

**Centre for Commonwealth Education
Faculty of Education
University of Cambridge**

**Research Consortium on
Educational Outcomes and Poverty
2005 – 2010**

INCEPTION REPORT

April 2006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. BACKGROUND INFORMATION	3
2. SUMMARY.....	4
3. KEY THEMES	5
3.1 What are the research outputs?.....	5
3.2 What are the research impacts on Policy and Poverty?	10
4. LESSONS LEARNT.....	11
5. PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT.....	12
Annex 1. RPC LOGICAL FRAMEWORK.....	15
Annex 2. FINANCIAL SUMMARY FOR 1 OCTOBER 2005 – 31 MARCH 2006.....	17
Annex 3. RPC RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN	18
Annex 4. RPC RESEARCH COMMUNICATION STRATEGY	34
Annex 5. PRODUCTS AND PUBLICATIONS.....	45
Annex 6. DEVELOPING CAPACITY	47

Research Consortium on Educational Outcomes and Poverty (RECOUP)

Inception Report, April 2006

1. Background Information

Title of RPC: 'Research Consortium on Improving the Outcomes of Education for Pro-Poor Development – Breaking the Cycle of Deprivation'. (Short Title: 'Research Consortium on Educational Outcomes and Poverty' (RECOUP)).

Reference Number: HD8

Period Covered by Report: October 2005-March 2006

Name of Lead Institution: Centre for Commonwealth Education, University of Cambridge

Director: Professor Christopher Colclough

Key partners:

School of Social and Political Studies, University of Edinburgh

Centre for the Study of African Economies (CSAE), University of Oxford

Collaborative Research and Dissemination (CORD), New Delhi, India

Mahbub Ul Haq Human Development Centre, Islamabad, Pakistan

Associates for Change, Accra, Ghana

Kenyatta University, Nairobi, Kenya

Countries Covered by Research so far: Ghana, Kenya, India, Pakistan

2. Summary

Progress made with Programme Outputs

A first set of major outputs from this RPC comprise the achievement of better knowledge about, and research methods for investigating, the educational impacts on poverty in developing countries. These outputs will be delivered by the production of policy-relevant research reports, which will be published in a variety of different styles and formats. Accordingly, central tasks during the inception phase have been to develop plans for research which will deliver these outputs, to be conducted by staff from the seven institutions in the consortium, and to set up the administrative arrangements and processes whereby effective research, communication and capacity building can be conducted over the programme's term. In that regard:

- A solid research design has been built and research projects have been developed. Research plans have been presented and discussed and a common core of research across the four southern partners has been agreed.
- Literature surveys have been initiated in the partner countries to establish baseline information on which our research will build.
- A first draft of the household questionnaire has been prepared for use in three of the four countries. Sample design has been determined.
- Preparation for the qualitative field-work is well advanced. A methodology workshop will be held during May. Field sites are being selected in the four partner countries. Where possible, field centres will be established as bases for the research. Identification and recruitment of researchers by southern partners has begun.

A second set of major outputs will arise from the implementation of the communication strategy for the RPC. In that regard:

- A communication strategy document has been prepared and is appended for approval at Annex 4.
- A number of conference papers and mimeo documents have been prepared, some of which are being submitted for publication (see Annex 5).
- Membership of national advisory committees has been agreed in three of the four countries and meetings of the NAC have been held in Ghana and India.
- Potential chairs for the Consortium Advisory Group are being approached.
- Inception workshops have been held in all four countries, and a broad cross-section of stakeholders attended.
- Collaboration with other education RPCs is under way in Ghana, India and UK.
- An RPC web-site has been designed and established.

Programme Impact

There is greater awareness, amongst both official and NGO circles in all four countries, of the existence and nature of our research programme than was the case prior to the inception workshops. Research findings have not yet been published by the RPC, although a number of conference papers and mimeo documents have been prepared. Accordingly, there is awareness mainly of our interests, activities and potential rather than, as yet, our results. Strong efforts are being made to involve government and civil society organisations in the research and dissemination process in each of our partner states.

The research design process has resulted in significant inter-country learning amongst members of the consortium. Research planning meetings, and subsequently the first meeting of the Steering Committee, were very valuable occasions in that regard.

3. Key Themes

3.1 What are the research outputs?

Generation of New Knowledge

Progress made on Key Programme Outputs.

Following the receipt of advice from DFID a more concise log frame than that included in the RPC bid is appended for approval (Annex 1). The following description of progress made during the inception phase is organised according to this revised log frame, rather than the earlier document.

Key outputs from this RPC include the achievement of better knowledge about, and research methods for investigating, the educational impacts on poverty in developing countries. These outputs will be delivered by the production of policy-relevant research reports, which will be published in a variety of different styles and formats. In that regard, central tasks during the inception phase have been to develop plans for research which will deliver these outputs, to be conducted by staff from the seven institutions in the consortium, and to set up the administrative arrangements and processes whereby effective research, communication and capacity building can be conducted over the programme's term. In that regard we have engaged in the following activities:

- inception workshops in each partner country and an overall RPC planning (Steering Committee) meeting
- setting up the National Advisory Committees and the Consortium Advisory Group (CAG)
- preparation of literature surveys to establish baseline information
- preparation for the household surveys
- preparation for the qualitative case studies

Progress made on each of these activities will now be summarized.

Inception Workshops and first Steering Committee Meeting

Inception workshops were held in the four southern partner countries in November (Kenya and Ghana), December (Pakistan) and January (India). The main aim of these workshops was to build a solid research design which, as far as possible, could be harmonised across all four focus-countries. The specific workshop objectives were to:

- help the teams develop their collective thinking about the key strands of research identified in the RPC bid and to ensure that this process resulted in specific research projects across the countries
- familiarize non-national team members with the local context, conditions and potential resources available to conduct the research
- help institutions identify potential partner-linkages and the scope and scale of the work envisaged
- engage Government officials and other local stake holders in the process of identifying and validating key areas of research interest within each country.

During the pre-inception phase, interaction between northern and southern researchers had been limited. The inception workshops provided an opportunity for all of the southern partner team members to meet the RPC Director together with a varying group of six to eight members of the northern team. In order to facilitate team-building, the model adopted in each country was to have (usually) two days of closed sessions, where research ideas under each of the themes of the RPC were presented and discussed. This helped to build research alliances between individuals/institutions. This was followed by a half or full day discussing

emerging ideas with a set of invited representatives from other research institutions, NGOs, government officials and donor agencies. DFID representatives were invited to all, and attended the Ghana and Pakistan workshops. These 'open' sessions provided a prime opportunity to disseminate the aims and objectives of the project, and to receive feed-back on its initial ideas.

The workshops were followed, in early February, by a first meeting in Cambridge of the Steering Committee, comprising the Principal Investigators (PIs) from all partner institutions. At this meeting PIs presented their draft research plans, which had been prepared in the light of discussions at the inception workshops and their subsequent planning activities. An important objective was to achieve a common core of research across the four southern partners, to which northern researchers would contribute and help to facilitate. Budget discussions were also held between the Director of the RPC and each of the partner institutions, providing a means of moving towards an agreed budget for the first full year of research.

National Advisory Committees and the Consortium Advisory Group

National Advisory Committees have been established. They have had a first meeting in India and in Ghana, and their membership has been agreed in the cases of Pakistan and Kenya. In the case of Ghana (having 10 DFID -funded RPCs), all three Education Consortia are represented. Accordingly, a combined 'National Reference Group' for these education RPCs has been established. Chaired by the Chief Director of the Ministry of Education, it includes other senior policy-makers from the Ministry and from civil society. DFID is a member of this group. (Full membership is given in Ghana inception report, Annex 2). At the first meeting in March, 20 members of the NRG attended, including representatives from those universities leading the other education RPCs, from NGOs, and from relevant government ministries. In the case of India, the national advisory committee presently includes 5 members external to CORD, mainly from the research and NGO communities. Other members may be appointed. In Pakistan five members of the national Advisory Committee have also been appointed, including the head of the Economics Department at Lahore University of Management Sciences and other distinguished researchers from the university and NGO sectors.

Some progress has been made in establishing the Consortium Advisory Group. Unfortunately, although we believed that a chairperson had been secured, he has decided that the tasks would conflict too much with his other duties. Other potential chairs are being approached, and a response is awaited. Decisions about other members will be made once a chairperson has agreed.

Literature surveys

Reviews of the literature relevant to each of our three research themes are underway in Ghana, India and Pakistan. Drafts are due during June. In Kenya, they have been delayed by a change in partner (see below), but they have begun.

Household Surveys

Household surveys will be conducted during 2006/7 in Ghana and Pakistan, and in India during 2007/8. A first draft of the questionnaire has been designed. It builds on questions used in a large number of successful earlier surveys but is focused strongly on information necessary for the investigation of the outcomes of education. *Inter alia*, detailed information about education, health, fertility, labour-market outcomes, savings, assets, shocks, social capital, opinions, attitudes, and perceived well-being will be collected.

The basic design is intended to be used across Ghana, India and Pakistan but it will need some local adaptation (e.g. list of religions, ethnicities, languages, govt./NGO sponsored training programme names etc. will differ from country to country). Notwithstanding local differences, the data will, for the most part, be directly comparable across countries. During the inception phase, work on the design of tests for literacy and numeracy performance, for incorporation in the household survey, was undertaken. Sampling design has also been broadly determined for all three countries. The questionnaire will be finalized during May, for piloting in Pakistan in June.

Qualitative Research

Groundwork for the qualitative research has been laid. Extensive discussions of possible methodologies, and training needs in each country, were pursued during the inception workshops. Linkages with the quantitative work are being anticipated, and some qualitative concerns are being integrated in the household survey questionnaire. Selection of states or districts in which the qualitative work will be conducted have been determined in all four countries. Field sites in villages of at least 350 households and in urban centres are in the process of being selected.

Research evidence derived from the use of qualitative methodologies will inform work conducted under all three research themes. It has been decided that, where possible, *Field Centres* (FCs) will be established as bases for research within poor communities, to allow the qualitative research to be tackled sequentially, and assist its integration across the themes. The first stage of the qualitative research will involve a '*Scoping study*' – which aims to build up knowledge of the community, its activities, composition and its social and economic characteristics. In preparation for the start of qualitative data collection the northern partners are engaged in producing a set of methodology briefing papers, as a guide to what qualitative methods might best be selected.

Identification of field researchers is under way, with three people (of four) having been identified for the Indian research, and a short-listing having been made in Ghana. In Pakistan and Kenya, researchers are still being identified.

Interaction with Stakeholders

Across partners as a whole, good interaction with policy makers in southern partner countries has been evident. Most notably this happened during (and partly as a result of) the inception workshops, when formal presentations of initial ideas were made to senior government and NGO officials (see above). Pakistan was the exception, however, in that no government official attended the workshop. Elsewhere, participation by government officials was strong and enthusiastic.

Since the inception workshop the Pakistan team has made contact with resident representatives of donor and multilateral agencies and education specialists. They have been very forthcoming about sharing documents and information related to their work in Pakistan. Arranging interviews and exchange of documents has however proved to be time consuming, owing to the other commitments of agency staff.

