



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

SCHOOL DROPOUT PREVENTION PILOT PROGRAM

ANNUAL REPORT

OCTOBER 1, 2010 – SEPTEMBER 30, 2011



Contract No. EDH-I-00-05-00029-00

Task Order AID-OAA-TO-10-00010

October 2011

School Dropout Prevention Pilot (SDPP) Program

**Summary Annual Progress Report
October 1, 2010 – September 30, 2011**

Submitted to:

**U.S. Agency for International Development/Asia and Middle East Bureau
Rebecca Adams, COTR
AME/ME/TS
Washington, D.C.**

Submitted by:

**Creative Associates International, Inc.
5301 Wisconsin Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20015**

Under Contract No. EDH-I-00-05-00029-00/Task Order AID-OAA-TO-10-00010

October 2011

This report was made possible by the American People through the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). The contents of this report are the sole responsibility of Creative Associates International and do not necessarily reflect the views of USAID or the United States Government.

DEC Submission Requirements

a.	USAID Award Number	Contract No. EDH-I-00-05-00029-00 Task Order AID-OAA-TO-10-00010
b.	USAID Objective Title	Investing in People (IIP)
c.	USAID Project Title	USAID Asia and Middle East Regional School Dropout Prevention Pilot (SDPP) Program
d.	USAID Program Area and Program Element	Education (program area 3.2) Basic Education (program element 3.2.1)
e.	Descriptive Title	Summary Annual Progress Report: October 1, 2010 – September 30, 2011
f.	Author Name(s)	Karen Tietjen
g.	Contractor name	Creative Associates International, Inc. 5301 Wisconsin Avenue, NW, Suite 700 Washington, DC 20015 Telephone: 202 966 5804 Fax: 202 363 4771 Contact: KarenT@creativcdc.com
h.	Sponsoring USAID Operating Unit and COTR	AME/ME/TS Rebecca Adams, COTR
i.	Date of Publication	October 30, 2011
j.	Language of Document	English

Table of Contents

Acronyms	ii
Activity Summary	iii
Executive Summary	1
I. Project Overview, Rationale and Strategy	2
II. Progress toward Results and Requirements and Activities Undertaken	3
A. Result/CLIN 1: Elements of Successful Student Dropout Prevention Programs Identified	3
B. Result/CLIN 2: Risk Factors and Conditions that Increase the Likelihood of Students Dropping Out of School in the Pilot Countries Identified	5
C. Result/CLIN 3: The Effectiveness of Education Interventions in Reducing School Dropout Rates Determined in Each Pilot Country	12
III. Project Management and Operations	14
A. Operations	14
B. Key Meetings with USAID and Partners	17
C. Staff Actions	24
D. Consultants	25
E. Staff and Consultant International Travel	27
F. Procurements	28
IV. Status of Contract Deliverables	29
V. Monitoring and Evaluation	30
VI. Challenges and Actions Taken	30
VII. Major Activities Planned for Next Quarter	32
VIII. Accrued Expenditures	32
Appendix 1. Media Coverage of SDPP, FY 2011	33
Appendix 2. Country Assessment Timetable	34
Appendix 3. Materials for In-Country Assessment Training	35
Appendix 4. Agenda: School Dropout Intervention Consultation Workshop	36

Acronyms

ADB	Asian Development Bank
AM	Activity Manager
AME	Asia and Middle East Bureau
CARE	CARE/Timor Leste
CBO	Community-Based Organization
CLIN	Contract Line Item Number (USAID)
COTR	Contracting Officer's Technical Representative (USAID)
DEC	Development Experience Clearinghouse
DED	District Education Director
DISE	District Information System of Education
ESDP III	3 rd Education Sector Development Plan (Cambodia)
EMIS	Education Management Information System
FTI	Fast Track Initiative
FY	Fiscal Year
HQ	Headquarters
IDEAL	Institute for Development, Education, and Learning
IIP	Investing in People
KAPE	Kampuchean Action for Primary Education
LOA	Letter of Authorization
LOC	Letter of Cooperation
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MHRD	Ministry of Human Resource Development
MOE	Ministry of Education
MOEYS	Ministry of Education, Youth and Sport
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MPR	Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
NA	Not Applicable
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
POE	Provincial Office of Education
QUEST	Quality Education and Skills Training
RED	Regional Education Director
RTE	Right to Education
SDPP	School Dropout Prevention Pilot Program
SES	Selected Educational Statistics
SSA	<i>Sarva Shiksha Abhiyaan</i> (India)
STS	School-to-School International
STTA	Short Term Technical Assistance
TCN	Third Country National
TOR	Terms of Reference
U.S.	United States
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

Activity Summary

Lead Implementing Partner:	Creative Associates International, Inc. (Creative)
Other Implementing Partners:	Mathematica Policy Research (Mathematica) School-to-School International (STS) Kampuchean Action for Primary Education (KAPE) Institute for Development, Education, and Learning (IDEAL) CARE/Timor Leste (CARE)
Activity Name:	USAID Asia and Middle East Regional School Dropout Prevention Pilot (SDPP) Program
Activity Objective:	The School Dropout Prevention Pilot (SDPP) Program's objective is to provide evidence-based programming guidance to USAID missions and countries in Asia and the Middle East on student dropout prevention in primary and secondary school by piloting and testing the effectiveness of dropout prevention interventions in four target countries: Cambodia, India, Tajikistan and Timor Leste.
USAID Program Objective:	Investing in People (IIP)
Life of Activity:	September 27, 2010 – September 29, 2013
Total Estimated Contract/Agreement Amount:	\$51,504,754
Obligations to date:	\$51,504,754
Accrued Expenditures 4 th Quarter (July-Sept 2011):	\$1,371,227
Activity Cumulative Accrued Expenditures to Date (Fiscal Year 2011):	\$3,484,300
Estimated Expenditures Next Quarter:	\$1,832,728

Executive Summary

The School Dropout Prevention Pilot (SDPP) Program is a three-year program, funded by the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), aimed at mitigating student dropout from primary and secondary school. Its objective is to provide evidence-based programming guidance to USAID missions and countries in Asia and the Middle East on student dropout prevention by piloting and testing the effectiveness of dropout prevention interventions in Cambodia, India, Tajikistan, and Timor Leste.

SDPP's three-stage applied research approach includes 1) identifying best practices in dropout prevention in the U.S. and developing countries (Result/CLIN 1); 2) identifying those groups, grades and/or geographic areas most severely affected by dropout and analyzing the risk factors and conditions affecting dropout (Result/CLIN 2); and 3) designing, implementing, and evaluating pilot interventions to keep at-risk students in the most acutely affected areas in school (Result/CLIN 3).

During its first year, SDPP operations started up successfully at headquarters (HQ) and in the four pilot countries, despite delays experienced in introducing and receiving official, in-country approvals for the project. Subcontracts were negotiated and signed between Creative Associates International and five U.S.- and field-based subcontractors, each of whom completed recruitment of their staff and, for the field partners, also established and equipped head office and project site offices. The exception was India, where due to subcontracting issues and a lengthy government approval process, project site selection and operational start-up were delayed until the fourth quarter.

Startup delays affected the implementation of activities according to the project's year one work plan; nevertheless, significant progress was made during the year under each of the three Result/CLIN areas, as follows:

Result/CLIN 1: A comprehensive review of the U.S. and international literature on dropout prevention research and programming was conducted, and a report was written, reviewed, and approved by USAID. The report provides a profile of those at risk of dropout and describes the types and effectiveness of evaluated dropout prevention programs, with recommendations for implications for SDPP. During the fourth quarter, the report was translated into five local languages and printed. Distribution of the report is under way and will continue as key findings from the report are presented in each country early in fiscal year (FY) 2012, as a key part of the process of selecting and designing SDPP interventions.

Result/CLIN 2: Dropout data trends analyses were completed in all four countries, allowing SDPP and its stakeholders to frame the magnitude of the dropout problem and to identify the locations and grades most acutely affected in each country. Detailed reports on research conducted on the policies and programs in each country affecting dropout were also completed and approved by USAID. The trends analyses and policies/programs inventories were translated into local languages in the fourth quarter and will also serve to inform the selection and design of interventions. Primary research on dropout among the targeted grades in the selected project sites was completed in Tajikistan, Cambodia and Timor Leste and was started in India. Data was collected from nearly 4,400 respondents in and around 95 schools in the first three countries; in India, during quarter four, a research team was assembled, sample schools were selected, and initial data was collected from 32 schools.

Result/CLIN 3: In all four countries, key stakeholders have been identified to serve on pilot coordination bodies, and government focal point persons and departments have been named. During the fourth quarter, planning for the upcoming, in-country consultation and design workshops was completed, including a detailed analysis of the key outcomes from the review of worldwide experience with dropout prevention programming and the country-specific assessments, review of contractual parameters and statistical power calculations, and preparation of presentations and other materials. The workshops will be the venue at which the dropout prevention interventions for each country will be identified and designed, together with plans for monitoring and evaluating the impact of the interventions.

I. Project Overview, Rationale and Strategy

For the past two decades, children's access to basic education has been the major focus of national and international education development efforts. However, as more children enroll in school, but fail to complete it, school dropout has become recognized as a major educational challenge both in developed and developing countries. Although the pattern of dropout varies by country, the result is the same: increasing numbers of under-educated and unemployable youth. Reducing dropout is key to improving access to basic education, particularly in countries with relatively high enrollment rates where most school-age children who do not currently attend school have previously been enrolled in school.

The School Dropout Prevention Pilot (SDPP) Program is a three-year multi-country program, funded by the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), aimed at mitigating student dropout from primary and secondary school. Its objective is to provide evidence-based programming guidance to USAID missions and countries in Asia and the Middle East (AME) on student dropout prevention by piloting and testing the effectiveness of dropout prevention interventions in four target countries: Cambodia, India, Tajikistan and Timor Leste. Using multiple channels, including a web-based platform, SDPP will build a community of practice, sharing information and feedback on intervention design, research methodologies, and results. It will also produce practical and accessible guidance and models for designing, implementing and assessing drop-out prevention programs in primary and secondary school.

