

Section A: Official Development Assistance (ODA) and GCRF strategy

The strategy

1. Summarise the key aspects of your three year **strategy for development related and GCRF research activity**, including:
 - a. Your institution's strategy and priority objectives for all development related research activity funded through all sources for three years from 2018-19.
 - b. A summary of the key aspects of your three year strategic plan for QR GCRF, in light of the criteria and objectives for the GCRF outlined in the guidance.
 - c. How activity funded through QR GCRF fits into your broader strategy and priorities for all development related research activity.
 - d. How activity funded through QR GCRF relates to the UK strategy for the GCRF.¹
 - e. How your development-related and GCRF strategies relate to your wider institutional strategy for using QR.
 - f. Likely key barriers and enablers to implementing your strategy.
 - g. The key activities by which you will realise your objectives, such as capacity and capability building; mono-disciplinary, interdisciplinary and collaborative research; generating impact from research; meeting the full economic cost of GCRF activity funded through other sources; rapid response to emergencies with an urgent research need; and pump priming.
 - h. The main developing countries, included in the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) list, which you intend to collaborate with.

Maximum 3,000 words

Our strategy for development-related research activity involves building on current strengths in two main areas.

The first of these two areas involves research into human trafficking and modern slavery. The second involves education for young people who are in refugee camps or otherwise are displaced. In relation to the former, a research centre was established in 2016 which has been successful in obtaining research funding and developing empirical research

¹ UK Strategy for the Global Challenges Research Fund,
<http://www.rcuk.ac.uk/funding/gcrf/challenges/>

that informs policy and practice in the areas of human trafficking and modern slavery. In relation to the latter area, the University has received considerable funding which is being used to establish a research centre. The funding for this research centre was obtained as a result of the success of an earlier project commended by the British Council. Again, the research of the centre will be empirical and designed to improve practice in many of the world's conflict zones for the long-term benefit of the young people affected.

A further subsidiary area which is part of the University's strategy in relation to development-related research is in the area of public policy to promote sustainability and innovation in less-developed countries. This work is conducted within the Centre for Global Innovation and Public Policy and especially focuses on public-private partnerships to promote entrepreneurship and sustainable development. The work involves collaborations with a Pakistan-based charity involved in vocational training. This is not a priority for GCRF funding.

The two main priority areas chosen reflect the very small amount of QR money available for this purpose (approximately £20,000 in the case of St. Mary's) and the benefits we can obtain from building on existing strengths and by using the funding in a way that is complementary to other funding streams. The strategy is to ensure that we undertake empirical research which makes a real difference to the most vulnerable people and to countries with which research collaboration takes place. With that in mind, the research will be enhanced by a programme of public engagement to ensure maximum impact. Our strategy also involves the funding of PhD students and post docs to work in the chosen areas funded by a mix of general research-related QR money, GCRF QR money and other research funding obtained by the University. The strategy for the spending of GCRF money in this way is drawn from St. Mary's Corporate Plan (Vision 2025) and the University's Research Strategy and is applied to the particular area relevant to this stream of QR funding.

This research in these fields relates directly to the criteria and objectives in the GCRF guidance. In particular, it will "promote challenge-led disciplinary and interdisciplinary research" (see further below); it will "strengthen capacity for research, innovation and knowledge exchange in the UK and developing countries through partnership with excellent UK research and researchers" and will increase the capacity to "provide an agile response to emergencies where there is an urgent research need".

The specific strategies for the two priority areas of research are described below.

The Centre for the Study of Modern Slavery (CSMS) at St Mary's University is engaged in independent research to provide evidence that informs policy responses to modern slavery and human trafficking. Its creation was motivated by the fact that the UK government is taking a strong stance on modern slavery and is dedicating significant resources to prevent this phenomenon. This is a cross-government initiative involving, amongst other departments, the Department for International Development. The issue has also been highlighted by a number of religious and humanitarian institutions as being

catastrophic for large numbers of people in ODA-recipient countries. The Centre is working with government departments to identify gaps in evidence and to accumulate empirical evidence to make the response to human trafficking more targeted, and to generate better outcomes for those at risk of trafficking in ODA-recipient countries. The Centre co-operates with Bakhita House (an organisation assisting those who have been trafficked) and the Santa Marta Group (an international network of civil society and policing organisations working to eradicate trafficking) to promote co-ordination with law enforcement agencies, NGOs and governments, with strategies informed by research and evidence. To achieve these aims, the Centre will draw on the expertise of internal and external partners. Academic staff from across the University in the departments of Criminology, Sociology, Law, Business, Film and Media, Education, Health Sciences and Theology are involved. External partners include the UK Government, Catholic Bishops Conference of England and Wales, Kevin Hyland, the UK's Independent Anti-Slavery Commissioner and Visiting Professor at St Mary's University, other academic institutions, campaigners, international organisations and NGOs.