As regards, the Government of Pakistan, consultation with agency staff and their education specialists has revealed names of the most relevant contacts in government agencies. Most important of these is the Economic Affairs Division (EAD), which deals with all international donors. Meetings have been held with the Minister in-charge of EAD. She has assured the team that she will assist them in accessing information or disseminating results, to facilitate the work of the project.

Following the workshops, Ghana has also continued the dialogue with government, notably via its National Reference Group membership (see above). Separate meetings between our partner institution and policy makers in Ghana have also occurred during April.

All the major donors to education have been informed of the consortium's work in our partner countries. DFID representatives were invited to attend each of the inception workshops, and they are members of the National Reference Group in Ghana.

Collaboration with other RPCs is under way in Ghana and India (the other education RPCs do not operate in Kenya and Pakistan), and representatives from them attended the inception workshops. In the case of Ghana, the National Reference Group has been constituted to advise each of the three education RPCs, thereby achieving, in principle, strong coordination of effort and activity (an outcome advocated by Paul Spray, during his recent field visit to Ghana). In India, the PI of the Access RPC (Professor Govinda), has become a member of the National Advisory Committee for our Consortium.

Purpose

It is too early to say anything useful about purpose achievement.

Good Communication of Results

The main output under this heading is the draft communication strategy document, which is appended for approval (Annex 4).

The web-site was prepared during the inception phase, and is now fully operational.

Table 1. Summary of research outputs

Outputs	OVI	Progress	Comments
1. Better Knowledge, with associated research methods, on educational impacts on poverty, with specific emphasis on: social and life outcomes; economic and market outcomes; and effects of different partnership arrangements between households, governments, and aid agencies	Joint research reports with explicit and feasible recommendations for policy and practice in each of three outcome areas, with specific reference to four partner countries and global trends.	<p>The central tasks during the inception phase have been to develop plans for research, which will deliver the outputs specified in the project log frame (Annex 1) and to set up the administrative arrangements and processes whereby effective research, communication and capacity building can be conducted over the programme's term. The following progress has been made in term of accomplishing these tasks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inception workshops were held in each partner country and an overall RPC planning (Steering Committee) meeting took place in February 2006. As a result a solid research design was built and collective thinking about the key strands of research was developed. The consortium partners came up with specific research projects across countries. Non-national teams were familiarized with the local contexts, conditions and potential resources to conduct the research. • The institutions identified potential partner-linkages and the scope and scale of work envisaged • The draft research plans were presented at the first Steering Committee meeting. A common core of research across the four southern partners was achieved. • Budget discussions were held between the Director of the RPC and each of the partner institutions and the budget for the first full year of research was agreed • The National Advisory Committees (NACs) were established. They have had a first meeting in India and Ghana and membership has been agreed in the cases of Pakistan and Kenya. • Some progress has been made in 	<p>November 2005: Kenya and Ghana workshops December 2005: Pakistan workshop January 2005: India workshop</p> <p>All three education RPCs are represented in Ghana's NAC</p>

Outputs	OVIs	Progress	Comments
		<p>establishing the Consortium Advisory Group (CAG) – potential chairs are being approached and decisions about membership will follow.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Literature surveys to establish baseline information are underway in Ghana, India and Pakistan for submission in May 2006. • A first draft of the household survey questionnaire has been designed to investigate the outcomes of education in Ghana, Pakistan and India. Sampling design has been broadly determined for all three countries. The questionnaire will be finalized during May, for piloting in Pakistan in June. • Work was undertaken on the design of tests for literacy and numeracy performance for incorporation in the household survey • Preparation for the qualitative case studies is underway. Extensive discussions of possible research methodologies, and training needs in each country, were pursued during the inception workshops and continued throughout the phase. Field sites are being selected in all four countries. It has been decided that, where possible, Field Centres (FCs) will be established as bases for research within poor communities. • The phases of the qualitative research have been agreed, the methodologies are being developed to guide field research and preparations for the 'Scoping study' are underway. <p>Identification and recruitment of researchers by Southern partners has begun</p>	<p>Lit. survey completion in Kenya will be delayed by a change in partner</p>
<p>2. Strategy implemented to disseminate and promote uptake of research findings</p>	<p>Papers, stakeholder meetings, and web-based dissemination as outlined in communication strategy document</p>	<p>The inception workshops were instrumental in identifying and bringing together all stakeholders in the research, introducing initial ideas and engaging Government officials and other local stakeholders in the process of identifying and validating key areas of research interest within each country. As a result, the aims and objectives of the project were broadly disseminated, the feedback on its initial ideas was received and collaborative arrangements were firmly put in place. All the major donors to education have been informed of the consortium work in our partner countries.</p> <p>These workshops were followed by strong initiatives by partners to continue and maintain dialogue and partnership with government and NGO sectors, especially in Ghana (through NAG) and Pakistan.</p> <p>Collaboration with other RPCs in underway in Ghana and India to achieve strong coordination</p>	<p>In Pakistan, , no government official attended the workshop. But the RPC partner has undertaken strong initiatives to engage with policy-makers subsequently.</p> <p>Separate meetings between our partner institution and policy makers in Ghana have also occurred during April</p>

Outputs	OVIs	Progress	Comments
		<p>of effort and activity (the other education RPCs do not operate in Kenya and Pakistan).</p> <p>The RPC Communication Strategy was developed jointly with all partners and an action plan for its implementation for the duration of the consortium was agreed with all partners (Annex 4). The strategy implies continuous and participatory communication of research and dissemination of its outputs.</p> <p>As part of our communication strategy an RPC web site was created with an internal portal to allow effective communication of partners and sharing of documents. The web site www.educ.cam.ac.uk/commonwealth/index.html will report regularly on the progress of research activities and its findings and send messages and disseminate the outputs for use by and sharing with wider policy and academic audiences as well general public.</p> <p>The detailed and aggregate research output dissemination plan is being agreed based on partners' communication and dissemination plans and the overall RPC communication strategy.</p>	

3.2 What are the research impacts on Policy and Poverty?

Methods to collect and monitor baseline evidence in order to track programme impact on poverty

It is not envisaged that the RPC will be able to track its own impact on poverty. The connections are too indirect and long-term. A more realistic aim would be to monitor the extent to which those policies which are believed to influence the extent or incidence of poverty change, in ways suggested as desirable by the research, over the duration of the Consortium's work. Let us assume that the research showed a negative impact of fees on educational outcomes for the poor. In that case, the extent to which the direct private costs to the poor of attending education were reduced during the period of research could be expected to proxy for the existence of a positive impact of policy upon poverty-alleviation (both directly by reducing the cost burden facing poor education-participating households, and indirectly by helping to increase the stock of human capital which such households possess). There would remain, however, the problem of causality – does this run from the communication of the research results to desirable policy change, or is the latter caused by other factors, such as political expediency? Equally, even were policies to move in anti-poor directions, it may still be the case that the extent of such change would have been even greater in the absence of the research results. In this case the impact of the research on poverty-alleviation would be positive, even though it appeared to have had no such result. Identifying the extent of poverty-impact of the research is therefore a complicated problem, solving which would itself require a dedicated research approach – extending beyond the scope and present time-horizon of this RPC.

Nevertheless, in order properly to interpret the data to be collected as part of both our quantitative and qualitative enquiries, a clear audit of the present policy framework - as it affects educational participation and outcomes – will be required. Situational analyses will be produced as part and parcel of our qualitative research – in order to describe and understand the main factors relevant to the educational outcomes of the poor. In addition, the literature reviews and the database sourcing for relevant qualitative and statistical information will provide material for a factual account of the current situation in the education sector, and of the differential outcomes experienced by different groups of the population. These starting points will provide a basis for mapping change over the lifetime of the project, which may provide suggestive (even if ultimately ambiguous) information relevant to interpreting its policy impact.

Evidence of increased awareness of research findings amongst policy makers and stakeholders, and impact on attitudes and practice

There is greater awareness, amongst both official and NGO circles in all four countries, of the existence and nature of our research programme than was the case prior to the inception workshops. Research findings have not yet been published by the RPC, although a number of conference papers and mimeo documents have been prepared (see Annex 5). Accordingly, this increased awareness is focussed upon our interests, activities and potential rather than, as yet, our results. Every effort will be made to strengthen awareness of our work and its results by involving government and civil society organisations in our research and dissemination process (as set out in the communication strategy document).

Cross-Regional Learning

There has been plenty of inter-country and inter-regional learning amongst members of the consortium as a consequence of the research preparation process. Research planning meetings, and subsequently the first meeting of the Steering Committee, were enormously valuable occasions: participants benefited greatly from talking through their research ideas and problems with colleagues from other nations. The process of attempting to find common themes which could be worked on similarly in different national contexts has been difficult, but beneficial for our initial understanding of the problems.

4. Lessons learnt

Working with partners

Our programme is ambitious in that it seeks to implement a strong core of common projects across all, or most, partners. This entails challenges for design and coordination. There can, for example, be tension between what may be seen as national research priorities and those which may arise from a cross-country comparative approach such as ours. Equally, the production of a research plan involving all institutions is more complex than would be implied by a more devolved approach. This way of working is also much more expensive in terms of travel and other transaction costs than would be required by an approach comprising a set of autonomous southern research programmes, having only minor engagement by northern partners. It is clear that the latter approach could still be compatible with achieving high quality research outputs for each partner separately. The question is whether the benefits (for research quality and relevance, and for capacity building) arising from the inter-country comparative aspect justify the increased transaction costs involved. We believe that they will, but this remains as yet an open question.

Southern partners are at a disadvantage in communications and access to research resources. Northern research institutions will not agree to grant them access to their electronic library facilities and resources. This has implications for efficiency. For example, some delay to the completion of literature reviews has occurred owing to lack of access to international journals by southern partners. Northern partners are compiling lists of readings that will be useful to southern partners. Key journal papers are being copied and sent in hard copy format to each partner.

Some partners would like to have more frequent exchange of ideas and views between all the research staff and northern partners. Even so, processes of communication to enable programme targets to be met on time are proving extremely time-intensive, notwithstanding the benefits of e-mail.

Good Practice/Innovation

The process of cross-national collaboration in research is relatively new, at least in the way it is being developed in our RPC. Each country will be conducting a mix of quantitative and qualitative research with, in three of the four countries, full-fledged household surveys using the same methodology. This should allow direct comparison of quantitative results across the three countries.

Achieving such direct comparison in the case of qualitative research is more difficult, owing to the importance of context in determining research outcomes. Accordingly the northern partners will be convening a research methodology workshop in May to allow a set of methodology papers to be developed, for subsequent sharing amongst, and discussion with, all partners. This will lead to a set of methodology discussion papers, which will be initiated at our first annual conference in February 2007.

Project/Programme Management

The programme management structure adopted assigns individual responsibility for the different leadership tasks required to secure output delivery. Management of partner-institution tasks is the responsibility of each of the PIs, under the overall direction of the RPC Director. In addition, there are International Coordinators for each of the three research themes. Within each theme, individual projects have co-directors drawn respectively from one of the northern institutions and from each of the southern partners. Management issues will generally be tackled via the Director-PI route. Research issues will be routed from theme coordinators to individual project leaders. It is early days to determine how well this division of responsibilities will work (and, of course, some individuals will wear more than one leadership hat), but experience so far is promising.