SDPP will advance knowledge on dropout prevention programs through an applied research approach. In a three-stage process, it will:

1. Identify best practices in dropout prevention in the U.S. and developing countries (Result/CLIN 1).
2. Identify existing policies and programs in each country designed to prevent or reduce student dropout and analyze dropout trends to identify the groups, grades and geographic areas most severely affected by dropout. SDPP will conduct a situational analysis in the target area and among the most affected groups in order to understand the risk factors and conditions affecting dropout (Result/CLIN 2).
3. Design, implement and evaluate interventions to keep at-risk students in schools in the most acutely affected areas. There are no preconceived interventions to reduce dropout prescribed by the project; design will be tailored to fit the needs of the target group in each country, based on the situational analysis and informed by promising interventions noted in the literature review. However, SDPP will not fund school construction, subsidies/incentives, general teacher training, vocational education, or workforce development activities. SDPP will rigorously assess the effectiveness and replicability of the pilot project interventions to provide state-of-the-art information on which dropout prevention strategies work (and those that do not), using randomized control trials and/or quasi-experimental designs and combining quantitative and qualitative methods (Result/CLIN 3).

SDPP is implemented by Creative Associates International with international partners Mathematica Policy Research (Mathematica) and School-to-School International (STS), and local partners Kampuchean Action for Primary Education (KAPE) in Cambodia, Institute for Development, Education, and Learning (IDEAL) in India, and CARE in Timor Leste. With technical guidance from Creative's SDPP headquarters, implementing partners in the target countries will implement the SDPP program, working with the government and key stakeholders to identify the project target group and site, design interventions, and assess effectiveness.

II. Progress toward Results and Requirements and Activities Undertaken

A. Result/CLIN 1: Elements of Successful Student Dropout Prevention Programs Identified

Programs or interventions from around the world which have been evaluated for their effectiveness in reducing dropout have been identified in order to help determine programming recommendations for the four pilot countries and to inform the selection and design of interventions in each country. The review of existing U.S. and international research on dropout prevention also provides critical information regarding dropout to USAID and its partners in the AME region.

Requirement 1.1: Conduct Identification and Analysis of U.S. and International Evidence-Based Student Dropout Prevention Programs and Interventions

During the first and second quarters, under the coordination of consultant Lorie Brush, the SDPP team at headquarters and field levels researched and assembled literature, research studies, and project references on dropouts, absenteeism and/or retention. A variety of channels were used, including searches of the internet, library journals, and websites of institutions that deal with education and specifically with dropouts (e.g. What Works Clearinghouse), and direct contact with organizations that implement or evaluate international projects related to dropout, researchers, and international funding agencies that support education programs.

Relevant studies and information were reviewed, synthesized and summarized according to a standardized format. The research uncovered a total of 26 dropout prevention programs that met stringent research criteria, including topic/outcome relevance, timeframe relevance, sample relevance, and research design relevance. An additional eight programs were identified which met some, but not all, of these criteria. The literature search also yielded a clear picture of the general characteristics of children who drop out of school in both developed and developing countries.

Identification of additional, relevant research on dropout prevention programming will continue throughout the project life, with updates made as necessary on the project website and/or in the literature review report. Preliminary findings were presented to the USAID team in charge of SDPP oversight (Rebecca Adams, Chris Capacci-Carneal and Meghan Mattern) in November 2010.

All four standards under Requirement 1.1 have been met.

Standards Achieved:

- ✓ Plan for conducting the identification and analysis provided within thirty days after award.
- ✓ Plan for identification and analysis includes methodology and criteria to identify effective evidence-based programs and interventions for preventing student dropout.
- ✓ Identification and analysis includes a review of at least fifteen programs or interventions.
- ✓ A synthesis of effective interventions that can be adapted to the pilot countries.

Requirement 1.2: Produce Report on U.S. and International Evidence-Based Student Dropout Prevention Programming

The results of the literature review were synthesized into a school dropout prevention and analysis report that includes (1) a profile and characteristics of children and youth at risk of dropout, (2) a typology of interventions mitigating dropout, (3) case studies of the 26 intervention evaluations that meet rigorous research criteria and the eight intervention evaluations met some of these criteria, including estimated costs associated with the interventions, and (4) a set of recommendations for the SDPP program. The report was reviewed by SDPP headquarters and field partners, USAID/Washington, and USAID Activity

Managers in all four pilot countries. After incorporating feedback, the report was submitted and approved by USAID in the second quarter. A total of 280 copies of the report in English were printed.

All six standards under Requirement 1.2 have been met.

Standards Achieved:

- ✓ Draft report submitted within thirty (30) days after completion of analysis.
- ✓ Report includes an executive summary, which succinctly profiles specific interventions, combinations of interventions and or programs that have demonstrated student dropout prevention.
- ✓ Report includes estimated costs associated with each intervention or program associated with positive results.
- ✓ Report includes a conclusion as to which interventions/programs are most convincing and make the greatest contribution to the understanding of student dropout prevention.
- ✓ Report is grammatically correct and contains no spelling or punctuation errors.
- ✓ Minimum of two hundred (200) reports packaged.

Requirement 1.3: Distribute Report on U.S. and International Evidence-Based Student Dropout Prevention Programming

The electronic version of the final English report was distributed during the third quarter to USAID/Washington, to each of the four USAID Missions in the pilot countries, and to the in-country implementing partners of SDPP. A total of 196 English reports were distributed to the pilot countries, including 100 during quarter four. Distribution of the hard copies to host country representatives, the USAID Missions, and other key stakeholders began during the fourth quarter in all four countries, in accordance with distribution lists drafted by the field partners and reviewed with their Activity Managers at USAID. Additional copies will be distributed during the design consultation workshops in the coming quarter.

During the fourth quarter, field offices completed translating the report into Khmer, Tajik and Russian¹, and Portuguese and Tetun (for Cambodia, Tajikistan, and Timor Leste, respectively), printed reports, and began distribution. In Cambodia, distribution to Provincial Office of Education and District Office of Education representatives took place at a meeting to update education officials on the progress of the SDPP project (in Pursat province). Distribution will continue in coordination with the design workshops next quarter.

The three standards under Requirement 1.3 have all been partially achieved.

Standards Partially Achieved:

- ✓ Minimum of two-hundred (200) total hard copy reports distributed to USAID pilot missions, and the AME Regional Bureau in English.
- ✓ Minimum of fifty (50) hard copy reports distributed to each of the four (4) USAID pilot missions and the respective host country representatives and key stakeholders in the official languages of the country.
- ✓ Report, in English, distributed to intended recipients within thirty (30) days after TO COTR approval.

¹ Translation into Russian was added at the request of the USAID/Tajikistan Activity Manager.

Requirement 1.4: Present Findings of the Analysis

A PowerPoint presentation summarizing the key findings from the report was finalized during the fourth quarter. Presentations of key findings will be incorporated into the in-country design consultation workshops scheduled during the October – December quarter. As such, none of the standards for Requirement 1.4 were completed during the year.

Standards Not Yet Achieved:

- A minimum of five (5) presentations total on report findings made to USAID AME Regional Bureau, USAID pilot missions and host country representatives and key stakeholders.
- Presentations include all key findings.
- Presentations include a power point that summarizes findings.

B. Result/CLIN 2: Risk Factors and Conditions that Increase the Likelihood of Students Dropping Out of School in the Pilot Countries Identified

In-depth assessments of the risk factors and conditions that influence school dropout were completed in three of the four pilot countries during the year (Cambodia, Tajikistan, and Timor Leste). The assessment in India was under way at the end of the year. In each country, this effort involved three main components, including analyzing national data on dropout trends; identifying existing policies and programs designed to prevent or reduce student dropout; and conducting field-based, primary research on dropout in the geographic areas and with the target populations and grades that pilot project interventions will address. The assessments will provide the SDPP team, USAID Missions, and the respective host governments in the pilot countries with key analytical information to assist with discussions about future programming.

Requirement 2.1: Identify Assessment Tools

Development of tools to be used in conducting primary research on dropout in the four pilot countries was undertaken in several stages over the first three quarters. As a first step, SDPP’s research team at HQ and in the field worked to identify already-existing data collection instruments related to student dropout available from USAID and through the international community. The team reviewed the documentation amassed for the literature review and searched the internet to locate references to other studies that were likely to have used relevant instruments. Publication lists and project literature at USAID, the World Bank, UNICEF, UNESCO and other groups involved in dropout-related research, as well as international surveys such as the Demographic Health Survey, the Living Standards Measurement Survey, Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), and Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS), were also consulted and yielded relevant instruments. Education researchers, donors and implementers in the SDPP pilot countries were also contacted for recommendations.

All of the instruments or tools identified were reviewed for their relevance to the factors generally considered related to student dropout. An inventory was compiled, indicating the source and country or region of origin of each instrument or tool and categorizing each in terms of the factors that it assesses, the instrument type, its intended respondents, its administrators, and its application and relevance to the SDPP country assessment.² The inventory served as a source of information for the development of instruments for conducting the in-depth SDPP assessments (and will also serve as a reference for others studying school dropout). While none of the instruments were appropriate for use in their entirety or “as

² Although a “non-deliverable,” the tool inventory was submitted to the COTR in March.

is” for SDPP’s assessments, many of them included questions and informed areas of inquiry that SDPP was able to assimilate into the instruments which the project developed for this research.

