing USA.
- Gladwell, C., Hollow, D., Robinson, A., Norman, B., Bowerman, E., Mitchell, J., Floremont, F., Hutchinson, P. (2016). Higher education for refugees in low-resource environments: landscape review. Jigsaw Consult, United Kingdom.

- Hakami, A. (2016). " *Education is our weapon for the future*": Access and non-access to higher education for refugees in Nakivale Refugee Settlement, Uganda (Master's thesis, University of Stavanger, Norway).
- Hatayama, M. (2018). ICTs and livelihood supports of refugees and IDPs.
- Hostettler, S., Besson, S. N., & Bolay, J. C. (Eds.). (2018). *Technologies for Development: From Innovation to Social Impact*. Springer.
- Jesuit Worldwide Learning: Higher Education at the Margins. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.jwl.org/en/home>
- Kabeer, N. (1999). Resources, agency, achievements: Reflections on the measurement of women's empowerment. *Development and change*, 30(3), 435-464.
- Lem, W., & Barber, P. G. (Eds.). (2010). *Class, contention, and a world in motion* (Vol. 8). Berghahn Books.
- Lewis, K., & Thacker, S. (2016). ICT and the Education of Refugees.
- LOO, B., OHORODNIK, M., & JEONG, J. ACCESS TO HIGHER EDUCATION FOR REFUGEES: A Review of Interventions in.
- Mackinnon, H. (2014). *Education in emergencies: The case of the Dadaab refugee camps*. CIGI.
- MacLaren, D. (2012). Tertiary education for refugees: a case study from the Thai–Burma border. *Refugee*, 27(2), 103-110.
- McLaren, P. (1999) 'Revolutionary Pedagogy in Post-revolutionary Times: rethinking the political economy of critical education', *Educational Theory*, 48, 432–462.
- Martin, S. B. (2018). Co-Creating Spaces of Critical Hope through the Use of a Psychosocial Peace Building Education Course in Higher Education in Protracted Refugee Context: Kakuma Refugee Camp, Kenya.
- Mitschke, D. B., Aguirre, R. T., & Sharma, B. (2013). Common threads: improving the mental health of Bhutanese refugee women through shared learning. *Social Work in Mental Health*, 11(3), 249-266.
- Mosaik – Supporting refugees into higher education. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://mosaik.ngo/>
- Moser-Mercer, B., Hayba, E., & Goldsmith, J. (2016, May). Higher education spaces and protracted displacement: How learner-centered pedagogies and human-centered

- design can unleash refugee innovation. In UNESCO Chair Conference on Technologies for Development (pp. 41-52). Springer, Cham. → remove?
- Moser-Mercer, B. (2014). MOOCs in fragile contexts. European MOOCs Stakeholders Summit. → remove?
- Punamäki, Raija-Leena. (1996). Can Ideological Commitment Protect Children's Psychosocial Well-Being in Situations of Political Violence?. *Child development*, 67, 55-69. 10.1111/j.1467-8624.1996.tb01719.x.
- Reinhardt, S. (2018). Exploring the Emerging Field of Online Tertiary Education for Refugees in Protracted Situations. *Open Praxis*, 10(3), 211-220.
- Sabriye, H. (2017). Recruitment and Retention of Somali Female Students Accessing Higher Education in Dadaab, Kenya.
- Save the Children, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and Pearson. (2017, March). *Promising practices in refugee education*.
- Smith, M. (2004). Warehousing refugees: A denial of rights, a waste of humanity. *World Refugee Survey*, 38, 38-56.
- UNHCR, (n.d.). Figures at a Glance. Retrieved from <https://www.unhcr.org/figures-at-a-glance.html>
- UNHCR (2011, June 28). Distance Learning; A Window of Opportunity.
- UNHCR, “Education Strategy: 2010–2012” (Geneva: UNHCR, 2009), 36.
- University Academic Success Programs. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://tutoring.asu.edu/>
- Wright, L. A., & Plasterer, R. (2012). Beyond basic education: Exploring opportunities for higher learning in Kenyan refugee camps. *Refuge: Canada's Journal on Refugees*, 27(2).
- Zeus, B. (2011). Exploring barriers to higher education in protracted refugee situations: The case of Burmese refugees in Thailand. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 24(2), 256-276.
- Zeus, B. (2009). Exploring Paradoxes Around Higher Education in Protracted Refugee Situations. *Borderless Education: The Provision of Tertiary Degree Programmes to Longterm Refugees*.