Communication

All of our research teams have contacted agency staff and various education specialists to make them aware of the research underway and its objectives. In Pakistan, it is reported that the heads of the resident missions change often, which has implications for the continuity of dialogue with one of the key sets of stakeholders. Nevertheless, national staff have longer periods of tenure and can be instrumental in liaising with the international offices of donor agencies.

Where collaboration between institutions is extensive there is a risk of information (and e-mail) overload. List-serves are being developed to try to ensure that all receive the information they need, whilst minimising gratuitous mailings.

5. Programme Management

Researchable Themes

The identification of researchable themes and projects began during the preparation of our RPC bid. The broad thematic topics of social and human outcomes, economic and labour market outcomes, and outcomes deriving from different partnership arrangements followed fairly directly from the terms of reference published by DFID. Following from discussions between the northern and southern partners during the inception phase, a range of projects have been identified within these broad themes. They reflect both the strengths and interests of the participating researchers and the priorities for delivery of new knowledge, as revealed by earlier work in partner countries and by our combined knowledge of the literature. Research plans have been prepared by each of the partners to provide the raw material for the overall plan for the Consortium's work.

Our research priorities have initially been two-fold: firstly to embark upon literature reviews in our four southern partner states covering each of our fields of study; secondly to establish the means whereby the

quantitative and qualitative empirical enquiries can take place. As regards the latter, draft questionnaires for the household surveys have been produced, and work to establish a framework and methodology for the various strands of qualitative work has begun.

Mechanisms for Partner participation in management

PIs are members of the Steering Committee. This body, meeting at least annually, is responsible for agreeing the overall plan for the RPC's work and for monitoring its implementation.

The management structure mixes real devolved authority with accountability mechanisms for the use of project resources, and for triggering their implementation. PIs are responsible for the conduct of the research programme of their own institution and for the timely delivery of agreed outputs. All the project leaders (usually paired northern and southern researchers for each project) will provide agreed project designs which incorporate accountability mechanisms. The sub-contracting mechanism makes clear that all partner organizations have clear responsibility for producing outputs as agreed in a timely fashion. Frequent review of progress both at the project level, and at the level of principal investigators will ensure that the agreed plans are kept to or, if not, that warning signals allow corrective action to be taken;

Changes to programme

During each of the inception workshops it was agreed that partner institutions would take forward the proposals discussed in order to develop them into draft research plans. These were to be discussed at the first Steering Committee meeting held in Cambridge in early February 2006. At that meeting it emerged that IDS Nairobi had not been able to take forward any of the proposals in ways earlier agreed. This was in spite of having had more time between its inception workshop and the SC meeting than the other partners. This disappointment followed on from a series of communication difficulties that had been present even during the bid-preparation phase, whereby e-mail contact with IDS Nairobi appeared difficult to maintain. After the Steering Committee meeting it was reluctantly decided that our future partnership with Nairobi would involve unacceptably high risk (see also the risk assessment annex). Shortly after the meeting, the Director of the RPC and the Director of IDS Nairobi agreed that other commitments appeared to be preventing our Kenyan partner from developing effective research collaboration with the RPC, and an amicable separation occurred. The new partner became Kenyatta University, with whom we had been collaborating with respect to the development of work for Theme 1.

This change has required the design of a somewhat more focussed research programme for Kenya than in the cases of the other southern partners. During the inception workshop, the Kenyan participants had not been keen to conduct a household survey – arguing that a number of similar exercises had already been done, and that the expense involved did not seem justified to them. Our new partner (Kenyatta University) is mainly interested in Theme 1 issues, and it is in the area of qualitative research that its comparative advantage lies. Accordingly work on Theme 2 issues, including the household survey, is not currently planned for Kenya. Theme 3 work will, however, be conducted by an economist from Nairobi University, to be sub-contracted by our partner.

Monitoring Arrangements

Internal monitoring of the programme will be provided by RPC Director and the RPC Steering Committee, and external monitoring and quality control will be provided by the Consortium Advisory Group. The National Advisory Committees, whose members are drawn from target local groups (policy makers, local university departments and representatives of NGOs and donor agencies), will also provide indications of wider impacts.

For internal management purposes the Director will produce progress six-monthly progress reports which will be shared with the key manager in each partner institution. Video conference calls will be convened around these reports. Their results will be shared with the CAG. The RPC Steering Committee will also meet at least once per year to monitor and review progress in implementation.

The nature of the research programme does not lend itself to a single 'benchmark' against which progress can be monitored over the entire five years. Rather, the progress reports will relate to an established and agreed timetable of activities and indicators which will be reviewed and re-set at annual, or 'end-of-phase' RPC Steering Committee meetings. The work of the RPC will be divided into three phases, as detailed in the 'Plan of RPC Activities'.

Monitoring indicators will cover areas of partnership development, research capacity building and policy impact. Specific indicators will include:

- completion of planned capacity-building activities
- progress with, and completion of 4 PhDs on RPC themes
- joint and individual publications
- policy presentations made
- policy briefs written and disseminated to media
- research findings having policy impact

Progress of Expenditure during the Inception Phase and out-turn 05/06

The expenditures shown in Annex 2 represent expenditures to the end of March 2006. They reflect the revised budget as agreed by DFID during March 2006. The revised budget was some 52% of the original budget for the inception phase. The main reasons for the differences were as follows:

Edinburgh - Training of research staff in qualitative methods, planned to take place in Edinburgh (Capacity Building head) during this phase, has been delayed until the first full year of research. It will now take place in partner countries.

Oxford - salaries have not been drawn down because the staff concerned are fully funded on other projects. These savings will be used to fund the Ghana household survey during 2006/7

Some salary costs for **Pakistan** and **Kenya** have not been drawn down, owing to relevant staff being funded from other sources.

Modest increases in costs were incurred in **Ghana**, where the costs of the inception workshop were underestimated, and it also proved necessary for Ghana partner staff to allocate more time to the research preparation exercise than we had expected.

The net savings on the original inception phase budget will not affect the delivery of the project outcomes, although the timing of the capacity-building activities for qualitative methods has changed. The savings have been carried over to fund the activities planned for 06/07, and subsequent years.

We have been allocated partial funding to finance four PhD scholarships by the Cambridge Overseas Students Trust. Attempts are presently being made to source other monies to fill the remaining financial gaps. When that has been achieved, recruitment of adequately qualified students will be initiated.

Annex 1. RPC LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Narrative Summary	Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions/Risks
<p>Goal: (DFID) Production and uptake of technologies and policies that will contribute to poverty reduction and the achievement of the MDGS</p>	<p><i>(No need to complete)</i></p>	<p><i>(No need to complete)</i></p>	<p><i>(No need to complete)</i></p>
<p>Purpose: Education and poverty reduction strategies in poorer countries show clearer recognition of education's contributions to poverty reduction.</p>	<p>Critical policy areas changed in four partner countries</p> <p>Key actors have shown active interest in applying new knowledge from all three RPC outputs</p> <p>Examples of related changes in policies, investments, and practice.</p>	<p>Policy and programme texts at international, national, and local levels.</p> <p>Interviews with stakeholders and policy actors.</p>	<p>Financial, policy, and institutional contexts remain favorable to integrated education and poverty reduction strategies.</p> <p>National elites strengthen their concern for inclusive education systems which optimize outcomes for poor as well as non-poor.</p>
<p>Outputs:</p> <p>1. Better knowledge, with associated research methods, on educational impacts on poverty, with specific emphasis on: social and life outcomes; economic and market outcomes; and effects of different partnership arrangements between households, governments, and aid agencies</p> <p>2. Communication strategy implemented to disseminate and promote uptake of research findings</p>	<p>1. Joint research reports with explicit and feasible recommendations for policy and practice in each of three outcome areas, with specific reference to four partner countries and global trends.</p> <p>2. Papers, stakeholder meetings, and web-based dissemination as outlined in communication strategy document</p>	<p>1. Project and annual reports of the RPC; evaluations of the RPC, publication lists, published external commentaries on the work of the RPC</p> <p>2. Evaluations and correspondence on meetings, peer reviews and commentaries on communication outputs</p>	<p>Political circumstances continue to allow productive collaboration amongst partner institutions.</p> <p>Research on educational outcomes continues to be favoured by partner institutions and governments.</p> <p>The broader funding environment for partner institutions remains stable.</p> <p>The funding environment for additional work on education remains positive.</p>
<p>Activities:</p> <p>1a. Literature reviews 1b. Household surveys 1c. Qualitative research 1d. Collaborative writing 1e. Training and support to southern partner research staff and students 1f. Generate further related research plans with</p>	<p>Inputs</p> <p>Budget: Research £1,239,354 Travel £174,912 Cap. Building £277,293 Communs £264,171 Mgmnt/other £544,235</p> <p>1. 7 principal investigators and trainers in 3 UK and 4</p>	<p>Milestones:</p> <p>As detailed in RPC and country work plans, including:</p> <p>1a. literature reviews by June 06 1b. Three Household surveys by Sept 07 1c. Qualitative research</p>	<p>Political stability in countries means that the research sites and target groups remain viable.</p> <p>Selected informants from all key categories willing and able to participate intelligently</p>

<p>increasing partner country responsibility for implementation and financing.</p> <p>2a: Dissemination workshops. 2b RPC website. 2c Training and support on dissemination and advocacy</p> <p>Further research, project management, advisory, and training activities as detailed in RPC Plan</p>	<p>overseas partner institutions, plus 7 teams of 5 to 15 research staff</p> <p>2. Communications team, Steering Committee, plus Consortium advisory Group, 4 national advisory committees in partner countries, and ongoing advice from key staff in governments and education policy institutions</p>	<p>begun by July 06</p> <p>1d. First reports by end 06</p> <p>1e. Training events in 4 countries by March 07</p>	<p>in surveys and qualitative interviews and focus-groups</p>
---	---	--	---

Annex 2. FINANCIAL SUMMARY FOR 1 OCTOBER 2005 – 31 MARCH 2006

Annex 3. RPC RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN

1. Risk Management Approach

1.1 Overall Strategy

This plan is developed in collaboration with all RPC partners and stakeholders. The risk management strategy implies continuous and collective monitoring of project risks, and the design and implementation of activities to ensure that identified risks do not prevent the RPC from reaching its objectives and generating key outputs. RPC risk management is an integral part of overall project management. The risk management activities outlined in this Risk Management Plan will be accomplished collectively through risk identification, risk analysis/evaluation, prioritization, response and review.

⇒

1.2 Definition of Roles

The RPC Director will take prime responsibility for project risk management as part of the overall Research Project Consortium management, including developing and administering the RPC risk management plan, preparing it for approval by the RPC Steering Committee and Consortium Advisory Group, evaluating the potential impact and probability of each risk, defining counter measures, checking the balance of the portfolio of challenge and risk, and assigning risk owners for each individual risk identified by the RPC team. The RPC Director will also authorize the use of contingency plans and undertake regular review of the project risk management strategy. The RPC Principal Investigators shall be jointly responsible for the overall RPC risk management with support from Theme Coordinators, International and National Study Leaders and Risk Owners. Risk Owners will be assigned to each risk to identify, track and manage risks and report on their impact. The table below reflects by functional role the assigned responsibility for key risk management activities.