A total of nine data collection instruments, including a school data capture tool and questionnaires for use with at-risk students, dropouts, parents or guardians of at-risk students, parents or guardians of drop-outs, teachers, school administrators, local education officials, and school-focused community group members, were developed. The “core” instruments were developed jointly by Creative, Mathematica and STS. They were sent to SDPP field offices in Cambodia, Tajikistan, and Timor Leste first for review, revisions, and customizing for local circumstances in preparation for the data collection which took place in those countries during the third quarter. In the fourth quarter, the instruments were sent to the SDPP team in India, who also reviewed and made minor adaptations to suit the India context. A list of the assessment tools and the factors they address (“Inventory of Instruments for the Situational Analysis”) was compiled, submitted to USAID/Washington in April, and approved by the COTR.

The nine instruments were translated into Khmer (Cambodia), Tajik (Tajikistan), and Tetun (Timor Leste) and pre-tested during data collector training in the third quarter in these three countries. During the fourth quarter, the instruments were translated into Hindi for use in India. As was the case in the other three countries, minor additional modifications to some questionnaires were made in India during training and after conducting the pre-test.

In addition to the data collection instruments and data entry system, the following supportive tools were also developed and, where necessary, translated into local languages: instructions for conducting pre-visits to schools, team leader instructions, instructions for local assistants to be used at each school to help identify respondents and make other survey preparations, respondent sample sheets and instructions (for selecting at-risk students and dropouts), parental consent forms, government letters of permission, protocols and interview guides for each instrument, school visit document handling form, document inventory form, document management protocol, questionnaire tracking spreadsheet, document management checklist, and a set of over 50 training materials, including instructions on confidentiality, informed consent, research ethics and protocol, and instructions on how to conduct interviews with different respondent groups, such as at-risk students, girls and women (see Appendix 3).

All standards under Requirement 2.1 have been met.

Standards Achieved:

- ✓ List of assessment tools for each of the four (4) countries that indicate the subset of core tools for all countries.
- ✓ Each proposed assessment tool specifies the factor(s) it assesses.

Requirement 2.2: Conduct an In-depth Assessment of Student Dropout Issues and Trends in each of the Four Pilot Countries

To ensure that pilot projects address the most critical academic and social pressures that influence dropout in each of the four pilot countries, SDPP conducted in-depth assessments in each country to identify children or youth who are most vulnerable to dropping out of school; determine the reasons for dropout in the most affected areas; and assess the effects of existing policies and/or programs designed to prevent or reduce student dropout rates. Progress made towards completing the in-depth assessments during the year is as described below, summarized under each of the three major tasks: (1) analysis of dropout trends, (2) policy and program analysis, and (3) on-site primary research that profiles children at risk of dropping out and the factors and conditions affecting dropout.

Analysis of Dropout Trends: Working from guidelines developed during the first quarter, SDPP field staff identified in-country data sources and worked with Ministry of Education (MOE) counterparts to compile recent data on enrollment, dropout, promotion, survival, completion, repetition, and/or transition rates. Staff from Creative and the other US-based SDPP subcontractors supported the in-country work on the trend analyses through site visits (to India by Creative and Mathematica, to Timor Leste by STS, and to Cambodia and Tajikistan by Creative). Field visits to candidate project sites for further data collection and consultations with local authorities and community members supplemented the data analysis work in Cambodia and India (by local partners KAPE and QUEST, respectively).

By the end of the second quarter, the trend analyses had resulted in the identification of the geographic areas, groups, and grades most severely affected by dropout in each country. Final selection of the project sites and target grades and populations was undertaken in close coordination with government representatives and USAID in each country, taking into account other important considerations such as patterns of migration, security, accessibility, receptivity of national and local authorities, and presence of similar initiatives by others. In India and Tajikistan, briefing papers were prepared and discussed with government as part of the selection process, and in Cambodia and Tajikistan the site selections played an important role in the development of formal project agreements.

In the fourth quarter, a proposal was submitted to the Bihar Education Project Council, State Project Director, *Sarva Shiksha Abhiyaan (SSA)*, making a case for the selection of one of two districts in Bihar state, based on District Information System of Education (DISE) data and Selected Educational Statistics (SES) from the Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD) on dropout, promotion, survival and transition rates. In September, a letter of authorization from the Bihar State government approving SDPP work in Samastipur district was received.

Final site selection³ and target grades in the four countries have been determined as follows:

<i>Country</i>	<i>Project Site</i>	<i>Target Grade(s)</i>
Cambodia	Battambang, Banteay Meanchey and Pursat provinces	Grades 7-9
India	Samastipur district, Bihar State	Grade 5
Tajikistan	Baljuvon, Temurmaliq (Sovet), and Vose districts, Khatlon region	Grade 9
Timor Leste	Bobonaro, Ermera, and Liquica districts	Grades 4-6

Reports on the data trends analyses have been completed for Cambodia, Tajikistan, and Timor Leste and drafted for India. The reports, which frame the magnitude of the dropout problem and identify the locations, groups and grades that are most acutely affected by dropout in each country, were finalized during the fourth quarter after review by in-country SDPP staff and updating as needed to account for new information or data which became available during the quarter. In Cambodia, feedback on the report from the Department of Planning, Ministry of Education, Youth and Sport (MOEYS), was also incorporated into the final report. In Tajikistan, additional information was obtained from the national MOE as well as from the three District Education Directors and some of the heads of schools in the targeted districts during the fourth quarter.

³ Power calculations were revised in late September, indicating that more schools than originally thought will be required. Additional provinces will be added to reach the specified number of schools.

Translation of the trend analysis reports was also carried out during the fourth quarter in Cambodia (Khmer), Tajikistan (Tajik and Russian), and Timor Leste (Tetun and Portuguese).

Policy and Program Analysis: Through the first three quarters of the year, each SDPP field office researched and compiled information on government policies or institutionalized practices of government that may have a positive or negative effect on dropout in their country, including those which may improve retention or deal with other factors associated with dropout, such as overage and absenteeism. In addition, field staff gathered information on past or current government or non-governmental programs with potential for influencing dropout, including details on the objectives, target groups, and reported effect of the program on dropout, where available. In gathering the required information, field staff consulted with the MOE, UN agencies, other non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and/or donor agencies and conducted internet searches for relevant web sites.

Creative HQ staff and a consultant (Brush) compiled the information provided by each field office into a report detailing the relevant policies and programs and evaluating implications for SDPP programming. The report was submitted to USAID/Washington and forwarded to USAID Missions in the pilot countries. Comments from the field were incorporated into a final version of the document during the fourth quarter. The consolidated inventory with information from all four countries was submitted to USAID/Washington and approved in July. From this report, four individual country reports were also prepared and translated (into Khmer, Tajik, Russian, Tetun, and Portuguese) during the fourth quarter. The final consolidated report and the individual country reports were distributed electronically to USAID/Washington and to the four USAID Missions.

On-Site Primary Research: A research plan describing the key research questions, primary research approach and methods, the sampling frame and size, instruments and tools to be developed, and detailed timeline for research preparation, training, data collection and data analysis, was developed by Creative, Mathematica, and STS with input from USAID and the implementing partners during the first two quarters of the year. The plan was finalized, submitted to USAID, and approved during the third quarter. By agreement with USAID, one overall plan was developed, with a few minor, country-specific adaptations and with country-specific timelines, rather than four individual country plans.

The primary research exercise was completed during the third and fourth quarters in Tajikistan, Cambodia and Timor Leste and had begun in India by the end of the fourth quarter (see below). In all four countries, preparations for the research included compiling lists of eligible schools for the sampling frame and sample selection; obtaining government permission and authorization letters for the data collection activity; hiring data collectors (team leaders and members) and data entry staff; procuring training facilities; lining up practice schools and respondents for instrument pretest and training activities; arranging for field transport; and setting up data entry stations. A timeline of the main assessment activities carried out in each country is provided in Appendix 2.

The assessments were initiated in Cambodia, Tajikistan, and Timor Leste with pre-visits to each of the 30 schools randomly selected from among the schools with target grade populations in the identified project sites. During the one-day pre-visits, Team Leaders and Field Supervisors collected basic data from each school, made observations of the facilities, conducted headcounts, and selected local assistants responsible for identifying respondents for the data collection exercise.

Three sets of training were held in each country to build research skills and ensure adequate understanding of the SDPP research processes, methods, and materials. One- to two-day trainings were held for implementing partner staff and team leaders in conducting the school pre-visits. Six-day trainings⁴ for data collectors, team leaders, field supervisors, and (in Cambodia and Timor Leste) data entry personnel, were also conducted, facilitated jointly by Creative, Mathematica, STS, and implementing partner staff. These trainings served to familiarize research teams with the SDPP project,

⁴ Five days for all personnel, a sixth day for team leaders and field supervisors alone.

the research design, purpose and approach, and the survey instruments, as well as to build skills in using the instruments and methods of interviewing. Instruments were refined based on feedback provided during the training and during field-testing of the instruments. Up to three days of training for the personnel responsible for entering data was also facilitated in each country by SDPP field staff responsible for database management and/or by SDPP Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)/Research Specialists.

Data collection was conducted by teams of trained interviewers, each coordinated and supervised by a team leader, usually drawn from among SDPP implementing partner staff or other experienced, outside personnel. On average, two days were spent by a team at each school, administering questionnaires to the eight identified target groups. The number of respondents reached in each country is as shown in the table below.

Table 1: Primary Research Respondents, by Country

Respondent	Tajikistan	Cambodia	Timor Leste	Total
At-risk students	304	291	358	953
Dropouts	299	288	300	887
Parents/guardians of at-risk students	306	291	358	955
Parents/guardians of dropouts	299	294	318	911
Teachers	150	146	158	454
School administrators	30	30	35	95
Local education officers	3	17	3	23
Community group members	30	30	35	95

Data from these three countries was entered locally by the trained data entry personnel, using data entry systems developed by Mathematica. Mathematica developed the data entry systems for each of the nine data collection instruments (including a verification system for ensuring data quality), customized the system with local language headings, prepared instructions to guide local data entry personnel in entering and uploading questionnaire data to the secure transfer site, and provided trouble shooting support and ongoing technical assistance to modify the database as needed after data entry began. During the fourth quarter, Mathematica received data files from each country, cleaned, recoded, and labeled the data files, and presented the data for analysis in a series of country-specific data tables. Analysis of the data was undertaken as part of the preparation for next quarter's intervention design workshops (see section C. Expected Result/CLIN 3).