Field work is being undertaken in a number of countries (see below) by a post-doc funded from other sources. A University-funded PhD studentship (using QR funds) is being used to finance research in the Philippines on trafficking and the influence of social networks on young people.

The Centre for Research into the Education of Marginalised Children and Young Adults will be established in August 2018 and will fill an important research gap. The centre will focus on education for those at the margins of society with the majority of the work being in the area of education for those in refugee camps or who are otherwise displaced as a result of emergencies. Again, the focus will be on ODA-recipient countries. This work will build on research that has already taken place on the provision of education in refugee camps in the Middle East which was highly-commended by the British Council who regard it as ground-breaking. That work was funded by the British Council and the United Nations High Commission for Refugees. Funding has been obtained for the provision of a PhD studentship for a student from an LDC who will specifically research education for the marginalised in the country from which the student comes. There is also funding for most of the costs of a post-doc researcher who will undertake field work with the director of the centre to develop ways to improve educational outcomes for children and young adults in refugee camps and who are otherwise displaced. As well as helping to fund the post-doc, the QR funding will contribute to the overheads of this centre for which core external funding has already been obtained for the next three years.

To summarise, the priorities in relation to the use of resources are:

1. Support for the work of the Centre for the Study of Modern Slavery in its research on human trafficking designed to improve outcomes upstream in ODA-recipient countries.
2. The establishment and development of the Research Centre into Education for Marginalised Children and Young Adults which will have a focus on refugees and displaced people mainly in ODA-recipient countries.

The funding will support the full economic costs of the centres, as well as supporting the provision of studentships and fees for PhD students, and it will help provide pump-priming support for the activities of the research centres.

This aspect of QR funding clearly fits into the broader institutional research strategy, including for the use of QR funding. The desire to establish new research centres is a key part of the University's Research Strategy, as is support for PhD studentships. We have identified the latter objective in particular as a significant and important part of building research capacity at St. Mary's University.

The research we are funding fits squarely into the GCRF strategy. It addresses a number of the key targets under the headings of "Equitable Access to Sustainable Development"; "Sustainable Economies and Societies"; and "Human Rights, Good Governance and Social Justice". By helping countries reduce the extent of human trafficking and modern slavery, conditions for those who would have been trafficked will improve. In addition, improvements in institutional and governance and the more effective monitoring and control of criminal networks will provide a governance environment more conducive to sustainability economic development. With regard to education in refugee camps and for those who are displaced, this is a specific problem that is often neglected in the midst of wars and national disasters. Disruption or neglect of education in such circumstances can be catastrophic for individuals, families and the wider community as well as the prosperity of communities when peace-building begins. Both pedagogical and organisational aspects of education have to be specially adapted and research into these areas will be particularly fruitful. In both cases, the benefit will be direct and considerable as the research being undertaken relates to people whose situation is desperate and in areas where there is a relative paucity of relevant research. The benefit of the work will go beyond the countries with which collaboration takes place (see below) as, to a large degree, the results will be transferable between countries in different situations.

There are no obvious barriers to implementing this strategy. Clearly, the recruitment of key personnel is important and the loss of personnel would create difficulties. However, we have a sufficient centre of gravity in these areas to ensure that we can deliver, especially given our chosen activities for funding and the small amount of QR funds that are available for this.

The activities by which we will realise our objectives include:

- Empirical field work
- Inter-disciplinary research on modern slavery and on education provision in disaster emergency situations, most of which will be empirical
- Public engagement through the production of policy briefings, hosting of conferences and public seminars, engagement with civil society organisations, and work with governmental and parliamentary groups to inform public policy discussions

Countries with which we will collaborate in research on questions supported by QR funding include: Nigeria, Vietnam, Albania and the Philippines (in the case of work on modern slavery) and Jordan, the Lebanon and Syria (in the case of work on marginalised children focused on those in refugee camps).

The activity that will be funded by the GCRF funds will be clearly focused on finding solutions to specific problems. Conflict in middle-east and North African countries has created a substantial movement of people to refugee camps, a large number of whom are young people. The education of the young people in such camps is crucial, both for the individuals concerned and for the long-term sustainable development of the countries from which they come. The problem of modern slavery and human trafficking is estimated to affect over 40 million people. Responses to both these problems can be improved by better empirical evidence in relation to workable solutions. The embedding of this work in research centres which are directed by leaders in the academic field will ensure the excellence of the research. As has been noted, the work of one of the researchers on education in refugee camps has already been commended by the British Council. In one strand of the work of the Research Centre for the Study of Modern Slavery advice is already provided to the National Crime Agency. Though this is a UK agency, its work directly impacts on international criminal networks that are at the origin of exploitation of those who are trafficked who are mainly from ODA countries. [N.B. This is mentioned as an indication of excellence, it is understood that the main beneficiaries of this work need to be in ODA-recipient countries]. The importance of empirical evidence for addressing the questions being researched ensures that there is a good chance of achieving success and positive outcomes from this work. This likelihood is considerably enhanced because the GCRF research funding is only around 10 per cent of the total University resources devoted to these areas.