Risk Management Activity	RPC Director	Principal Investigators	Theme Coordinators	International Study Leaders	National Study Leaders	Researchers	Risk owners	Consortium Advisory Group
Develop and administer Risk Management Plan	P	J	S					S
Determine if Risk Management Plan is ready for approval	P	J	J	S	S			J
Identify project risks	P	J	J	J	J	J	J	J
Estimate their potential impact and probability	P	J	S				S	

Risk Management Activity	RPC Director	Principal Investigators	Theme Coordinators	International Study Leaders	National Study Leaders	Researchers	Risk owners	Consortium Advisory Group
Define and plan counter measures or contingency plans	P	J	J	S	S			J
Assigning risk owners	P	J						
Tracking and managing risks and reporting on their impact	S	J	S	S	S	S	P	
Approve and authorize use of Contingency Plans	P	J						J
Regular review of the risk strategy to assess the effectiveness of risk management	P	S	S	S	S		J	S
Legend								
J = joint/shared responsibility								
P = primary/lead responsibility								
S = support/participatory responsibility								

2. Risk Assessment

2.1 Risk Identification

2.1.1 Methods and Techniques

Risk identification will be carried out during the planning phase and continued throughout the project. According to the approach to the RPC risk management adopted in this document, extensive consultations on potential risks and their management took place during the inception phase among all parties involved in the project. The data for risk assessment is based foremost on the results of the brainstorming exercise conducted among key RPC members at the end of the inception period, when project teams had clearer perceptions about potential pitfalls and constraints that might hamper or jeopardize achievement of RPC goals as defined in the project logical framework. Especially important were the views and evaluations provided by the project stakeholders during initial workshops in the four researched countries (Ghana, Kenya, India and Pakistan) and numerous meetings and consultations of partners held throughout the initial phase, including the meeting of the RPC Steering Committee held on 2-3 February 2006 and the RPC meeting on qualitative research held on 6-7 March 2006. Continued consultations on project risks as well as communication of risks and risk management issues to all partners and stakeholders will be carried out systematically to ensure that all involved are aware, informed and understand their part in managing risks. The project interim data, such as inception reports, were critical in identifying and assessing the project risks in each of the countries involved. No less important were screening of development web sites, knowledge portals and media compendia with a view to learning from the practice and experience of educational and other development projects conducted in these countries as well as taking note of the current socio-economic and political situation and policy and institutional contexts in the four researched countries.

⇒

2.1.2 Project Risks

The RPC risk identification exercise revealed that as with any project there is a possibility that the RPC lags behind schedule in reaching its objectives and producing desired outputs of desired quality in the absence or

lack of adequate planning and coordination. Such risks become more complicated in multi-country and multi-disciplinary programmes where communication and physical distance impose some constraints upon action. The following types of risk and uncertainty associated with reaching research objectives were identified as plausible for the RPC. The list does not reflect the importance (in terms of impact) or probability of risks.

Risk	Risk Description
External	
Lack of political will and active engagement in the RPC research from the part of government and national policy makers at the macro level	National elites and policy makers lack clear vision of the benefits of the research programme for achieving education and other MDGs and broader developmental objectives.
Lack of support, enthusiasm and engagement at micro levels	Lack of broad support and collaboration from local government organizations, media, local research and educational institutions, think tanks and NGOs due to various reasons (lack of awareness of the MDGs and their importance for local development; lack of general awareness and acknowledgement of education and its outcomes as an important factor for individual success and well-being).
Change in country socio-economic and political contexts that is unfavourable to integrated education and poverty reduction strategies	Rapid change in socio-economic and political contexts in one or several countries (for example, reduced government funding of the education sector or reduced government ability to respond to demand as a result of rapid economic downturn/crisis or natural disasters; election of radical/uncooperative political parties; political instability; internal and external conflicts based on religious, ethnic and other grounds; social unrest).
Change in financial, policy and institutional contexts	Deterioration of public finances and budgeting frameworks, and/or changes in policies and institutions that may be unfavourable to integrated education and poverty reduction strategies (for example, lack of education sector funding and deterioration of education and related social infrastructure; change in government priorities and pro-poor policies; restructuring of ministries and agencies with resultant uncertainties in dealing, negotiating, collaborating with and communicating research to policy-makers)
Financial	
Budget overruns and ensuing costs	Risks associated with budget overruns and ensuing costs due to underestimation of financial resources required for the implementation of activity plans during the annual budget planning process or poor budget management and breach of budget discipline at the centre/by partner budget managers.

Risk	Risk Description
Activity	
Project schedule risk	The project deliverables (objectives, outputs) are delayed because of inefficiency; lack of proactive action; lack of or ineffective communication; physical distance; project scale; project scope; inadequate scheduling and/or prioritization; lack of motivation; lack of personnel to carry out scheduled tasks; limited access to academic literature and bibliographical resources, software etc.
Inconsistency of project plans and activities	Annual activity plans and the overall research plans as detailed in the 'Plan of RPC Activities' are inconsistent, incoherent and incompatible as a result of lack of effective management at central/partner level and lack of coordination among/communication of partners
Lack of visible impact on policies and attitudes	The RPC fails to deliver on its main objective of inducing policy or attitude change so that national elites strengthen their concern for inclusive education systems which optimize outcomes for the poor as well as non-poor. Various factors could lead to this outcome, including poor design of and implementation gap in the RPC communication strategy and inadequate quality of project research outputs, various external factors mentioned above, including non-responsive government.
A partner chooses to withdraw from the contractual arrangement	One or more RPC partner institutions withdraw its commitment to the project by terminating/breaching its/their contractual obligations.
Human Resources	
Lack of adequate human resource capacity to deliver on project outputs in Southern partner institutions	Southern partner institutions may not have sufficient pool of research and other staff to ensure effective project management and coordination at the national level and to implement activities which require specific technical skills and knowledge (qualitative/quantitative research skills, data analysis skills; research communication skills, policy and research advocacy and lobbying, negotiation, project management skills etc).

2.2 Risk Analysis

2.2.1 Methods and Techniques

Risk Probability Scoring	<p>Low – unlikely to occur or the risk is fully manageable by the RPC;</p> <p>Medium – Could go either way and the RPC can have some influence in managing the risk but cannot control it completely</p> <p>High – Very likely to occur and the RPC’s ability to actively manage the risk is limited</p>
Risk Impact Scoring	<p>Low – Risk factor may lead to tolerable delay in the achievement of objectives or minor reduction in quality/quantity and/or an increase in cost</p> <p>Medium – Risk factor may lead to some delay, and/or loss of quality/quantity and/or increase in cost</p> <p>High – Risk factor may cause some or all aspects of the objectives in relation to time, quality/quantity not being achieved to an acceptable standard or to an acceptable cost</p>
Risk Analysis Description	<p>The risk owners at the RPC Director and project/partner levels will establish the RPC exposure for each risk and identify which risk is the most important to address. This will be carried out through examining each risk, isolating the cause, establishing the probability of occurrence, and determining the nature and impact of possible effects. The list of risks will be produced, prioritized according to probability and impact and then plotted to a risk matrix which assigns risk ratings based on probability and impact scoring described above.</p> <p>The risk assessment below (section 2.2.3) is based on the following rating scheme: High risk: Two or more risks fall into the darkest squares Medium risk: One or no risks fall into the darkest squares but one or more fall into the light grey squares Low risk: All the risks are concentrated in the white squares</p> <p>The RPC Steering Committee, the Consortium Advisory Group, National Advisory Boards, Theme Coordinators and International and National Study Leaders will review the results of the risk assessment. The final decision with regard to accepting/rejecting each risk will be made by the RPC Director based on recommendations by project level risk owners.</p>

2.2.2 Risk Analysis and Prioritization

The table below provides a risk statement for each identified project risk together with the probability of occurrence and impact for each risk. Each risk statement is a refinement of the risk description defined during risk identification.

No.	Risk Statement		Probability (P), Impact (I)	
	Event	Consequence	(P)	(I)
1	Political elites in Southern countries show lack of political will to introduce changes in policies and practices and to actively engage with the RPC activities	The event will have major implications for the RPC with the possibility of falling short of achieving its main policy outcome	L	M
2	Government officials in Southern countries in charge of education and social policy, media, research think tanks, educationalists and local NGOs and activists provide limited support and show little enthusiasm to engage in project activities	The event will have significant effect on the quality/quantity and/or costs of the RPC due to additional efforts and resources that needs to be deployed in order to support in-country operational work, including access to data and selection of and access to field sites for qualitative research and household surveys. The RPC communication strategy will be at risk of falling short of achieving its objectives. The project effectiveness and impact will be reduced due to lack of dialogue and feedback to the research, and reduced responsiveness and sensitivity of the RPC activities to local needs and perceptions.	L	M
3	Country socio-economic and political contexts change in a direction away from integrated education and poverty reduction strategies	The consequences are hard to estimate. The event might have conflicting effects on the RPC (might or might not affect in terms of planning, scheduling and implementing activities or operational efficiency and effectiveness of the RPC but will raise serious concerns in terms of achieving the RPC overall goals and purposes)	L	H

	Risk Statement	Probability (P), Impact (I)
4	Country financial, policy and institutional contexts change that make the RPC activities difficult to implement	<p>The event will affect the implementation of the RPC Activity Plans and the RPC Communication Strategy by disrupting established communication channels and networks; reducing the capacity of national governments to respond to the RPC activities and messages, take actions based on informed decisions to facilitate the introduction of inclusive and pro-poor education policies and practices; creating the need to review and revise existing plans and strategies to accommodate changes in recent policy and institutional contexts; and limiting the impact of the RPC on national policies and practices</p> <p>L H</p>
5	The RPC encounters budget overruns and ensuing costs	<p>The event will impact on project financial management causing unnecessary delays associated with extensive budget reviews, re-negotiation with funding agencies and viring of funds between budget items and assessment of overruns and ensuing costs. The ability of partners to implement activities will be jeopardized due to lack of resources to carry out planned activities or implement sub-projects and deploy personnel and other resources according to plans. The RPC ability to plan and schedule future activities will be seriously hampered.</p> <p>L M</p>
6	The project risks falling behind its approved schedule and activity plans	<p>The overall project implementation and achievement of objectives/outputs/outcomes as described in the logframe are delayed causing gaps and/or overlaps in plans. The entire RPC Plan of Action will be disrupted causing losses in quantity/quality and operational efficiency.</p> <p>M L</p>

	Risk Statement		Probability (P), Impact (I)	
7	Project plans and activities are poorly scheduled and designed, partner plans are incompatible and overlap with each other in a manner that is difficult to manage, coordinate and implement	Significant delays in reaching RPC objectives and delivering on its outputs with complications in terms of producing comparable and compatible for analysis data across themes, sub-projects and countries.	M	M
8	The RPC produces insufficient impact on policies, practices and attitudes	The event will have major implications for the RPC with the possibility of falling short of achieving its main policy outcome	M	H
9	The RPC faces skills and capacity gaps to deliver on project outputs	Significant impact on the quality and quantity of outputs, and/or project costs with delays in implementation. The costs increase due to increased amount of time and effort required for search, selection and recruitment of skilled personnel and/or sub-contracting costs.	L	M
10	A partner chooses to withdraw from the contractual arrangement	During the inception phase the Institute of Development Studies of Kenya failed to deliver on its outputs and caused delays to RPC activities. It became necessary to change the Kenya partner. The rest of the partners have fully committed themselves to the RPC and have entered into contractual relationships.	L	H

2.2.3 RPC Risk Matrix

		Probability		
		Low	Medium	High
Impact	High	Change in country socio-economic and political contexts; change in financial, policy and institutional contexts; RPC partner withdraws	insufficient impact on policy and practice	
	Medium	Lack of political will and engagement at the top; low engagement and participation at local levels; budget overruns and ensuing costs; skill gaps	Incompatibility and inconsistency in activity plans	
	Low		Project schedule risks	

The results of the risk analysis and plotting the risk on the risk matrix above show that the project is rated as **medium** risk according to the classification and assessment of risks provided in the Department for International Development (DFID) annual reporting guidance (although the probability of risks is minimally low). According to the risk matrix, only one risk falls into the darkest squares and the rest fall into the light grey squares.