The primary research process was initiated during the fourth quarter in India. A request for proposals was issued by the SDPP India team in order to identify an experienced research organization capable of carrying out data collection and entry. After screening proposals from eight organizations, the team identified and contracted SUNAI, a local, Patna-based consultancy firm to carry out the data collection and entry, under the supervision of IDEAL and Creative. SUNAI organized a 50-person research team including field supervisors, eight teams of data collectors and team leaders, and data entry clerks.

A database of upper-primary schools (grades 1-8) was compiled from DISE data and 30 schools were randomly selected for inclusion in the sample, based on different criteria including size and location (urban versus rural). As was the case in the other three countries, government counterparts facilitated access to schools through letters of authorization; in the case of India, the district Nodal Officer sent a letter to all the Block Education Extension Officers and headmasters at selected schools to notify them of the activity and ensure their cooperation.

After a one-day training for 10 team leaders and supervisors, the team travelled across 14 blocks of Samastipur district to identify at-risk and dropout children from these schools. Due to recent initiatives by the Indian government to reduce dropout, fewer than expected numbers of at-risk and dropout children in the targeted grade (grade 5) were found at these schools, so the team expanded the potential sample to include grade 4 and those who had dropped out longer than one year ago, and visited an expanded number of schools. By quarter's end, 80 schools had been visited in India in order to identify those with adequate numbers of dropouts and at-risk students; 32 were selected as the final sample for data collection (and a list of 13 schools was compiled as replacement schools).

In addition to identifying schools with sufficient numbers of target respondents, the pre-visits also allowed the team to collect specific information on school functioning and facilities and to establish a schedule for data collection, which will begin in October 2011. During the pre-visits, the team also identified local assistants in these schools who will be responsible for follow-up with the respondents on their availability during the data collection period. Most of the local assistants are either teachers or headmasters; however in some schools community members were identified for this role.

With the initiation of the in-depth assessment in India during the fourth quarter, all standards under Requirement 2.2 have been met.

Standards Achieved:

- ✓ Draft plan for implementing in-depth assessment developed for each of the four (4) pilot countries within two (2) months after award.
- ✓ Four (4) individual pilot country assessment plans submitted within fifteen (15) days after approval of drafts.
- ✓ In-depth assessments initiated within each of the four (4) pilot countries no later than one (1) month after Country AM/TO COTR approval.
- ✓ Inventory of existing government policies and programs of government, NGOs and community-based organizations (CBOs) that may affect dropout rates and that may be considered as interventions to test in Result 3 compiled.

Requirement 2.3: Produce Report of In-Depth Pilot Country Assessments

In order to help USAID, host country governments, and other stakeholders in the pilot countries and the AME region gain a clearer understanding of dropout factors and trends, key findings from the country assessments will be documented and shared widely. Reports on two of the major components of the assessments—the trend analysis and the inventory of existing policies and programs—have been completed, as described above (the India trend analysis report is in final draft form).

Initial summary reports providing an overview of the primary research methodologies and results from each country except India were prepared in the fourth quarter in preparation for the design consultation workshops. SDPP will continue the preparation of these reports and begin drafting India's report in the coming quarter.

One Standard under Requirement 2.3 was achieved; the other four standards related to the writing of in-depth country assessment reports were partially achieved.

Standards Partially Achieved:

- ✓ In-depth country assessment results identify grade-levels and student populations most at risk of dropping out for each of the four pilot countries

Standards Partially Achieved:

- ✓ Four (4) in-depth country assessment draft reports written within two (2) months after the completion of the country assessments.
- ✓ One (1) report with country comparisons.
- ✓ All four (4) reports adhere to a uniform organizational format.
- ✓ Written reports are grammatically correct, without spelling or punctuation errors.

Requirement 2.4: Present Findings of In-Depth Pilot Country Assessments

A major activity during the fourth quarter was the preparation of presentations on the assessment findings, which will serve to ensure widespread understanding and acceptance of the findings and to facilitate discussion around and broad support for programming options for the pilot interventions. For each of the three countries for which data from the in-depth assessments became available during the quarter, tailored power point presentations were developed which summarize the key findings and their implications for programming in the particular context of the country. Presentations were also developed which summarized key findings from the trend analysis and the inventory of policies and programs in each country. These will be presented to large groups of stakeholders—including the ministries of education, province and district education authorities, school personnel, and representatives of donor agencies, NGOs and projects—in Cambodia, Tajikistan and Timor Leste as part of the intervention design consultation workshops planned for the first quarter in FY2012.

Three standards under Requirement 2.4 were achieved and one partially achieved; three standards are not yet achieved.

Standards Achieved:

- ✓ Four (4) country tailored power point presentations.
- ✓ Presentations on in-depth country assessments include all risk factors and trends identified for each of the four (4) countries.
- ✓ Presentations include at least two (2) recommendations for possible programming to mitigate student dropout for each of the four (4) pilot countries.

Standards Partially Achieved:

- ✓ Presentations on in-depth country assessments include a summary of findings for each of the four (4) country assessments.

Standards Not Yet Achieved:

- One (1) power point presentation including all countries.
- A minimum of five (5) presentations on the in-depth country assessment findings made to pilot country stakeholders, including USAID mission personnel and Washington personnel.
- A minimum of four (4) workshops held to discuss country findings and possible programming options.

Requirement 2.5: Translate and Distribute In-Depth Pilot Country Assessment Report

As described above, two components of the assessment reports – the trend analysis and the inventory on policies and programs – were translated into the official languages of the pilot countries during the fourth quarter, as follows: Khmer (Cambodia), Tajik and Russian (Tajikistan), and Tetun and Portuguese (Timor Leste). Though not required by the Task Order, it is expected that some portions at least of the report for India will also be translated into Hindi, in order to provide wider access to the findings in that country.

The workshop presentations described above were in process of being translated at quarter's end.

One of the four standards under Requirement 2.5 (*Each country assessment report translated into the official languages of the pilot countries*) was partially achieved. As planned, the full report will be developed after the design consultation workshops.

C. Result/CLIN 3: The Effectiveness of Education Interventions in Reducing School Dropout Rates Determined in Each Pilot Country

Building on findings from Results/CLINs 1 and 2, SDPP will develop and pilot dropout prevention projects in each of the four pilot countries, incorporating interventions that show promise in addressing identified academic and social pressures shown to influence dropout, as well as gender considerations where needed. Rigorous research designs will allow for measurement of intervention effectiveness. By the end of the pilots, SDPP will have identified achievements and failures, described lessons learned, suggested possible models for replication in other countries, and made recommendations for dropout prevention programming in Asia and the Middle East. Guidance and toolkits on evidence-based school dropout prevention programming, including best practices, requisite conditions and estimated cost, will be prepared and distributed.

Requirement 3.1: Establish Pilot Country Coordination Bodies for the SDPP Program

Throughout the first year of the project, SDPP worked to identify the most appropriate mechanisms for establishing pilot coordination bodies in each country. During initial visits to the countries to introduce the project, key stakeholders and existing task forces or working groups were identified. The process of identifying stakeholders and assessing the suitability of identified existing groups to serve as the coordinating bodies continued through the year as SDPP offices and staff became established and as work under the first two CLINs progressed. In all four countries, contacts were established with several organizations to formally introduce the key project staff and the project, particularly among those with strong links to the potential coverage area.

Interest in participating on a coordinating body was expressed by numerous stakeholders in all four countries, but as SDPP activities and discussions with host governments progressed in the countries, it began to appear less likely that a single, static coordination body or consultative group would be established. Instead, governments and other stakeholders have expressed preference for more flexible arrangements which allow different representatives to attend, depending on interest, expertise and availability. Key stakeholders who may contribute to meeting the aims of the coordination bodies have been identified in each country and will be called to participate as an initial step in the design consultation workshops to be held in the coming quarter. In Cambodia, terms of reference (TOR) for a coordination body were drafted, using the TOR for two other existing education-focused working groups as a guide.

Particular effort was made by SDPP partners to develop close working partnerships with the respective MOEs and to keep them apprised of the key SDPP activities, particularly those related to the assessment processes. In all four countries, official focal point persons and/or departments have been named by the respective MOEs. This includes the MOEYS Planning Department in Cambodia, the Bihar Education Project Council State Project Director and a Nodal Officer in Samastipur district in India, the Deputy

Minister of Education and the Senior Specialist of Secondary Schools in Tajikistan, and the MOE Director of Planning and Development in Timor Leste.

The primary research activity in all four countries involved representatives from government, as a means of facilitating the activity and also to familiarize government personnel with SDPP and promote their ownership and participation. In Cambodia, three Deputy Provincial Office of Education representatives responsible for lower secondary level education, one from each target province, were invited to join the pre-visit training, school visits, researcher training, and to provide logistical support to team leaders during the data collection. In Tajikistan, the MOE assigned the Senior Specialist of Secondary Schools department to provide support to SDPP during all phases of the assessment, including supporting the research team in introducing the project and objectives of the assessment at regional level. In Timor Leste, two MOE officials attended the training and, as in Cambodia and Tajikistan, research activities were coordinated with local education officers, provincial and district officials, school directors and other community leaders. In India, a Nodal Officer in Samastipur district was assigned to support SDPP in planning and organizing the upcoming research activities.

During the fourth quarter, regular contact with counterparts from the MOE, other key government departments, UN agencies, and NGOs involved in dropout prevention initiatives continued, including through the attendance of SDPP staff at events and meetings relevant to education and dropout in particular. Many of these meetings are highlighted in table 2 below. Some, including for example a meeting held in Battambang, Cambodia, attended by the MOEYS Secretary of State and over 50 others, were extensive efforts to keep host governments and other stakeholders informed about the project. In all four countries, site visits were made during the third and fourth quarters by SDPP staff in the target districts in order to continue building relationships at local level as well.

