*A tool to understand which activities can be scaled successfully, and what support those activities will need.*

# Scalability Assessment

An assessment to determine the scalability of different activities based on factors such as credibility, support, ease of adoption, and funding sustainability.

*SOURCE: USAID Basic Toolkit for Systematic Scale-Up, developed by MSI based on ExpandNet: Nine steps for developing a scaling-up strategy, p.17*

Not all activities with a solid evidence base are feasible to scale and sustain. Several characteristics need to align in order to make an attempt at scaling a priority. Taking time to assess the fit of an activity for scale up in your context can avoid problems later on.



*AVAILABLE FORMATS: The worksheets included here are meant for printing at A4 size. Visit the Guide's website for downloadable interactive (fillable) PDF worksheets, alternate languages and alternative formats.*
inspire-strategies.org/adaptationandscale

# How to use this tool

**1** Go item by item, and fill in the circle indicating if the activity is closer to one side of the scale or the other—or if it sits in between.

**2** Total the filled-in circles for each column. Transfer the subtotals for each scalability factor to the final page of the tool (Reflect on Scalability).

**3** Discuss each factor's score; consider other aspects you may know about, but which were not discussed. For each factor, mark whether the activity is strong, moderate, or weak.

**4** Think about and discuss how this activity might be strengthened for scale up.

**5** Determine together if, overall, this activity has potential for scale up in your context.

**THINGS TO KEEP IN MIND**

○ A working group or technical team with knowledge of the activity is best suited to fill out the assessment.

○ Overall scalability is based on consensus from discussion, not on one opinion.

○ Document your discussion, so others can follow your decision-making process later.

○ When you're finished with assessing one intervention, on to the next! When all activities and interventions have been addressed, compile the results to compare.

REMINDER...FEEL FREE TO ADAPT THIS
TOOL IN ANY WAY THAT WORKS FOR
YOUR TEAM AND YOUR CONTEXT!

# Scalability Assessment

1. For each item, fill in the circle on the 3-point scale from left-side statement to right-side statement to indicate where the activity sits on the scale.
2. Count the filled in circles of each column and write the total number for each section.
3. Copy over the score for each section to the final score sheet.
4. Use the final score sheet to reflect on the scalability of the activity.

## STEP 1: ASSESS THE ACTIVITY

| NAME OF ACTIVITY | |
|---|---|

| A. How credible is the activity package? | | |
|---|---|---|
| A1. Evidence base | A lot of or sound evidence ←◯–◯–◯→ Little or no solid evidence | |
| A2. Evaluation | Independent external evaluation ←◯–◯–◯→ No internal evaluation | |
| A3. Diverse contexts | Substantial evidence that it works in diverse context ←◯–◯–◯→ Little or no evidence that it works in diverse contexts | |
| A4. Expert judgment | Supported by eminent individuals or institutions ←◯–◯–◯→ Few or no eminent individuals or institutions support it | |
| A5. Visible, attributable impact | Decision-makers see impact and link to activity ←◯–◯–◯→ Decision-makers do not see impact or link to activity | |

**Subtotals** ←◯– –◯– –◯→

## B. Does the activity have relative advantage over existing practices?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| B1. Other solutions | Current solution(s) are adequate ←〇–〇–〇→ Little or no evidence it is superior to other solutions | |
| B2. Evidence it is more effective | Solid evidence it is superior to current activity ←〇–〇–〇→ Little or no evidence it is superior to current activity | |
| B3. Cost Effective | More cost effective than existing practices ←〇–〇–〇→ Less cost-effective than existing practices | |

**Subtotals** ←〇– –〇– –〇→

## C. How strong is support for the activity?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| C1. Urgency | Strong sense of urgency regarding the problem or need ←〇–〇–〇→ Relative complacency | |
| C2. Leadership commitment | Strong leadership committed to activity ←〇–〇–〇→ Weak or divided leadership committed to activity | |
| C3. Significance of problem | The problem is significant and persistent ←〇–〇–〇→ The problem affects few people or has limited impact | |
| C4. Policy priority | Addresses an issue that is high policy priority ←〇–〇–〇→ Addresses an issue that is low on the policy agenda | |
| C5. Opposition | Faces limited opposition ←〇–〇–〇→ Faces strong opposition | |
| C6. Felt Need | Addresses a felt need, problem or policy priority ←〇–〇–〇→ Does not addresses a felt need, problem or policy priority | |