3. Risk Response Actions

This section provides the description of response strategies and actions that the RPC will take to avoid, remedy or mitigate the identified risks. Only those risks which have high/medium impact are described and selected for response action (this does not imply that these actions are highly probable).

Risk Event	Project schedule risk
Risk Response Action	Risk avoidance actions: Action 1: Devolved management; Action 2: Introduce effective project scheduling and planning mechanisms

Description	<p>Action 1 Implementation of the management structure which mixes real devolved authority with accountability mechanisms for the use of project resources, and for triggering their implementation. Accordingly all the project leaders will provide agreed project designs, which incorporate such mechanisms. The sub-contracting mechanism will make clear that all partner organizations have clear responsibility for producing outputs as agreed in a timely fashion. Frequent review of progress both at the project level, and at the level of principal investigators will ensure that the plans agreed are kept to or, if not, that warning signals allow corrective action to be taken;</p> <p>Action 2 Introduce a comprehensive project scheduling system that allows planning, coordination, implementation and monitoring of multiple tasks and activities by multiple parties and ensures overall comparability, compatibility, integrity and consistency of project plans and activities for all project partners</p>
Assigned To	<p>Action 1: Christopher Colclough, Members of the RPC Steering Committee, National Advisory Board; Action 2: Shailaja Fennell, Madeleine Arnot, Roger Jeffery, Bolormaa Shagdar</p>
Date	01/05/06

Risk Event	Inconsistency of project plans and activities
Risk Response Action	Risk avoidance actions
Description	<p>Action 1 All national/partner activity plans will need to use the same grids for planning, phasing and stage of the research in order to ensure effective coordination across partners.</p> <p>Action 2 Transfer national Activity Plans for the year beginning 1 April 2006 onto Excel grid in order to pinpoint any incompatibilities between the plans of each partner, in particular with respect to the availability of Northern partners. There will be one grid for each Theme and one grid for each partner</p> <p>Action 3 Collate and negotiate any issues, problems with Southern partners with regard to project design, planning and coordination (objectives, phasing, scale etc)</p> <p>Action 4 Provide general oversight of the RPC in terms of its plans and meeting planned targets and outputs</p>

Assigned To	<p>Action 1 Faisal Bari, Fatuma Chege, Christopher Colclough, Leslie Casely Hayford, Geeta Kingdon, Roger Jeffery, Claire Noronha</p> <p>Action 2 Shailaja Fennel and Roger Jeffery</p> <p>Action 3 Christopher Colclough, Shailaja Fennel, Bolormaa Shagdar</p> <p>Action 4 Members of the RPC Steering Committee, Consortium Advisory Group</p>
Date	15/04/06

Risk Event	Project overruns and the ensuing costs
Risk Response Action	Risk avoidance actions
Description	<p>Action 1 Design and implement prudent and effective overall project financial management system and carry out project budget expenditure monitoring throughout the project life-cycle;</p> <p>Action 2 Ensure that activity plans are consistent with annual and 5–year budgets;</p> <p>Action 3 Enforce financial discipline both at the overall RPC level and the level of partner institutions</p>
Assigned To	<p>Action 1 RPC level – Christopher Colclough, Philip Vale, Bolormaa Shagdar. Partner institutions – Leslie Casely Hayford, Claire Noronha, Fatuma Chege, Faisal Bari, Roger Jeffery, Geeta Kingdon, Christopher Colclough;</p> <p>Action 2 Project level – Christopher Colclough. Level of Principal Investigators - Leslie Casely Hayford, Claire Noronha, Fatuma Chege, Faisal Bari, Roger Jeffery, Geeta Kingdon, Christopher Colclough;</p> <p>Action 3 Project level – Christopher Colclough, Members of the RPC Steering Committee, Consortium advisory group/National Advisory Boards. Level of Principal Investigators - Leslie Casely Hayford, Claire Noronha, Fatuma Chege, Faisal Bari, Roger Jeffery, Geeta Kingdon, Christopher Colclough;</p>
Date	<p>Action 1 01/03/06</p> <p>Actions 2 and 3 Throughout the project</p>

Risk Event	Lack of visible impact on policies, practices and attitudes
Risk Response Action	Risk mitigation/avoidance actions
Description	<p>Action 1 Develop and implement high quality and effective research communication strategy to maximize the impact of the project on policy, practice and attitudes toward and perception of pro-poor and inclusive education policies</p> <p>Action 2 Quality control is crucial to assuring that the outputs from the RPC will be able to influence policy and practice. The RPC will ensure that research results are excellent from technical and methodological points of view (including the production of methodology papers to establish methodological consensus among partners and setting standards and rigour of analysis).</p> <p>Action 3 Help to set policy agendas, by using the RPC links and contacts with agencies to influence opinion about priorities, and by ensuring feedback from research to the policy debate to sustain interest in and ownership of the research issues.</p> <p>Action 4 Carry out systematic review and assessment of policies, socio-economic, political and institutional contexts in the researched countries to minimize/mitigate the adverse effect of external risks upon project outcomes and maximize the project impact on policy and practice</p>
Assigned To	<p>Action 1 Faisal Bari, Fatuma Chege, Christopher Colclough, Leslie Casely Hayford, Geeta Kingdon, Roger Jeffery, Claire Noronha, Bolormaa Shagdar, Project Leaders (CC, GK, RJ)</p> <p>Action 2 Members of the RPC Steering Committee, National Advisory Board, Theme Coordinators - Roger Jeffery, Geeta Kingdon, Christopher Colclough</p> <p>Action 3 Members of the RPC Steering Committee, National Advisory Board, Christopher Colclough, Faisal Bari, Fatuma Chege, Christopher Colclough, Leslie Casely Hayford, Geeta Kingdon, Roger Jeffery, Claire Noronha, Bolormaa Shagdar</p> <p>Action 4 Members of the RPC Steering Committee, National Advisory Board, Faisal Bari, Fatuma Chege, Christopher Colclough, Leslie Casely Hayford, Geeta Kingdon, Roger Jeffery, Claire Noronha, and National Study Leaders</p>
Date	Throughout the project cycle

Risk Event	Lack of adequate human resource capacity to deliver on project outputs in Southern partner institutions
Risk Response Action	Risk avoidance/mitigation actions
Description	<p>Action 1 Carry out training needs assessment for all partners</p> <p>Action 2 Develop the RPC capacity development programme based on identified training needs</p> <p>Action 3 Design and implement specific strategies and training programmes, including syllabus, curricula and training schedule to meet capacity gaps identified with the partners</p> <p>Action 4 Produce field research guidelines and methodology papers</p>
Assigned To	<p>Action 1 Principal Investigators, Roger Jeffery, Madeleine Arnot</p> <p>Action 2 Principal Investigators and International Study Leaders</p> <p>Action 3 Roger Jeffery, Madeleine Arnot, Geeta Kingdon, Principal Investigators</p> <p>Action 4 Roger Jeffery, Madeleine Arnot, Geeta Kingdon, Principal Investigators</p>
Date	October – November 2006

Risk Event	Change in country socio-economic and political contexts that is unfavourable to integrated education and poverty reduction strategies
Risk Response Action	Risk mitigation actions
Description	<p>Action Carry out systematic review and assessment of socio-economic and political change in the researched countries to minimize/mitigate the adverse effect of external risks upon project outcomes and maximize the project impact on policy and practice</p>
Assigned To	Members of the RPC Steering Committee, National Advisory Boards, Faisal Bari, Fatuma Chege, Christopher Colclough, Leslie Casely Hayford, Geeta Kingdon, Roger Jeffery, Claire Noronha, and National Study Leaders
Date	Throughout the project

Risk Event	Lack of political will from the part of government and national policy makers at the macro level
Risk Response Action	Risk mitigation actions
Description	<p>Action 1 Develop and implement high quality and effective research communication strategy to maximize the impact of the project on policy, practice and attitudes toward and perception of pro-poor and inclusive education policies</p> <p>Action 2 Help to set policy agendas, by using the RPC links and contacts with agencies to influence opinion about priorities, and by ensuring feedback from research to the policy debate to sustain interest in and ownership of the research issues.</p> <p>Action 3 Carry out systematic review and assessment of policies, socio-economic, political and institutional contexts in the researched countries to minimize/mitigate the adverse effect of external risks upon project outcomes and maximize the project impact on policy and practice</p>
Assigned To	<p>Action 1 Faisal Bari, Fatuma Chege, Christopher Colclough, Leslie Casely Hayford, Geeta Kingdon, Roger Jeffery, Claire Noronha, Bolormaa Shagdar, Project Leaders (CC, GK, RJ)</p> <p>Action 2 Members of the RPC Steering Committee, National Advisory Board, Christopher Colclough, Faisal Bari, Fatuma Chege, Christopher Colclough, Leslie Casely Hayford, Geeta Kingdon, Roger Jeffery, Claire Noronha, Bolormaa Shagdar</p> <p>Action 3 Members of the RPC Steering Committee, National Advisory Board, Faisal Bari, Fatuma Chege, Christopher Colclough, Leslie Casely Hayford, Geeta Kingdon, Roger Jeffery, Claire Noronha, and National Study Leaders</p>
Date	Throughout the project

Risk Event	Lack of support and enthusiasm at micro levels
Risk Response Action	Risk avoidance/mitigation actions
Description	<p>Action 1 Develop and implement high quality and effective research communication strategy to maximize the impact of the project on policy, practice and attitudes toward and perception of pro-poor and inclusive education policies</p> <p>Action 2 Establish and maintain close and effective working relationships, networks and collaboration with local government agencies, media research institutions, think tanks, local NGOs, civic groups and activists concerned with education and educational outcomes. Ensure their active engagement and involvement in project activities in order to sustain participation, interest in and ownership of the research issues at local levels.</p>
Assigned To	<p>Action 1 Faisal Bari, Fatuma Chege, Christopher Colclough, Leslie Casely Hayford, Claire Noronha, Bolormaa Shagdar, Project Leaders (CC, GK, RJ)</p> <p>Action 2 Faisal Bari, Fatuma Chege, Leslie Casely Hayford, Claire Noronha, National Advisory Board</p>
Date	Throughout the project

Risk Event	Change in financial, policy and institutional contexts
Risk Response Action	Risk mitigation action
Description	<p>Action Carry out systematic review and assessment of policies and institutional contexts in the researched countries to minimize/mitigate the adverse effect of external risks upon project outcomes and maximize the project impact on policy and practice</p>
Assigned To	<p>Action Members of the RPC Steering Committee, National Advisory Board, Faisal Bari, Fatuma Chege, Leslie Casely Hayford, Geeta Kingdon, Roger Jeffery, Claire Noronha, and National Study Leaders</p>
Date	Throughout the project

4. Risk Monitoring and Control

The RPC Director will be the risk owner at the programme level and Principal Investigators shall be risk owners at the project/partner level responsible for identifying, evaluating, monitoring, controlling and reporting risks. Monitoring of risks will be conducted on an ongoing basis by project and theme leaders, and will be formally reported during the annual reporting exercise. Changes in risks will be detailed and actions will be identified to counter them. These, in turn, will lead to changes in the risk management plan, as detailed below.