All five standards under Requirement 3.1 were achieved or partially achieved.

Standards Achieved:

- ✓ Stakeholders identified in each of the four (4) pilot countries that include, at a minimum, representatives from the Ministries of Education, the teacher's union (where applicable), and community representatives, PTAs or private sector.
- ✓ Areas of collaboration identified and areas of potential conflict and resolutions identified.

Standards Partially Achieved

- ✓ A SDPP project oversight body formed in each of the four (4) pilot countries.
- ✓ A communication plan developed for each of the four (4) pilot countries.
- ✓ The Coordination Body convened and a scope of work developed for its engagement in the project.

Requirement 3.2: Design Student Dropout Prevention Pilot Projects

The key outcomes from the first two project Results/CLINs, namely, the review of worldwide experience with dropout prevention programming and the detailed, country-specific assessments with most-affected populations, were analyzed in-depth during the fourth quarter in an effort to identify those interventions most likely to be effective at reducing school dropout in each country. In addition to analyzing the research data, the SDPP team also determined the relevant contractual and design parameters guiding intervention development and design, reviewed and revised statistical power calculations to determine the intervention scale, defined the approach to be undertaken in gaining consensus around the selection of interventions, and developed a set of materials to guide that process, which will center around a series of in-country consultation and design workshops scheduled for October (Cambodia), November (Tajikistan and Timor Leste), and January (India).

An agenda for the upcoming workshops was drafted and reviewed by all SDPP partners and USAID during the quarter. The final agenda, which also shows the various materials drafted to support the sessions, is included as Appendix 4. The key outcome of these workshops will be agreement on which interventions will be applied to address dropout in each location. Plans for operationalizing the interventions and for collecting the information required for monitoring and evaluating the impact of the interventions will also be drafted.

During the fourth quarter, the in-country SDPP partners began preparing for the workshops, including developing lists of participants, adapting and translating invitation letters, identifying a venue, lining up facilitators, interpreters, and translators, translating materials, designing workshop banner, procuring supplies, and making other logistical arrangements.

None of the Requirement 3.2 standards were achieved during the year.

Requirement 3.3: Develop a Monitoring and Evaluation Plan

The development of the SDPP M&E Plan is predicated on the development of each country's program of interventions. In consultation with the SDPP COTR, the M&E Plan for each country will be prepared once intervention work plans have been finalized. During quarter four, Mathematica outlined the necessary steps in the design and implementation of a rigorous impact evaluation of SDPP interventions. These steps will guide the development of the research (or evaluation) portion of the SDPP country M&E plans.

None of the Requirement 3.3 standards were achieved during the year.

The following requirements were not addressed this year:

Requirement 3.4: Launch SDPP Projects in the Four Pilot Countries

Requirement 3.5: Conduct Student Dropout Prevention Pilots in the Four Selected Countries

Requirement 3.6: Produce and Distribute Reports of the Student Dropout Prevention Pilots in the Four Selected Countries

Requirement 3.7: Present Findings of the Student Dropout Prevention Pilots

Requirement 3.8: Student Dropout Prevention Programming Guide Developed and Distributed

III. Project Management and Operations

A. Operations

In addition to supporting the programmatic and technical activities described above, SDPP operations during the first year of the project focused on a variety of start-up activities, including staffing, developing management systems and procedures, drafting and executing subcontracts with partners, establishing field offices, and introducing the project and securing support from USAID Missions and host governments in-country. In general, project start-up was slower than anticipated. Requests to travel to the pilot countries were not approved until the second quarter in three of the four countries, due to local scheduling and other challenges, and the need to reacquaint USAID Mission personnel and host government counterparts with the project due to delayed award also led to delays in signing MOUs and otherwise proceeding with critical start-up and project activities.

Key staff and consultant actions are detailed in sections C. and D.; other important operational activities are as described in detail below.

Creative HQ Start-up

In addition to staffing actions (see section C.), initial start-up activities at Creative's HQ included the following:

- A post award meeting was held at USAID to formally introduce the SDPP team (including Creative, Mathematica, and STS staff) to the USAID staff responsible for program and contract management, as well as other AME Bureau and EGAT stakeholders.
- Creative organized a series of kick-off meetings and teleconferences with its U.S. and overseas partners.
- Creative prepared briefing and publicity materials (including a PowerPoint presentation) on the SDPP program for use by USAID and local partners. Notable media events are detailed in Appendix 1.
- Creative submitted and received COTR approval for a 120-day work plan (covering project inception through the end of January 2011) and a second work plan which covered the implementation period through the end of September 2011.
- English and local-language program brands were finalized after review by USAID/Washington and the respective USAID missions. All official SDPP documents and other materials (presentations, banners) have been branded with the approved logos.
- An SDPP website is in process of being designed. The project's url was selected and approved by USAID (www.schooldropoutprevention.com). Content is being uploaded and made compliant with USAID requirements. It will serve as a channel for sharing key project outputs, exchanging experiences, and communicating important successes, lessons learned, and findings.

Subcontracts

SDPP is implemented by Creative and two international partners, Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. (Mathematica) and School-to-School International (STS), and with implementing partners Kampuchean Action for Primary Education (KAPE) in Cambodia, CARE International in Timor Leste, and the Institute for Development, Education, and Learning (IDEAL) in India (in Tajikistan, Creative is implementing SDPP activities through its own field office).

Letters of Authorization (LOA) were issued to each subcontractor (apart from IDEAL) in October so that work could begin immediately. Subcontracts were prepared and sent to each partner by the end of the first quarter, and were fully executed with Mathematica, CARE, and KAPE during the second quarter. As a result of changes in STS's fringe rate and other organizational costs, the subcontract with STS was signed early in the third quarter.

Subcontracting was delayed in India, as SDPP was unable to subcontract with its originally proposed partner, Quality Education and Skills Training (QUEST), as a result of QUEST not having acquired the necessary certification to receive foreign funding. Creative proposed and received approval from USAID to subcontract with IDEAL, but following concerns raised in-country related to a government of India service tax on contracts, signing of the subcontract was delayed while investigations into the service tax were undertaken by QUEST and IDEAL, Creative, and USAID. In the meantime, activities in India progressed with support from three QUEST employees hired as SDPP consultants, and in the fourth quarter, after resolving the service tax issue, a LOA was issued and signed with IDEAL.

Over the course of the year, limited changes to the original subcontracts became necessary, as follows:

- Agreement was reached with Mathematica regarding changes to their scope of work and level of effort under CLIN2, necessitating a budget revision and a modification to the subcontract, finalized in quarter four.

- As a result of the extended CLIN2 period, limited changes were also required to the CLIN2 budgets of KAPE and CARE. KAPE's subcontract was modified to accommodate a small increase in their CLIN2 budget (offset by a reduction in the CLIN3 budget), and to change the contract a cost reimbursable subcontract. Changes to CARE's budget were made within the bottom line amounts of the original budget and did not require subcontract modification.

Government Agreements

During the year, SDPP worked to formalize working relationships with the host country governments in each country, as described below. This process took longer than expected due to a combination of factors, including delayed formal introductions of the project and extended local review processes.

In Cambodia, a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between KAPE and the MOEYS was drafted during a first quarter visit by Creative staff to Cambodia, during which the project was introduced to USAID, the government, and other stakeholders in education. The MOU was developed with input from USAID and UNICEF and submitted to MOEYS in mid-February. After a series of reviews at the MOEYS, the MOU was signed by the Minister of Education, Youth and Sport in May.

In Tajikistan, USAID formally introduced the project to the Minister of Education in December, which allowed local staff to begin collecting and analysing national educational data in order to identify the areas of the country most impacted by dropout. This process was facilitated during a February visit by Creative HQ staff, at which time two different options for potential project sites were presented to the Minister, Deputy Minister, and other MOE staff. A letter of cooperation (LOC) between USAID and the MOE was drafted, translated into Russian and Tajik, and signed by the Minister in May.

In Timor Leste, the project was presented to the Minister of Education by the U.S. Ambassador and the USAID Country Director in January, and the MOE has agreed to support SDPP, without the need for a formal agreement. While a SDPP-specific agreement with the MOE was not required, SDPP activities will be incorporated into a forthcoming MOU between the MOE and CARE Timor-Leste covering all of CARE's operations in country.

In India, following a visit by SDPP's COTR to introduce the project and facilitate further communications with USAID and government, SDPP HQ staff visited during quarter two to introduce the project further and to pursue project approval. The team met with the Department of School Education, Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD), and, at the recommendation of MHRD, the SDPP India team met subsequently with the State Project Director for SSA Bihar state to explore the state's interest in hosting SDPP. As a result of these meetings, separate proposals for project approval were prepared for both MHRD and the Bihar Education Project Council, emphasizing the contributions of the project in supporting ongoing government education initiatives and the RTE (Right to Education) Act. The Bihar state proposal was submitted for review by the Bihar Education Council technical team. It was approved in August, and in September a letter of authorization from the Bihar State government approving SDPP work in Samastipur was issued. Visits by the SDPP India team to district education officials in Samastipur to initiate the research activity, including collecting school-level data for the district, followed immediately.

Field Offices

SDPP offices in the capital cities of each of the four countries were established, equipped, and furnished. Satellite SDPP offices were also established in Cambodia (Battambang), Tajikistan (Kulyab, Khatlon region), and Timor Leste (Maliana, Bobonaro district), and recruitment for local level project staff initiated. In Cambodia, smaller project offices in Pursat and Banteay Meanchey provinces were identified during quarter four. The office in Pursat is located in the Provincial Office of Education, Youth and Sport (POE); due to lack of space in the POE Banteay Meanchey, the office is located outside of the POE. A satellite office in Bihar state, India, will be established in the next quarter. In India, a satellite office will

be opened in Bihar state after the conclusion of data collection. In addition to the Delhi office, SDPP personnel are also based in Bangalore (at QUEST's headquarters) and in Ahmedabad (IDEAL headquarters). Additional field offices may have to be established to accommodate additional provinces if the geographic target area is expanded.