2. Provide details of the main intended **outcomes and impacts** of your strategy.

Maximum 500 words

Work on modern slavery will focus on Nigeria, Vietnam, Albania and the Philippines. In addition to the GCRF funding, this research has also received support from the ESRC, the Home Office and from charitable sources from organisations and individuals whose philanthropic activity involves funding research that is focused on improving conditions in less-developed countries.

The **outcome** of the work in Nigeria, Albania and Vietnam will be to fill gaps in the empirical evidence base to enable the development of strategies to combat modern slavery at the upstream sources. A further **outcome** will be research on improvements to law-enforcement policy (related to capacity to deal with organised crime) and to governance. The **outcome** of the work in the Philippines will be a better understanding of the impact of the internet, social media and technology on the trafficking of children.

Through the empirical research and public engagement strategy, the work is designed to have an **impact** on policy and practice in those countries. It will inform the work of outside agencies operating in the identified ODA-recipient countries so that they can work more effectively to reduce the vulnerabilities that lead people to become trapped in modern slavery. By focusing on the upstream causes of modern slavery, it will ensure that there is an **impact** on peoples in the target countries which will benefit directly from reduced levels of trafficking. The research across all these countries is designed to have an **impact** on policy and practice so as to reduce the extent to which people become vulnerable to trafficking and irregular migration.

The research on education in refugee camps and for displaced young people will focus on the Lebanon, Jordan and Syria, though the results are likely to be transferable. The **outcome** will include the production of practical research, including that resulting from field work, relating to the education of young people in refugee camps or who are otherwise displaced as a result of emergencies. **Outcomes** will also include the production of publications and the provision of advice to government departments and other stakeholders involved in these areas.

The **impact** of that research will be improved educational methods, policy and practice for young people affected by conflict and emergencies. This will include the building of skills (e.g. English language and translation) and the development of the research capacities of the local partners and institutions in the countries mentioned above. By bringing local concerns to a wider global audience through a public engagement strategy based on the research it is intended that there will be an **impact** on education policy for refugees and displaced people beyond the immediate target countries by ensuring, for example, that there is a platform for refugee voice in education policy. The dissemination of the research will also allow local partners the opportunity to learn from international 'best practice' (policy borrowing).

Management of GCRF

3. How will your HEI **monitor** and **evaluate** its progress and compliance in ODA and GCRF activity, including assessing geographical distribution of activity, outputs, outcomes and economic and social impacts?

Please describe the policies, procedures and approach you have in place to measure progress, evaluate outcomes, identify lessons learned, and ensure ODA compliance.

Maximum 1,500 words

The GCRF QR funding that we receive is extremely small and will support a wide range of activity that is also funded from other sources. The vast majority of the relevant activity will take place in designated Research Centres and the evaluation process will reflect the reporting process for Research Centres within the University. Reporting, monitoring and evaluation is made more straightforward because the Research Centres in which the

activity will take place are largely focused on research relating to ODA recipient countries.

The evaluation will firstly take place within Research Centres by the Director. Goals are set institutionally which Research Centres must reach and on which they must report. The reporting and accountability structure is as follows:

- The Research Centres will appoint an external academic who will advise on the progress of the Centre in meeting its goals.
- The Director of the Research Centres will meet formally each year with the Dean of Faculty and Associate Dean for Research and the University Director of Research and Public Engagement to discuss progress towards agreed objectives.
- The Director of a Research Centre should agree a budget with the Head of School each year and report in a clear and transparent way.
- Every two years, the Director of a Centre will prepare a report which assesses progress in relation to set criteria relating to success in research and public engagement. The report will be assessed by the external adviser, Associate Dean for Research, Dean of Faculty and the Director of Research and Public Engagement in turn. Each should add a brief appendix to the report relating to desirable and/or agreed actions for the following two years (if needed) or make other comments if it is felt that relevant criteria have not been met. This report is forwarded for comment to the School Research Committee and, with comments and as amended, to the University Research Committee.
- In addition, in the alternate years when the above report is not submitted to the University Research Committee, Research Centres will produce a report for the School Research Committee which includes a description of research outputs, a summary of papers published, research work ongoing, events organised, external links developed, grants obtained, grants applied for and impact.

Through the above mechanisms, the research outputs and impact will be monitored and evaluated. If the planned outputs are not met and the impact is not achieved, there are a number of University mechanisms to ensure that the Centres are put back on track or to re-allocate resources to other objectives (in this case within ODA-compliant activities).