5. Revision History

Changes to the Risk Management Plan

Version	Date	Name	Description

Annex 4. RPC RESEARCH COMMUNICATION STRATEGY

The design of this Communication Strategy is based on a belief, shared by all partners, that our research results will contribute directly to meeting the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) - endorsed by 189 nations and signed by 147 heads of state - and to illuminating ways in which their achievement will help to reduce poverty. It also assumes that policy and research environments, nationally and globally, will be receptive to the research findings, owing to the widely held commitment to achieving the MGDs and to halving world poverty by 2015.

This document indicates how our results will be communicated to researchers, policy-makers and others. It contains: a) a detailed description of the communication strategy, including its objectives, underlying principles, main outputs and mechanisms for involving key target and user groups at each stage of the research; and b) an action plan for research communication activities, agreed by all partners.

1. OBJECTIVES OF THE RPC

Education can promote social mobility. However, persistent educational inequalities – themselves driven by poverty – can also perpetuate subsequent socio-economic inequality and exclusion. The core objective of the research is to study the mechanisms that drive this cycle of deprivation, and to identify the policies needed to ensure that educational outcomes benefit the disadvantaged.

Simple expansion of education does not necessarily benefit the poor. The outcomes of education depend not only on educational experiences, but also on the broader context of welfare and opportunity. The multi-sectoral objectives of the MDGs acknowledge this inter-dependence. Yet, its nature and strength are not fully understood, and judgments about priorities for policy change, or about their sequencing, are not always firmly based.

Our research is intended to help clarify how the pursuit of the education MDGs can truly help pro-poor development. It will elucidate how poverty alleviation is sensitive to the quality and quantity trade-off in education. The research will explore these issues in the contexts of South Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa – the two regions where the challenge of achieving the MDG objective of halving world poverty by 2015 is greatest and where the policy benefits are most urgently required. Most of the detailed work of the RPC will take place in the four major Commonwealth countries where our partners are located: Ghana, Kenya, India and Pakistan.

2. COMMUNICATION OBJECTIVES, PRINCIPLES AND KEY MESSAGES

2.1 Objectives

The objectives of the Communication Strategy are to:

- create awareness about the above goals and objectives of the RPC amongst our target audiences, and induce and support a sense of ownership

- regularly inform audiences and users of the research about the programme's accomplishments and outcomes in an accessible way. Ultimately, we seek to induce policy change by actively engaging our target audiences, enabling them to use the research outputs in their own work and thus helping them to make research- and evidence-led decisions.

2.2 Principles

The following key principles underpin our communication strategy:

Communication as a process: communication of results to target audiences is an *on-going process* which must occur throughout the research cycle;

Integrity: the communication of research objectives and results is an integral part of the research process. Each partner institution will have its own Communication Action Plan that is integral to their research activity plans and consistent with the overall communication strategy;

Engagement with policy-makers and user groups: effective communication of research results will be facilitated by involving policy-makers and user groups in research design, implementation and evaluation;

Pro-activeness: new ideas and knowledge should be communicated to target audiences as they become available, thereby engaging in a consultative process, with prompt response and feedback to the research;

Participation: the strategy adopts a *participatory* approach to communicating research by involving the research partner institutions in its design and implementation;

Cost-effectiveness: communication activities must be cost-effective and reach as many audiences as possible. This will be achieved by prioritising our target and user groups, and using low cost but high-impact methods.

2.3 Key Messages

A core intention of the RPC is to produce research results that influence policy. There are several strands of information and knowledge that will be communicated to our target user groups for the above purpose.

Firstly, we shall aim to shed light on the differing and contested views regarding the relationship between education, its labour market outcomes, and broader issues of human and social development. Major strands of our work will cover both theoretical debates on these issues and more practical aspects of researching educational outcomes and poverty in developing countries. An early output will be a set of methodological notes to inform our fieldwork, to be discussed at a Methodology Conference in May 2006.

Secondly, the RPC will generate new knowledge and evidence to inform research and policy by producing new comparable data in each of the southern partner countries. These data will help to clarify the dynamics of educational outcomes for the poor and ultimately will provide new evidence on which to base pro-poor policy decisions. The RPC will address recent experiences of aid in our partner countries, to help understand past performance and identify promising approaches for the future. Sub-projects will investigate how different legislative frameworks, and government/household partnership and financing relationships, affect educational outcomes for the poor. The researchers will communicate their findings by writing papers for peer-reviewed publications, and by contributing to working/discussion paper series. These outputs will also be rewritten for less technical audiences in the form of policy briefs or newspaper articles.

Our research aims to help clarify how the pursuit of the education MDGs can truly help pro-poor development by elucidating how poverty alleviation is sensitive to the quality/quantity trade-off in education. It is intended that the research will contribute to a more subtle interpretation of the MDG goals and targets, with attendant benefits for policy. Its key messages encompass the following issues:

- the local meanings of different kinds of schooling, and how these differ by gender, ethnicity, disability and other dimensions of social exclusion
- the mechanisms through which education impacts on social and human development (e.g. health, fertility, civic engagement, empowerment, particularly of women, social and cultural capital)
- how the social and human development outcomes of education may best be measured and improved

the impact of education, skills and training acquired both at school and in the workforce on the economic and market opportunities available to different fractions of the poor and the non-poor

how to understand and improve the economic and market outcomes of education, particularly for the poor

the forces that drive the cycle of deprivation and how to break its reproduction

changes in educational outcomes for the poor – particularly differentiated by the gender and their relationship with broader patterns of social and economic development

the effects of different partnership arrangements between households, governments and aid agencies on educational outcomes

factors that may explain disappointing performance of existing aid instruments (procedural, institutional, absorptive capacity, fiscal and/or programming efficiency etc.)

efficiency of new instruments and modalities, such as the FTI and reasons behind their success/failure

effects of different legislative frameworks, government/household partnerships and financing relationships on educational outcomes for the poor

3. KEY AUDIENCE(S)

Key Audiences

The key target groups for our research are those charged with ensuring that the expansion of education does impact on the poor. These comprise a wide range of groups including both those directly or indirectly involved in designing, formulating and implementing policies and those who lobby, monitor and influence policy decisions directly and/or through mechanisms of democratic political participation.

The RPC inception workshops organized in our four partner countries were instrumental in clarifying our potential policy and user groups and in establishing whether the RPC priorities are consistent with those of its target audiences.

Government officials

This target group comprises government officials charged with the formulation and implementation of economic and social policies in the four researched countries. They include legislators, senior government officials at central and local/provincial levels mainly in charge of education and health, youth and women, population issues and their advisers. Their priority is to formulate and implement policies that are consistent with their national and regional development goals and often to ensure that these policies are conducive to achieving the MDGs. Our findings concerning how the poor are using education, the extent of their inclusion, and the routes by which they exit (or remain in) poverty, should be of central interest to them.

International organizations

Improved understanding of the relationships between educational outcomes and pro-poor development is of particular interest to those charged with MDG implementation and monitoring at the global level. These include UN, and other multilateral organizations such as the World Bank and its sister institutions, regional development banks (the African Development Bank, and the Asian Development Bank) and bilateral agencies such as DFID. The overall objective of poverty reduction – shared by DFID and many other development agencies - requires educational investments well integrated into national and international poverty reduction strategies. Our research should provide aid agencies with updated knowledge of how to promote good outcomes of education for the poor, and how better to support educational systems in promoting socio-economic transformation.

Research communities in the North and South

The technical aspects of the research will, of course, be of particular interest to the research community itself. Thus, each RPC partner has reported on the local demand for this research and their capacity to carry it out. It is therefore, important that normal academic publications such as journal articles and/or books are used as a prime communication channel for the research community. In addition, the RPC will utilize other channels for engaging with researchers in the North and South, including by linking other websites with its own, by securing membership of global research networks (e.g. Global Knowledge Partnership – GDN), and by giving regular contributions of news and events information to the UK and international gateways to development information and research (Eldis, Id 21, GDN).

Non-governmental and community based organizations

An important target audience is the group of national and international NGOs involved in national implementation processes. NGOs are active stakeholders in development and there are many in developing countries that provide education services to the poor, in partnership with both public and private sectors. In some of our partner countries NGOs have had a significant influence on government decisions with regard to education.

General public

The RPC communication strategy will also use commercial media outlets for communicating its research. Local media, such as TV, radio and newspaper outlets, are an important communication channel in South Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa. Academic outputs from the research will be rewritten in shortened, non-technical styles, in ways conducive to being taken up and published or discussed by local media.

The RPC priorities

Our priorities are, first of all, to relay information about research and its outcomes to the above key audiences so as to ensure that they are able to make better-informed judgments with regard to educational policies and policy outcomes and are able to identify key policy issues necessary for improving the educational outcomes of the poor and disadvantaged.

Secondly, based on our research findings which will help clarify the relationships between education and the broader context of welfare and opportunity, we seek to influence economic and education policy-making in these countries with a view to breaking the 'cycle of deprivation' that exists between education and poverty.

Thirdly, the RPC will ensure that the research agenda remains responsive to change in the knowledge needs of policy-makers and development practitioners - the ultimate consumers of the research evidence. This will be achieved by engaging relevant policy-makers throughout the duration of the RPC and keeping abreast of the emerging academic literature and media reports in both the south and the north to observe changes in the outcomes of education and in the pathways of impact from education into other (labour market, health, fertility, subjective well-being) outcomes for the poor and non-poor.