During the fourth quarter, Creative's Regional Security Manager conducted on-site safety and security assessments of the Dushanbe and Kulyob offices and conducted basic safety and security awareness training for 11 SDPP personnel as well as more extensive training with the project's designated Project Security Manager on Creative Minimum Operating Security Standards and best practices. Training covered such areas as personnel security, including location of medical facilities, facility protection and access control, including fire precautions, information/document security, information systems security, emergency planning/continuity of operations, and communications, including control of field trips and emergency incident response. As an output of the visit, a crisis response plan was developed and finalized during the quarter.

B. Key Meetings with USAID and Partners

In each of the first three quarterly reports, a detailed list was provided of the formal meetings held in Washington, DC and in the field with the client, partners or other donors at which key decisions affecting project program or operations were taken or major presentations made. Meetings held during the fourth quarter are as shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Key meetings with USAID and partners (fourth quarter)

Date(s)	Key SDPP representative(s)	Key client and/or partner representative(s)	Topic/focus of meeting	Key decisions/outcomes (if any)
<i>SDPP Headquarters/Washington</i>				
7/14/11	Jeff Davis, Thomaz Alvarez (STS); Nancy Murray, Kathy Buek (MPR); Karen Tietjen, Adam Correia, Ann Hawley, Diane Prouty, Rajani Shrestha, Jennifer Shin, Tom Ventimiglia (Creative)	NA	Debrief on research in Cambodia, Tajikistan, and Timor; update on India; status of data entry; intervention design	Scheduled follow-up meeting to review data table shells; STS to develop design workshop draft agenda; agreement on potential interventions and next steps
7/28/11	Tietjen, Prouty, Shrestha, Shin; Murray, Buek	NA	Presentation/organization of situation analysis data	Agreed on mapping of instrument items
8/16/11	Tietjen, Prouty, Hawley, Ventimiglia, Shrestha, Shin	Rebecca Adams (COTR) and Meghan Mattern, (USAID/Washington), Mavjuda Nabieva, USAID Tajikistan Education Management Specialist	Update on SDPP research, products, plans; updates from Nabieva on interactions with MOE; districts for possible expansion	

Date(s)	Key SDPP representative(s)	Key client and/or partner representative(s)	Topic/focus of meeting	Key decisions/outcomes (if any)
Multiple in August	Tietjen	Adams, Heng Sieng (USAID Cambodia SDPP Activity Manager)	SDPP status, upcoming activities, SDPP Consultative Group, AM support	Determination on how to deal with Consultative Group issue, and clarification OAM support required
9/7/11	Tietjen, Prouty, Correia, Hawley, Ventimiglia, Shrestha, Shin; Alvarez	Aakash Sethi, SDPP Project Director, IDEAL (India)	Updates on India's situational analysis, government approval process, and operational issues	Tentative situation analysis schedule determined; to issue RFP for research agency to facilitate recruitment and joint supervision of research team with IDEAL; agreement on next steps for district selection
9/15/11	Tietjen, Prouty, Correia, Hawley, Ventimiglia, Shrestha, Shin; Murray and Buek	NA	Program and operational updates, travel schedules, review of data sets, design workshop agenda, power calculations, baseline design	Draft design workshop agenda; agreement on data items to disaggregate
9/20/11	Alvarez, Buek, Shrestha	NA	Data entry software and procedures	Preparation for data entry training and supervision in India
9/28-30/11	Tietjen, Prouty, Hawley, Shin, Ventimiglia, and Wendi Carmen (Creative); Mark Lynd and Davis (STS); Buek, Murray, Larissa Campuzano, and Emilie Bagby (MPR)	Adams, Mattern	Planning for upcoming intervention design workshops; implications of intervention design (statistical power, in particular) for the impact evaluation	Finalized design workshop schedule, agenda, and workshop assignments; assigned tasks for workshop materials preparations
<i>SDPP/Cambodia</i>				
7/29/11	Chea Kosal (SDPP Country Coordinator, KAPE), Sothira Ouk, Education Specialist (KAPE)	Members of the OOSSC, including Lynn Dudley, Natasha Graham (World Bank), Peter de Vries (UNICEF), MoEYS representatives and other NGOs	Present SDPP progress and receive update on Out of School activities from other organizations	To meet with UNICEF, World Bank and MoEYS to further discuss the collaboration and coordination of SDPP with Out of School activities

Date(s)	Key SDPP representative(s)	Key client and/or partner representative(s)	Topic/focus of meeting	Key decisions/outcomes (if any)
8/10/11	Kosal, Sothira and Pharin Kuoy, Team Leader-Access to Education (KAPE)	Heng Sieng (USAID Cambodia SDPP Activity Manager) and Brad Arsenault (USAID); Peter de Vries (Chief Education Section UNICEF)	Clarification of SDPP progress report; Coordination of Dropout and Out of School activities; Government involvement and 'buy in' to ensure impact of the project continues after end of project	-UNICEF recommends use of existing government systems that are already in place, e.g. the district monitoring team (DTMTs) for monitoring and provision of technical support and guidance. - call for further meeting with all stakeholders to discuss collaboration and coordination (see meeting 8/24/11)
8/17/11	Kosal, Sothira, Pharin, and Carole Williams, M&E/Research Specialist (KAPE)	H.E Nath Bunroeun, (MoEYS), Tara Milani, USAID Deputy Director Office of Public Health and Education, Arsenault and Sieng	Update on SDPP progress and future plans, informing about the progress meeting in Pursat on 19 th August	-HE Nath Bunroeun assigned by the MoEYS Minister to open the meeting in Pursat 8/19/11 -SDPP to invite Dept of Planning, Secondary Education Dept and Teacher Training Dept to meeting on 8/19/11 -advice received from HE Nath Bunroeun on correspondence with MoEYS -call for further discussion with stakeholders working around issue of dropout for better coordination (see meeting on 8/24/11)
8/19/11	SDPP team	H.E Nath Bunroeun (MoEYS), Arsenault (USAID), UNICEF Battambang representative, POE & DOE (Battambang, Pursat & Banteay Meanchey) representatives MoEYS (54 participants)	SDPP background, its progress to date and next steps	Understanding of the SDPP project and welcoming of the project to each of the provinces and commitment for collaboration
8/24/11	Kosal, Sothira and Carole	H.E Nath Bunroeun, UNICEF, USAID, World Bank, ADB	Coordination of the various working/consultative bodies and potential for bodies to come under a re-established CFS umbrella working group	-Confirmation by MoEYS of Planning Department being the focal point for SDPP at national level for the present. -MoEYS/ESWG to discuss coordination bodies at the upcoming retreat

Date(s)	Key SDPP representative(s)	Key client and/or partner representative(s)	Topic/focus of meeting	Key decisions/outcomes (if any)
9/1/11	Sothira, Carole, Pharin and Ratha Lork, IMS Manager	Mr. Lim Sothea, Deputy Director, Planning Dept. MoEYS	Review of the Inventory of Policies and Programs, Trend Analysis for official approval	Assigned Dept of Planning representative to review the Policies & Programs and Trend Analysis and give feedback to SDPP
9/2/11	Sothira	NEP Board members	NGO input to MoEYS/ESWG retreat	NEP Board members to gather information to provide to NEP for the MoEYS/ESWG retreat including sensitive topics such as unofficial fees and high dropout rate
9/9/11	Kosal	EDUCAM members (EDUCAM is a formal network meeting of organizations working in the sector to share information)	Presentation of survey on mental health in Cambodia and survey on out of school children and those with disability in Cambodia by World Bank consultants	None
9/13-14/11	Kosal	Senior MoEYS and Development Partners including UNICEF, WB, ADB, JICA, SIDA, EU and NEP	- Midterm Review of the Education Strategic Plan (MTR of the ESP) -technical and policy dialogue - Aid effectiveness and partners, partnership principles	-MoEYS will organize a meeting with POE representatives from 24 provinces to share the result of the retreat. -Coordination bodies coming under one CFS umbrella were not clearly discussed as planned.
<i>SDPP/India</i>				
8/19/11	Aakash Sethi, Project Director, and Sushant Verma, SDPP Country Coordinator (IDEAL)	Mr. Rajesh Bhushan, IAS, State Project Director, SSA	Proposal approval	Discussion on the proposal and selection of district
8/29/11	Verma	Mr. Rajesh Bhushan, IAS, State Project Director, SSA	Proposal approval for Samastipur district	Approval of SDPP project for Samastipur district
8/29/11	Verma	Mr. Ram Sagar Singh, Programme Officer, SSA, BEPC Patna	Discussion on selection of Samastipur district	Drafting the approval letter for SDPP from State Project Director, SSA