**Subtotals** ←〇– –〇– –〇→

## D. How easy is the activity to transfer and adopt?

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **D1. Consistent with policy** | Fully consistent with government and organizational policies | ←○—○—○→ | Requires substantial change in government and organizational policies |
| **D2. Fits with existing systems** | Can use existing systems, infrastructure, and human resources | ←○—○—○→ | Needs significant new or additional systems, infrastructure, or human resources |
| **D3. Operational & resource capacity** | Implementing organization(s) have the capacity to implement at scale | ←○—○—○→ | No implementing organization(s) have the capacity to implement at scale |
| **D4. Agreement to adoption** | Few decision-makers were involved | ←○—○—○→ | Many decision-makers were involved |
| **D5. Diversity of the problem** | Homogeneous problem, target group and setting | ←○—○—○→ | Multiple, diverse contexts |
| **D6. Replicability** | Activity is a clear and straight-forward technology | ←○—○—○→ | Activity is not a technology or easily replicated |
| **D7. Level of complexity** | Low complexity; few components | ←○—○—○→ | High complexity; many components—integrated package |
| **D8. Maintaining quality** | Activity is self-regulating | ←○—○—○→ | Activity requires substantial supervision and monitoring |
| **D9. Limited testability** | Able to be tested by implementers on a limited scale | ←○—○—○→ | Implementing organizations try out the new practice without fully adopting it |
| **D10. Degree of change** | Activity requires a small departure from current norms, practices and resources. | ←○—○—○→ | Activity requires a large departure from current norms, practices and resources. |

**Subtotals** ←○—○—○→

| E. How good is the fit with the implementing organization? | | |
|---|---|---|
| E1. Compatibility | Practice is compatible with current values or services of the implementing organization. ←O—O—O→ | Practice is not compatible with current values or services of the implementing organization. |
| E2. Built-in support for activity | Leadership team, organizational norms and incentives align with activity ←O—O→ | Major changes needed in leadership, organizational norms, and incentives |
| E3. Support of staff | Demonstrable support among staff ←O—O—O→ | Active resistance by staff |
| E4. Adaptive capacity | History and culture of iterative learning and evidence-based decision-making ←O—O—O→ | No history of iterative learning and evidence-based decision-making |
| E5. Scale-up experience | Has experience with a systematic scale-up process ←O—O—O→ | Lacks experience with a systematic scale-up process |
| E6. Values | Easy to maintain the values of the practice during expansion. ←O—O—O→ | Difficult to maintain the values of the practice during expansion. |
| E7. Degrees of adaptation | Limited adaptions needed to be relevant for changes in context.. ←O—O—O→ | Significant adaptions needed to be relevant for changes in context. |

**Subtotals** ←O— | -O— | -O→

| F. Is there a sustainable source of funding? | | |
|---|---|---|
| F1. Additional Resources | Requires limited additional human or financial resources or commodities ←O—O—O→ | Requires major additional human or financial resources or commodities |
| F2. Startup funds | Requires small commitment of funds to begin ←O—O—O→ | Requires large commitment of funds to begin |
| F3. Internal funding | Financed by internal funding (e.g., user fees) or endowment ←O—O—O→ | No internal funding, requires substantial external funds |

**Subtotals** ←O— | -O— | -O→

## STEP 2: REFLECT ON SCALABILITY

Bring over the subtotals from the previous pages to help you determine the overall scalability.

**NAME OF ACTIVITY**

### RESULTS FROM ASSESSMENT

| SCALABILITY FACTOR | TOTAL FROM EACH COLUMN |
|---|---|
| | *EASIER TO SCALE ← → HARDER TO SCALE* |
| A. CREDIBILITY OF THE ACTIVITY | ←○- + -○- + -○→ = **5** |
| B. RELATIVE ADVANTAGE OVER EXISTING STRATEGIES | ←○- + -○- + -○→ = **3** |
| C. SUPPORT FOR THE ACTIVITY | ←○- + -○- + -○→ = **6** |
| D. EASE OF TRANSFER AND ADAPTATION | ←○- + -○- + -○→ = **10** |
| E. IMPLEMENTING ORGANIZATION FIT | ←○- + -○- + -○→ = **7** |
| F. FUNDING SUSTAINABILITY | ←○- + -○- + -○→ = **3** |

### NATIONAL COORDINATION MECHANISM THOUGHTS

| HOW STRONG IS THE ACTIVITY IN TERMS OF SCALABILITY? | HOW MIGHT THIS ACTIVITY BE STRENGTHENED FOR SCALABILITY? |
|---|---|
| STRONG / MODERATE / WEAK | |
| STRONG / MODERATE / WEAK | |
| STRONG / MODERATE / WEAK | |
| STRONG / MODERATE / WEAK | |
| STRONG / MODERATE / WEAK | |
| STRONG / MODERATE / WEAK | |

**CONCLUSION: DOES THIS ACTIVITY HAVE STRONG SCALE-UP POTENTIAL?**  ○ Yes    ○ Yes, with modification    ○ No

*Justification:*

# Now What?

## YOU SHOULD NOW HAVE...

- A list of which interventions can potentially be scaled successfully

- Suggested areas of activity modifications which will increase the likelihood of successful scale up.

# Act and apply

Is the issue of scalability considered in the action plan to end violence against children? Should it be?

How will you address the specific challenges to scalability for each activity (or summarized for multiple activities in each INSPIRE strategy)? What adaptations are you considering?

### RELATED TOOLS:

- *Tool 3C:* Benchmarking and Tracking for Vertical Scale Up

- *Tool 3D*: Benchmarking and Tracking for Horizontal Scale Up

- *Tool 4A*: Core and Peripheral Elements of a Violence Against Children Prevention Activity