4. COMMUNICATION CHANNELS

The RPC communication strategy will employ a range of dissemination channels, in addition to conventional academic products (books, articles and papers). These traditional outputs remain fundamental, but too narrow to meet all of our objectives. For example, the RPC recognizes that the most effective way to influence policy is often to engage directly with policy makers and the user community. An initial engagement with policy makers from southern governments and donor agencies took place at the inception workshops organized in Ghana, Kenya, India and Pakistan. Some senior officials from our partner countries participated in these research planning exercises. A variety of other groups have contributed to the conceptualization and design of the programme, including educational consultants, government agency personnel, and academic

researchers. In order to steer the research in policy-relevant directions, we shall continue to involve institutional partners in all stages of the research project cycle.

The national advisory committees which are being set up in each country, comprising representatives from each of the main stakeholders, (researchers, policy-makers, NGOs and civil society) will act as important communication channels. These committees will be a focal point for interaction with and involvement of national officials, policymakers and donor agencies in research design, implementation and evaluation processes. At a more macro level, a Consortium Advisory Group, including research experts in the fields covered by the RPC, will serve as an additional focal point for engaging nationally and internationally with policy-makers.

A major communication channel for both policy-makers and the academic community will be the RPC annual conference, where presentations of the work of the RPC will be made. The first annual conference is planned for February 2007 during which four National Reports and papers, (including statistical patterns and trends; literature reviews and situational analyses), a Methodology Discussion Paper and other collaborative publications will be presented.

Eventual users of the research will thus be directly engaged during its implementation. National workshops will be held at least annually in each of the partner countries where such engagement can be further nourished. At mid-term (Feb/March 2008) an international conference will be convened. Feedback from users at this stage will help to align research closely with user needs and open new lines of research. These dissemination exercises will also be a means of bringing together researchers from Africa and South Asia to identify common themes and lessons. We shall involve the news and print media both to communicate our interim results widely and also to trigger feedback from society at large.

Towards the end of the research period, we shall organize a major public event in each of the four southern partner countries, together with a major international conference, to communicate the research findings. We envisage putting a large amount of effort into making this a high-profile dissemination exercise to engage policy makers, practitioners, and other stakeholders. In addition, presentations of RPC research at other conferences, seminars and workshops at DFID, the World Bank and at academic institutions in the north (Universities of Oxford, Edinburgh, Bristol and Sussex) will serve a similar function..

The RPC will inform networks of policymakers and researchers in the South by interacting with global processes. Regional networks such as those provided by ADEA, by the Global Campaign for Education, by Southern-based NGOs, and by research networks such as NORRAG will be utilised to publicise results and initiate peer review and discussion.

Table 1. Target Audiences and Communication Channels

Target audience for the RPC Communication Strategy	Communication Channels
Research funding agency	RPC reports, website, research output, working papers, discussion papers
Other bilateral and multilateral aid agencies	RPC annual conferences, seminars, media outlets (newspaper, specialist journals?), conference papers (at World Bank, UNESCO), website
National and local governments	Internal government channels, seminars, RPC annual conferences, inception and other training workshops, newsletters, targeted stakeholder consultation, radio, TV, newspapers, consultative meetings (National Advisory Committees), internet/e-mail/website, E-discussions
Donor community in researched countries	RPC annual conferences, National Advisory

Academic community (international)	Committees, RPC international conference, Peer-reviewed journal articles, books, book chapters, E-discussions, website, presentation at international conferences, symposia
Academic community (local)	Annual conferences, workshops, E-discussions, working papers, newsletters, website, formal and informal networks, RPC annual conferences, RPC International Conference
NGOs	RPC annual conferences, training workshops, RPC International Conference
General public	Mass media, website, newspapers, TV, radio, informal networks and communication channels

Between the UK and the developing-country partners, we have a wide network of contacts in government, research institutions, donor agencies, UN institutions, NGOs, unions and the media which we shall use to ensure that our findings become influential.

Particular attention will be given to embedding research fully within the wider institutional settings in the South, and within long-term institutional commitments to researching poverty. In particular, within each of the southern partner countries, Ministries of Education and other relevant arms of government, Faculties of Education and other university departments will be invited to engage with the work. Research dialogue between southern partners and southern policy institutions will be encouraged from the start, as will regular policy briefings.

The RPC will employ the latest technology both for communication of its research and dissemination of its research outputs. The RPC website was launched at the end of the inception period to communicate our research goals, objectives and activities to the wider policy and research community. It will be a useful information dissemination and publicity tool for making public our research activities, accomplishments and outputs. In addition it will be an important tool for maintaining communication between RPC members through its internal portal. The website will also be used for networking and establishing links with other research projects and institutions working in the field of education and development through creating links and regular input and sharing of news and documents (ID21, Eldis).

RPC members will also utilize worldwide web and satellite technology for communicating with each other as well as engaging with and linking with policy-makers, research communities and civil society in the North and South through E-discussions and video-conferencing. These facilities will, on the one hand, allow a more comprehensive record of the discussions to remain, and they will facilitate direct and immediate feedback and advice from interested parties for next steps in research planning.

We shall also employ local/traditional formal and informal communication channels to disseminate new knowledge created as a result of our research to make an impact on policy and action. Our partners in the South will play a key role in developing and maintaining such links and networks. Knowledge will be transferred and disseminated through local and national mass media, conferences and workshops involving national and local government education policy-makers, representatives of the donor community, and civil society.

5. COMMUNICATION PLAN

5.1. Communication Activity Plan

The communication plan comprises outreach, capacity building, communication and dissemination activities. The RPC will build capacity not only by strengthening research expertise in the Southern partner institutions but also by helping stakeholders in partner countries use research evidence to make research-informed

decisions. Annual conferences will be linked to appropriate policy and/or scientific conferences, in order to expose ideas and research development to peer review and to provide opportunities to publicise the key ideas emerging from our research.

Table 2. Communication Plan

Activity	Budget	Responsible person/timeframe	Success Criteria
Identity/General PR			
Liaise with partners on research communication strategy and its implementation		B. Shagdar, Prof. Colclough, Principal Researchers (April 2006)	The overall RPC Communication Strategy, partner communication activity plans (including research output dissemination plans) agreed and adopted
Produce a short summary/briefing paper of the RPC research programme for use by media (with key points backed up with facts and figures)		B. Shagdar (July 2006)	
Network and liaise with education RPCs and other institutional partners and explore opportunities for joint communication initiatives		Prof. Colclough, B. Shagdar, All members (on-going)	Number of joint and collaborative initiatives (workshops, conferences, seminars organized, invited lecturers, papers presented, articles/books published)
Internal Communication			
Videoconferencing (2 hour sessions twice a year)	£1,000 x 4 (£4,000)	Prof. Colclough, B. Shagdar	
Create an intranet for internal communication and consultation with various listserves, discussion areas, and document and other resources sharing tools		B. Shagdar (April 2006)	
Introduce systems to facilitate communication between partners (e.g. mailing lists)		B. Shagdar (April/May 2006)	
	Subtotal: £4,000		

Activity	Budget	Responsible person/timeframe	Success Criteria
Media relations			
Produce press releases/ briefing papers, newspaper articles, newsletters on the RPC research activities, progress and results 10 Policy briefing papers: 50 copies of each at £2.50 per copy Identify key media outlets (specialist press, national press, local press, broadcast media, electronic media) that cover 'educational outcomes' to reach target audiences and develop long-term relationships with key representatives (make media and press contacts list) Research findings (research methodology and specific recommendations) published in international and local/national journals Initiate Discussion paper series as first pre-publication format for all RPC outputs. 30 papers:, 50 copies of each at £2.50 per copy	£1250 Subtotal: £5000	Principal researchers, B. Shagdar, Karen Gee (throughout the research) B. Shagdar, Principal Researchers, Karen Gee (June 2006) All - Principal Researchers, Researchers (throughout the research)	Number of newspaper articles and press releases published and/or submitted, newsletters printed and distributed Contacts and links e-list created; Number of articles in peer-reviewed publications, number of book and book chapters (published and/or submitted); number of cross-references and citations in specialist publications
Public Affairs			
Publicity Materials			
RPC poster with a logo Workshop and Conference posters	£5 x 50 £5 x 150 (£1,000) Subtotal: £1,000	B. Shagdar/ Consultant - design artist (July 2006)	
Events			
Methodology workshop in Cambridge (jointly with the Chronic Poverty Centre, Manchester)	2 days x £500 venue subsistence 10@£100 travel 10@ £50	Christopher Colclough, Shaila Fennel, Roger Jeffery, Madeleine Arnot (May 2006)	Draft Methodology Briefing Papers discussed, number of papers presented, number of participants

Activity	Budget	Responsible person/timeframe	Success Criteria
RPC National workshops (at least annually)	(£2,500) 4 x £2,000 (£8,000)	Principal researchers, Theme Coordinators	RPC National Reports produced and disseminated; number of participants; number of papers discussed
RPC Annual Conferences	2 x £18,000 (£36,000)	Prof. Colclough, B. Shagdar, Principal Researchers, Theme Coordinators (March – April 07 and 09)	RPC Annual Reports produced and disseminated; number of participants, number of papers presented, number of media/press reports
RPC Mid-term Conference	(£18,000)	Prof. Colclough, B. Shagdar, Karen Gee Principal Researchers, Theme Coordinators	RPC Mid-term report produced and disseminated; number of participants, number of papers presented; number of media/press reports
RPC Final Conferences in each country (4)	4 x £2,000 (£8,000)	(March 2008) Principal Researchers, Theme Coordinators	RPC Final National Reports produced and disseminated; number of participants, number of media/press reports
International Conference	(£18,000)	(August 2010) Prof Colclough, Theme Coordinators, Principal Researchers, B. Shagdar (September 2010)	Number of participants attended; number of conference papers; number of press/media reports;
Subtotal: £90500			
Website/electronic communication			
Design and maintain the RPC website (software, equipment)	(£1,500)	B. Shagdar (March 2006)	Website created, functional and updated regularly
Organize at least one E-discussion/conference on a topic of interest to RPC members		Theme Coordinators, B. Shagdar (May 2009)	Number of participants, number of issues covered
Subtotal: £1,500			
Total: £102,000			

5.2. Distribution of Research Outputs

The RPC will produce the following research outputs for communication and dissemination:

Communications Outputs

- Methodology briefing/discussion papers on, *inter alia*, approaches to working with the poor, engaging with poor communities, designing field studies and interpreting the data, and the ethical stance adopted by researchers in the field.
- High quality, policy-relevant joint research reports, analytical papers, and policy briefings published and disseminated, based on integrated surveys and qualitative enquiries in four countries
- Discussion Paper series initiated from the second half of 2006
- Jointly authored papers by north-south partners published in peer-reviewed publications
- Books and book chapters
- Databases from household and qualitative surveys
- Project and annual reports of the RPC
- Evaluations of the RPC
- Published external commentaries on the work of the RPC
- Further research-funding proposals
- PhD reports and theses
- Fellowship visit reports
- Workshop reports and evaluations

Each country will incorporate in their activity and 5-year plans a plan for output dissemination, which will in turn be reflected in the overall Research Communication Strategy. Dissemination will be a constant strand throughout the project. There will be both nationally and internationally published outputs from the research, presenting opportunities for individual, group, and cross-national authorships. All outputs will also be distributed electronically via the website.