Date(s)	Key SDPP representative(s)	Key client and/or partner representative(s)	Topic/focus of meeting	Key decisions/outcomes (if any)
8/30/11	Verma	Mr. Sanjay Kumar, District Programme Officer, SSA, Samastipur,	Introducing SDPP project	
9/09/11	Verma	Mr. Surya Deo Paswan, District Education Officer (DEO), Smastipur	Introducing SDPP project	Support for SDPP project in Samastipur district and letter to all the Block Education Officers (BEO) and School Principals in Samastipur district for data collection
9/24/11	Verma and Correia	Mr. Sanjay Kumar, District Programme Officer, SSA, Samastipur,	Introducing Creative team	Discussion related to drop out issues in Samastipur district
<i>SDPP/Tajikistan</i>				
Several meetings, August and Sept	Gulguncha Naimova, SDPP Country Coordinator, Zarina Bazidova, SDPP M&E/Research Specialist, Sayora Abdunazarova, SDPP Education Specialist	Muhammad, MOE EMIS department	To find needed information for the trend analysis	Collected available data
8/3/11	Myles Harrison-Pope, Senior Associate Security and Field Operations Division (Creative) and Sergey Semyonov, Project Security Manager and Operations Procurement Officer	Maxim Kamarzaev, Deputy Security Advisor, UNDSS		Introduction, obtaining information on Security situation, arrangement for meeting with UN Security advisor
8/10/11	Harrison-Pope and Semyonov	Faisal Mustafa, UN Security Advisor	Security situation security standards used in TJK	Obtaining overall security information (regions) and information needed for the Crises response plan
8/10/11	Harrison-Pope and Semyonov	Eric Olerud, Special Agent, Regional Security Officer, Diplomatic Security Services, US Embassy	Introduction of Creative to US Embassy Regional Security officer	Introduction, obtaining information on Security situation.
8/11/11	Naimova	Sarah Penhune, Deputy Chief of Mission, Jeffery Lehrer, USAID Country Director, Nabieva (USAID Activity Manager)	Introductory meeting to present the overview of SDPP	Presentation made on SDPP

Date(s)	Key SDPP representative(s)	Key client and/or partner representative(s)	Topic/focus of meeting	Key decisions/outcomes (if any)
9/22-24/11	Bazidova, Abdunazarova	DED Temurmalik District Mirzoev Muzaffar; DED Vose District Davlatyorov M.; DED Baljuvan District Aliev Hikmatullo, DED deputies, some school heads	To brief the DEDs and other participants about SDPP activities conducted and upcoming workshop	Collected needed information for Trend analysis report
<i>SDPP/Timor Leste</i>				
7/11/11	Lorina Aquino, SDPP Country Coordinator (CARE)	Amy Hunt, USAID Program Development Officer and Activity Manager for SDPP	Project updates and validation of Global Review of Literature distribution list	USAID updated on status of data collection and informed of plans for sharing report with partners
8/11/11	Martin Canter, Education Specialist, and Shoaib Danish, M&E/Research Specialist (CARE)	Therese Curran, Secretariat for Professional Training and Employment (SEFOPE) / ILO	Discussions on the National Qualifications Framework for Employment; Support for community-based career advice for youth and older children	Introduction of the SDPP project and understanding of SEFOPE's areas of work.
8/18-19/11	Aquino, Canter	Kirsty Gusmão, President of the UNESCO National Commission	2 nd Conference on the National Languages of Timor-Leste	Understanding of the issues and concerns in relation to Mother Tongue-based Multilingual Education and potential issues that may affect design options for SDPP; Formally introduced the team to the head of the commission, Kirsty Gusmão, and the Language of Instruction Advisor at MOE
8/19/11	Aquino	Remegio Alquitran, UNESCO	Update of the current status of SDPP and discussion of current UNESCO initiatives in country	Information shared about the current status of initiatives related to children and youth, particularly the Community Education Centers
8/24/11	Aquino, Canter	Teresa Verdial de Araujo (Alita), Chief Executive Officer, ALOLA Foundation	SDPP overview; ALOLA Foundation's education programs	Understanding of respective programs

Date(s)	Key SDPP representative(s)	Key client and/or partner representative(s)	Topic/focus of meeting	Key decisions/outcomes (if any)
8/26/11	Geraldine Zwack, CARE Country Director, Aquino	Rick Scott, USAID Mission Director; Amy Hunt; and other COPs	COP meeting focused on status of elections preparations and updates from the mission	Updated on the role that USAID is playing in relation to the elections; requested to submit human interest stories that demonstrate impact of USAID projects in T
8/29/11	Canter	Fernando Encarnação – ILO Youth Employment and Community Empowerment Advisor	ILO’s vocational training, counseling and support for older children	Understanding of respective programs
8/31/11	Aquino, Canter	Georgia Noy, Country Director, Save the Children	Save the Children’s country strategy on education, SDPP overview	Understanding of respective programs
8/31/11	Aquino	Susan Smandych, Country Director of Plan International	Formal introduction of the project	SDPP introduced to Plan International; another meeting set for overview of Plan’s programs in education with Plan’s key staff
8/20-31/11	Aquino	Director General Domingos Maia, Agostinho Caet – Language Advisor to the MoE.	Discussion on MoE study trip to the Philippines for increased understanding of MTB-MLE implementation.	Strengthened contact with the DG for Curriculum and Materials Development
9/5/11	Canter	Yuki Mori (Ermera Project Manager) and Naka Nakayam (Liaison Manager) – SHARE Project	Discussion on school gardens and food security; involvement of parents and community in school activities	Understanding the challenges of the project in Ermera which may inform SDPP project design
9/9/11	Canter	CARE Community Gardens project – Project Manager and Field Officers	CARE Community gardens and Rural Roads Projects in Liquica and Bobonaro	Understanding the projects approaches towards community involvement and community mobilization, which may provide lessons for SDPP, depending on the design chosen
9/9/11	Aquino, Canter	Director Afonso Soares, UNICEF, UNESCO, World Bank	Feedback meeting on UNICEF’s Out-Of-School Children Research Study in Timor-Leste	Informed about the results of the research which may be useful as input to the discussions during the design workshop
9/19/11	Aquino	DG – Basic Education Domingos Maia, Save the Children, Plan International	MoE Delegation to the Mother Tongue-Based MLE Study Visit to the Philippines Feedback Session	Informed about the Ministry’s insights on MTB-MLE and their plans to pilot the approach in a limited number of schools

Date(s)	Key SDPP representative(s)	Key client and/or partner representative(s)	Topic/focus of meeting	Key decisions/outcomes (if any)
9/7 and 9/21/11	Aquino	Development Partners in the Education Sector	Appraisal of the National Education Strategic Plan and discussion on the MoE's FTI proposal	Established presence among development partners in preparation for the formation of the project coordination body; better understanding of development concerns in the Education Sector in Timor-Leste

C. Staff Actions

SDPP HQ- and field-based teams were built during the year. At Creative HQ, an SDPP team of seven full-time staff were hired, including five new Creative staff. In addition, 12 Creative HQ staff also contributed short-term technical and operational support to SDPP at some point during the year. All key technical and support positions at the two HQ-level partners, Mathematica and STS, were also filled. In total, Mathematica had 32 personnel approved for part-time work on SDPP, including a variety of information systems and administrative staff providing short-term support for the design, programming, and testing of the CLIN2 data entry system and other data entry and analysis tasks, while STS had six.⁵

With the exception of SDPP/India, which could not proceed with hiring until a LOA was finalized late in the third quarter, all field offices had identified their three core staff (Country Coordinator, Education Specialist, and M&E/Research Specialist) by the end of quarter two (see Table 3). In Tajikistan, the M&E/Research Specialist resigned during the second quarter, but a replacement was recruited and in place early in quarter three.

In India, the Country Coordinator candidate and two senior technical and management staff from QUEST oversaw the early stages of SDPP implementation under consulting agreements until the LOA was signed. The Country Coordinator was engaged as a full-time SDPP staff member during the fourth quarter, and a full-time M&E/Research Specialist was also recruited and began work during the quarter. Recruitment for the Education Specialist continued; a candidate was interviewed by field office and HQ staff and a decision on her candidacy will be made early in October. A full-time Program Associate was also hired in the fourth quarter.

In the fourth quarter, field offices in the other three countries also worked to recruit project-level staff as well as to replace departing staff where necessary. In Cambodia, one driver (for the Phnom Penh office) and several senior staff for the provincial offices, including a Regional Program Coordinator, Technical Coordinator, Regional Finance and Administrative Officer, and three Provincial Coordinators, were hired (the newly recruited provincial staff will begin in early October 2011). In Tajikistan, a project office accountant was identified (to start work in October), and replacements for the main office Procurement Officer and part-time Receptionist were also hired. An expatriate Project Support Specialist position was discussed and agreed with the USAID COTR; a candidate was identified and approval processes are under way. In Timor Leste, a Senior Finance and Administration Officer was hired (to start October 1). In addition, both of the Assistant Country Directors (for Programs and for Finance and Administration) departed during the quarter; interim replacements from CARE Australia were identified to fill this gap (both positions support SDPP part-time) until permanent replacements are found.

At the end of the year, the following numbers of field staff were participating in SDPP:

⁵ Of these, two MPR staff and one STS staff were approved during the fourth quarter.

Cambodia: 19 full-time staff (no part-time staff)

India: three full-time staff and two part-time staff, each at 2/3 time, or 1.33 full-time equivalents (FTE), and supported by several part-time support positions at IDEAL HQ on an as-needed basis

Tajikistan: 11 full-time staff, 6 part-time (14 FTE in total)

Timor Leste: five full-time, 41 part-time (approximately 15.25 FTE in total)

In accordance with guidance issued by USAID in February, all SDPP part-time and full-time staff at field and HQ levels had to be approved by USAID. Creative worked with all HQ and field partners to submit the required documentation in order to facilitate the approvals, retroactively for those already working on SDPP and prospectively for new hires. During the year, just under 150 personnel (not including consultants), including those from Creative HQ, Mathematica, STS, Creative Tajikistan, CARE, IDEAL, and KAPE, were approved (or were pre-approved from the proposal).

A waiver was granted by USAID allowing SDPP field offices to hire third-country national (TCN) staff at rates which exceed local country salary scales and to pay certain allowances, provided the salaries and allowances are approved by the USAID COTR and are in accordance with partner and Creative policies. This waiver greatly facilitated progress in field hiring, particularly in the case of CARE/Timor Leste, which employed a significant number of TCNs.