With regard to PhD students (the research of which is also supported by the GCRF funds), the process of supervision requires the recording of eight progress meetings per year and two review points per annum where the students' work is evaluated by an internal and then external (validating body) committee. The University has an exceptionally good record in ensuring that PhD study proceeds according to plan.

GCRF QR funds are allocated by the Director of Research and Public Engagement, advised by the University Research Committee and Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Research and Enterprise. The Director of Research and Public Engagement is responsible directly

for the proper spending of money allocated to PhD studentships. Research Centre Directors, accountable to Deans of Faculty, are responsible for the proper spending of money on other Research Centre activities. The Director of Research and Public Engagement will monitor directly whether the geographical distribution of activity.

Following on from the above, we will measure success in terms of the production of research outcomes in the following ways: PhD student completion and external examiner reports; quality of research publications; invitations to present at prestigious conferences; success in raising complementary funds; interest from prospective PhD students in the work of the Centres; invitations to provide advice on policy issues. We will measure the success in terms of the impact of research by assessing changes in policy or practice that can be traced back to the research financed by GCRF allocations. In particular the extent to which changes in practice are substantial and/or widespread changes will be important.

Section B: Use of QR GCRF 2018-19 allocation and future QR GCRF priorities

4. Please complete the table in Annex A2 detailing the expected spending and activities for QR GCRF in the academic year 2018-19. Note that the total QR GCRF spending must equal the indicative allocation (available in Annex C), and all activities must be ODA-compliant for strategies to be assessed as ODA-compliant overall.

5. Please add here any explanatory notes on how you have completed the table in Annex A2 that will help inform assessment of ODA compliance.

Maximum 200 words

The amount of GCRF QR funding is very small and is complemented by other, more substantial, funding from a range of sources, most of which has already been secured.

6. How would your **priorities and activities** for 2018-19 QR GCRF change if the funding level differs from that outlined in indicative allocations? Please include detail of how priorities will change with increases and decreases to QR GCRF funding, and details of how each priority meets ODA criteria.

Maximum 500 words

We would not expect the funding to vary considerably (in terms of total amount) because the total amount to begin with is small reflecting our low level of QR funding, so even a significant proportionate change in funding will lead to few extra resources.

Decreases in funding would lead to lower levels of institutional support for the two research centres and require either a minor scaling down of activity or greater funding from other sources. The most likely impact is to make PhD studentships and post-doc researchers part-time. Increases in funding would be used to scale up activity assuming that the full economic cost of existing activity were already covered. Changes in funding would be shared equally between the two areas of research into modern slavery and education of refugees/those in emergency situations. Both these areas clearly meet the ODA criteria in relation to improving educational outcomes, sustainability and good governance.

7. Based on indicative funding allocations, what are your **priorities** for QR GCRF activity in 2019-20? Please include detail of how priorities will change with increases and decreases to QR GCRF funding, and details of how each priority meets ODA criteria.

Maximum 1,000 words

Our priority is the full-funding of the PhD studentship and thereafter meeting full economic costs of research, the marginal cost of which is funded from other sources.

Decreases in funding would lead to lower levels of institutional support for the two research centres and require either a scaling down of activity or funding from other sources. The most likely impact is to reduce the FTE fraction of the post-doc researchers and thus reduce field work activity. Increases in funding would be used to scale up activity assuming that the full economic cost of existing activity were already covered. Changes in funding would be shared equally between the two areas of research into modern slavery and education of refugees/those in disaster emergency situations. Both these areas clearly meet the ODA criteria in relation to improving educational outcomes, sustainability and good governance.

It should be noted that any reduction in funding will have negligible impact on the totality of the activity as less than 10 per cent of it is funded by GCRF QR money.

8. Based on indicative funding allocations, what are your **priorities** for QR GCRF activity in 2020-21? Please include detail of how priorities will change with increases and decreases to QR GCRF funding, and details of how each priority meets ODA criteria.

Maximum 1,000 words

Our priority is the full-funding of the PhD studentship and thereafter meeting full economic costs of research that is partly funded from other sources.

Decreases in funding would lead to lower levels of institutional support for the two research centres and require either a scaling down of activity or funding from other sources. The most likely impact is to reduce the FTE fraction of the post-doc researchers thus reducing the extent of the empirical field work. Increases in funding would be used to scale up activity, especially field work, assuming that the full economic cost of existing activity were already covered. Changes in funding would be shared equally between the two areas of research into modern slavery and education of refugees/those in emergency situations. Both these areas clearly meet the ODA criteria in relation to improving educational outcomes, sustainability and good governance.

It should be noted that any reduction in funding will have negligible impact on the totality of the activity as less than 10 per cent of it is funded by GCRF QR money.