Measuring Impact/Success

The extent to which the RPC communication strategy is successful will be measured in a variety of ways. First, the strategy and its implementation will be evaluated as part of the generic RPC evaluation and review process during its mid-term and annual reviews.

In addition, various methods of evaluating the effectiveness of RPC communication channels and activities will be employed, including indicators of both supply and demand. The supply-side indicators with which to measure the efficacy of the RPC communication activities include quantitative indicators such as number of press releases/briefings; peer reviewed publications by theme; publications in press or submitted; books or book chapters; publicity materials; website links; RPC reports; meetings; workshops and conferences held.

The demand-side qualitative indicators will measure the efficiency and quality of communication channels and activities such as attendance at meetings, workshops and conferences; number of invited lectures and conference papers; number of attended workshops and conferences (by invitation); numbers of cross-references and citations in specialist journals; number of links established to the RPB website, total number of visitors to the RPB website per month/year (see Table 1). The extent to which members of the RPC are approached by national and international organizations for advice and council on matters related to the work

of the consortium and the extent of press interest and coverage by the mass media of the outputs from the programme will also be monitored and evaluated.

Finally, the evaluation of the RPC communication strategy and its implementation will be carried out through surveys and/or evaluation sheets, for example, evaluation of conferences and seminars based on feedback from participants, stakeholders, partners, focus group discussions, questionnaires, interviews, and regular consultations with stakeholders/partners. The evaluation of the overall RPC Communication Strategy will be carried out at the end of the period as part of the programme evaluation activity during which the plan will be compared against outcomes and supported by evaluation indicators (see Table 2).

Annex 5. PRODUCTS AND PUBLICATIONS

Conference Papers
Theme 1: Social and life outcomes of education
<p>Patricia Jeffery, Roger Jeffery and Craig Jeffery 'Investing in the Future: Education in the Social and Cultural reproduction of Muslims in UP', Conference on Religious and Social Fragmentation and Economic Development in South Asia, Cornell University, October 2005</p> <p>Patricia Jeffery, Roger Jeffery and Craig Jeffery, 'Everyday Communalism and the Spatial Politics of Primary Schooling in Bijnor, UP', Madison, Wisconsin (34th South Asian Studies Conference), October 2005</p>
Theme 2: Economic and market outcomes of education
<p>Kenneth King and Robert Palmer 'Skills Development and Poverty Reduction: The State of the Art', paper for European Training Foundation, December 2005</p> <p>Patricia Jeffery and Roger Jeffery 'Privatising Labour: Discrimination and Exclusion in Rural Bijnor', India International Centre, New Delhi, February 2006</p>
Theme 3: How education outcomes are affected by different forms of aid and funding of education
<p>C. Colclough ' Does Education abroad Help to Alleviate Poverty at Home? An Assessment' paper presented at the Pakistan Society of Development Economists Conference, Islamabad, December 2005</p> <p>G. Kingdon, 'Public Private Partnerships in Education in India', paper presented at World Bank conference on PPPs in Education, Washington, November 2005</p>
Mimeo Papers
Theme 1: Social and life outcomes of education
<p>C Ayamdoo, L Casely-Hayford and R Palmer (2006) Ghana Donor Partnerships' Literature review. Improving the Outcomes of Education for Pro-Poor Development, Working Paper, University of Edinburgh: Edinburgh/Associates For Change: Accra</p>
Theme 2: Economic and market outcomes of education
<p>R Palmer (2006) 'Education, Training and Labour Market Outcomes in Ghana: A Review of the Evidence'. Improving the Outcomes of Education for Pro-Poor Development, Working Paper, University of Edinburgh: Edinburgh</p>
Theme 3: How Education outcomes are affected by different forms of aid and funding of education

Kenneth King and Robert Palmer 'Capacities, Skills and Knowledge in the Least Developed Countries: New Challenges for Development Cooperation', background paper for UNCTAD's Least Developed Countries Report of 2006
Website
www.educ.cam.ac.uk/commonwealth/index.html
RPC Papers
Inception Report from Mahbub ul Haq Human Development Centre Pakistan – 1 October 2005 – 31 March 2006
Inception Phase Report from CORD India for the period 1 October 2005 – 31 March 2006
Ghana Inception Report By Associates for Change, 4 April 2006
Dissemination Events
Kenya Inception Workshop: Nairobi 1-3 November 2005. Key attendees: RPC Partners, World Bank representative, NGOs, Government Officials, Donors, Researchers
Ghana Inception Workshop: Accra 15-17 November 2005. Key attendees: RPC Partners, NGOs, Government Officials, Donors, Researchers
Pakistan Inception Workshop: Islamabad 19 December 2005. Key attendees: NGOs, Government Officials, Donors, Researchers
India Inception Workshop: Delhi 9-11 January 2006. Key attendees: RPC Partners, NGOs, Government Officials, Donors, Researchers

Annex 6. DEVELOPING CAPACITY

Strategy

Capacity development was a major strand of the RPC activities during the inception period. The key objective of capacity development is, as envisaged in the initial project tender document, to strengthen analytic and research capacity in our partner institutions and help stakeholders in partner countries use research evidence to make research-informed decisions. To this end, several initiatives have been planned for the duration of RPC, including methodological and dissemination workshops to build capacity directly, qualitative and quantitative skills workshops before embarking upon field research and data analysis skills workshops later. In addition four linked research studentships for PhD studies are being negotiated.

All available direct and indirect routes for building capacity of our partners and stakeholders will be pursued. At the most basic level, this will include knowledge and skills transfer through 'learning by doing' where groups of more and less experienced researchers engage in effective collaboration. This implies the provision of guidance and advice on critical research issues, and on the use of particular analytical and methodological tools, where relevant. Southern partners will draw their expertise from local pools of researchers, including recent graduates, thereby adding a multiplier effect to our capacity building efforts.

The consortium members recognize the importance of sharing the research findings with wider academic, research and policy communities and civil society, to aid informed debate and consultation. It is intended that this will add to the existing knowledge of such groups, and increase their awareness of the potential role of education in combating poverty and promoting well-being.

Achievements

Creating awareness of the research

Inception workshops held in each southern country were important for developing capacity of all partners and stakeholders. Our partners in Ghana, Kenya, India and Pakistan reported that the model of inviting members of society ranging from researchers and NGOs to government officials and donors proved an effective model. Inception workshops enabled researchers in partner institutions to debate the aims and objectives of the research, its pro-poor and broader developmental role, and helped clarify their expectations of their roles in the research. Stakeholders were informed about the research and were encouraged to think critically about the state of education in their respective countries and to reflect on their personal experiences. For example, a senior analyst from the Ministry of Education together with representatives from the Basic Education Division, who attended the Ghana inception workshop, gave insights about core concerns related to educational outcomes from the Ministry's perspective.

Skills training

Key research skills training workshops are scheduled to begin from July 2006, prior to household surveys and qualitative field research being launched and continued throughout 2007-8.

Literature reviews are 'stage-setting' exercises in all partner countries. Inception reports from partners indicate that the process of preparing these studies has helped them learn from current debates regarding methodological issues (eg., in estimating economic rates of return and helping them develop a theoretical nexus between skills and education outcomes in their countries). Partners in Pakistan and India report that the literature reviews have helped develop a macro-perspective and to identify knowledge gaps which can be addressed by our own research.

Staff from our Indian partner institution have benefited from a demonstration by Roger Jeffery of qualitative data analysis software (Atlas ti, EndNote), and of skills for searching the Web for academic sources. Our

Southern partners, especially those in India and Pakistan emphasize the importance of being able to use latest software in research and data analysis. Arrangements are being made to purchase EndNote for all partners, and possibilities for purchasing SPSS and Atlas ti for qualitative and quantitative data analysis are being explored. In addition, southern partners have been sent information about relevant bibliographical sources, copies of some key journal articles and other print media that would otherwise be inaccessible to them.

Often, capacity building is an outcome of closer patterns of working together: many research skills build on implicit knowledge and can be transferred fully only when they are being exercised in close collaborative working arrangements (e.g. learning about questionnaire design by working closely with others to refine and improve an initial draft or piloting a questionnaire). Northern capacity has been developed by southern partners sharing documents and methodological tools with them, and also their perspectives on important concepts underpinning research on 'poverty'. Indirect Southern capacity development can be encouraged through local collaborative work arrangements. For example, in Ghana our partner has developed links with Ghana Statistical Service, the Education Assessment Research Centre and the Research Division at the Ministry of Education by consequence of our research plans.

We estimate that some twenty southern researchers have so far benefited from our research partnership and collaborative working arrangements during the inception phase. Additional research assistants are being hired on a short-term basis to assist with literature review and scoping studies. Sensitising our Northern researchers to Southern contexts, poverty and education issues, and to the broader development agenda, has also been an important area of our capacity building efforts.

Research studentships, fellowships

The RPC has been successful in securing partial funding from Cambridge Overseas Students' Trust for four nationals – one from each partner country - to work on the project and pursue research on a theme directly related to the RPC.

Supplementary funding opportunities are being and/or will be sought (Aga Khan Foundation, Noon Foundation, Shell Group). The British Council in each partner country will also be lobbied for possible support.

Our Southern partners also offer internship opportunities for young researchers by involving them in the project. Thus, our partner in Ghana benefited from the work of a Ghanaian research intern for a period of one year through the Ghana National Service Secretariat and is eager to continue offering internships.

Methodological guidance

An important strand of our consortium's capacity building activities is to help to determine sound research methods and tools for researching poverty and education that are appropriate for their contexts. To this end, members of the qualitative research cluster (with participation from quantitative researchers) have been working on the design and production of a set of methodological guidelines, covering the following topics and issues:

- Translating fieldwork data
- Inter-generational methods
- Voices of the poor
- Ethnographic methods and the poor
- Researching sciences
- Disability: conceptual and methodological issues
- Linking qualitative and quantitative research
- Elite interviewing
- Capability and methods

Literature reviews
National/statistical and situational analysis

These guidelines will be refined and improved, with support of southern partners, and discussed at a Methodological Seminar planned for 15 May 2006 in Cambridge – to be held jointly with the Centre for Chronic Poverty, SED, University of Manchester. The guidelines are intended to provide a core for a 'methodology working paper series' to be issued throughout the duration of the research.

Southern partners have also been developing their methodological tools. In Ghana, for example, methodologies have been developed on scoping, library and on-line literature search and review, and writing annotations and summaries. They are in the process of developing an in-house manual for research assistants.

Challenges

The capacity-building strategy described above will entail many and diverse ongoing challenges for its successful implementation. There are, however, two particularly difficult hurdles which northern partners are presently attempting to cross. These are the following:

Securing further top-up financial support for the research studentships negotiated for one national researcher from each partner country will be vital if the full scholarships are to be made available.

A major constraint to developing effective research capacity in partner institutions is the fact that they have only limited access to the key international journals, bibliographical reference material, and databases. Northern partners have attempted to secure access for southern partner institutions to their own on-line databases of full-text journal articles at the Universities of Cambridge, Oxford and Edinburgh. This has not, however, proved possible to agree. Northern universities typically allow such access only to their own members, or those who are given 'visitor' status. The latter status does not allow the inclusion of research collaborators who remain based in their own institutions.