Table 3: Field Office Core Staff Actions

Core Staff Position	Name and Start and/or (Departure Date)	Name and Replacement Date	Status
<i>SDPP/Cambodia (KAPE)</i>			
Country Coordinator	Kosal Chea, 1/1/11	NA	Filled
Education Specialist	Sothira Ouk, 1/1/11	NA	Filled
Monitoring, Evaluation & Research Specialist	Carole Williams, 11/1/10	NA	Filled
<i>SDPP/India (IDEAL)</i>			
Country Coordinator	Sushant Verma, 6/20/11	NA	Filled
Education Specialist	TBD	NA	Vacant, recruiting
Monitoring, Evaluation & Research Specialist	Vir Narayan, to start 10/18/11	NA	Filled; to start in October
<i>SDPP/Tajikistan (Creative)</i>			
Country Coordinator	Gulgunchamo Naimova, 12/6/10	NA	Filled
Education Specialist	Sayora Andunazarova, 11/15/10	NA	Filled
Monitoring, Evaluation & Research Specialist	Davlatmo Yusufbekova (2/10/11)	Zarina Bazidova 5/3/11	Filled
<i>SDPP/Timor Leste (CARE)</i>			
Country Coordinator	Lorina Aquino, 4/19/11	NA	Filled
Education Specialist	Martin Canter, 3/12/11	NA	Filled
Monitoring, Evaluation & Research Specialist	Shoaib Danish, 2/14/11	NA	Filled

D. Consultants

Several consultants were engaged by SDPP at HQ and field levels during the year, including a significant number engaged during the fourth quarter to support activities related to the primary research activity, as shown in Table 4. During the second quarter, USAID granted authority to the USAID COTR (rather than the CO) to approve consultants hired under SDPP at rates consistent with local salary scales and otherwise in accordance with Creative policies on pay, which facilitated the approval of several consultants.

Table 4: Consultant Actions

Consultant	Dates of consultancy	Activity/Assignment	Place
Lorelei Brush	10/29/10-2/28/11	Coordinate and prepare CLIN 1 literature review	U.S.
Lorelei Brush	4/11 – 5/11/11	Compile inventory of dropout-related policies and programs	U.S.
Richard Bertrand	10/1/10-9/29/13	Support STS with CLIN 1 – CLIN 3 tasks	U.S.
Wendy Dougherty	10/15/10-2/15/12	Support STS with CLIN 1 tasks	U.S.
Elaine Jeffrey	11/1/10-12/19/10	Assist KAPE establish SDPP in Cambodia	Cambodia
Firdavs Ibonoff	1/4/11-3/1/11	Assist setting up IT network in SDPP Dushanbe office	Tajikistan
Rafoat Gazieva	5/10/11-5/28/11	Translation of Literature review into Tajik	Tajikistan
Nadezhda Dzugaeva	7/15/11-8/23/11	Translation of Literature review into Russian	Tajikistan
Aakash Sethi	1/12/11-5/31/11	Support SDPP work pending finalization of IDEAL subcontract/LOA	India
Amitav Nath	1/12/11-5/31/11	Support SDPP work pending finalization of IDEAL subcontract/LOA	India
Sushant Verma	2/8/11-3/31/11	Support SDPP work pending finalization of IDEAL subcontract/LOA	India
Gabriela Lima	8/26/11-9/8/11	Translation of the Dropout Trend Analysis report to Portuguese	Timor Leste
Afonso Jesus	8/26/11-9/8/11	Translation of the Dropout Trend Analysis report to Tetun	Timor Leste

In addition to these consultants, a large number of personnel were engaged through short-term consulting agreements to support the research activities in the four countries, as shown in Table 5. In India, a local research firm was contracted to engage most of the required research personnel, and the numbers of those personnel are not reflected in the table.

Table 5: Short-term Research Consultants

Category	Cambodia	Tajikistan	Timor Leste	India
Field Supervisor	-	-	-	1
Database Manager	-	-	-	1
Team Leader	3	6	6	-
Data Collector/Enumerator	27	24	24	-
Data Entry Clerk	8	8	8	-
Local Assistant	30	30	30	-
Driver	-	7	-	-
Translator/Interpreter	-	6	-	1

E. Staff and Consultant International Travel

Visits by staff from Creative, Mathematica, STS, and USAID/Washington were made during the year to the four pilot countries, including for the purposes of introducing SDPP to USAID Missions, host governments, and other key in-country stakeholders; pursuing selection and approvals of project sites; assessing and providing training in financial management systems and procedures; conducting a safety and security assessment (Tajikistan); providing technical support for the primary research and trend analyses (including instrument revision and training preparation, data collector training and instrument pre-test/revision, data entry training, and quality assurance field visits to the research teams collecting data); and providing other operational, programmatic, and technical support to field office staff. Details of the international travel undertaken during the year to support SDPP field activities and operations are as shown in Table 6.

Table 6: Staff and Consultants International Travel

Name of Traveller	Destination(s)	Dates of Travel	Purpose of Trip
Zelma Harrison	Tajikistan	12/2-13/10	Country office start-up operations (recruitment, procurement, banking, etc.)
Karen Tietjen	Cambodia	12/10-19/10	Introduce SDPP to USAID and MOEYS; work with KAPE
Adam Correia	Cambodia	12/10-19/10	Introduce SDPP to USAID and MOEYS; work with KAPE
Jeff Davis	Timor Leste	1/2-1/16/11	Introduce SDPP to USAID and MOE; support data trend analysis
Karen Tietjen	India	1/30-2/12/11	Introduce SDPP to USAID and MHRD; support data trend analysis
Jennifer Shin	India	1/30-2/12/11	Introduce SDPP to USAID and MHRD; support data trend analysis
Arkadipta Ghosh	India	1/30-2/26/11	Introduce SDPP to USAID and MHRD; support data trend analysis; site visit Bihar State
Tom Ventimiglia	Tajikistan	2/12-2/26/11	Introduce SDPP to USAID and MOE; support data trend analysis; operational support to Creative/Dushanbe
Rajani Shrestha	Tajikistan	2/12-2/26/11	Introduce SDPP to USAID and MOE; support data trend analysis
Roger Plath	Tajikistan	2/5-2/22/11	Install computers, establish local network and communications
Adam Pearce	India	4/16-4/30/11	Management review with IDEAL and QUEST; investigate requirements around the government of India service tax
Peter Kapakasa	Tajikistan, Cambodia	5/14-5/26/11 5/27-6/10/11	Financial management review and training
Ann Hawley	Tajikistan	5/3-5/20/11	Assist with preparations for primary research activity
Kathy Buek	Tajikistan	5/13-5/27/11	Primary research preparations, training, and supervision
Diane Prouty	Tajikistan	5/14-6/9/11	Primary research preparations, training, and supervision
Rajani Shrestha	Tajikistan	5/14-6/9/11	Primary research preparations, training, and supervision
Karen Tietjen	Cambodia, Timor Leste	5/21-6/10/11 6/11-7/1/11	Primary research preparations, training, and supervision
Jennifer Shin	Cambodia	5/21-6/10/11	Primary research preparations, training, and supervision
Lotte Renault	Timor Leste	6/9-7/5/11	Primary research preparations, training, and supervision
Thomaz Alvarez	Timor Leste	6/9-7/5/11	Primary research preparations, training, and supervision
Myles Harrison-Pope (Creative)	Tajikistan	8/7-14/11	Conduct office safety and security assessment and training; develop crisis response plan
Adam Correia	India	9/17-10/21	Primary research preparations, training, and supervision
Rajani Shrestha	India	9/23-10/18	Primary research preparations, training, and supervision
Thomaz Alvarez	India	9/20-10/23	Primary research preparations, training, and supervision

F. Procurements

Creative HQ worked with field offices to procure essential office and program supplies, equipment and services, in accordance with established procurement regulations and requirements. Country office procurement policies for each country office were reviewed either at HQ or on-site (e.g. in Cambodia and Tajikistan) or both, to ensure compliance. Significant procurements during the year are as noted in the table below.

Table 7: Procurements

Field Office	Description	Amount	Status
Cambodia	Furniture, Phnom Penh office	\$5,042	Delivered
Cambodia	IT equipment, Phnom Penh Office	\$16,626	Delivered
Cambodia	Photocopier	\$2,370	Delivered
Cambodia	Phone network	\$1,359	Delivered
Cambodia	Vehicles	\$48,400	Delivered
Cambodia	Translation services (research tools and protocols, English to Khmer)	\$1,340	Delivered
Cambodia	IT equipment, field office	\$7,766	Delivered
Cambodia	Translation from English to Khmer of Literature review	\$1,324	Delivered
India	Translation of research tools, protocols, and training materials	\$754	Estimated amount (not yet paid)
India	Data collection and entry services	\$17,602	Estimated amount (not yet paid)
India	IT equipment – Delhi office	\$8,586	Delivered
India	Furniture – Delhi office	\$1,594	Delivered
Tajikistan	IT equipment, Dushanbe office	\$33,862	Delivered
Tajikistan	Office furnishings, Dushanbe office	\$7,633	Delivered
Tajikistan	Printers/printer cartridges	\$1,514	Delivered
Tajikistan	Phone PABX and handsets	\$3,699	Delivered
Tajikistan	Wireless router, Dushanbe office	\$1,251	Delivered
Timor Leste	Laptop computers	\$11,200	Delivered
Timor Leste	Various software (MS Office, Kaspersky Anti-Virus, SPSS, Acrobat Prof.)	Approx. \$7,000	In process
Timor Leste	Vehicles (2)	\$66,520	Waiver received from USAID 9/28/11. CARE/TL is rechecking availability of same model and prices given delay since original quotes received.

IV. Status of Contract Deliverables

Table 8. provides an updated list of the contract deliverables completed and in process since the beginning of the project, as per section F.2(a) of the SDPP Task Order.

Table 8: Contract Deliverables

Deliverable	Requirement	Delivery date	Approved by client date
School dropout prevention identification and analysis plan	1.1	10/12/10	Approved 10/16/10
School dropout prevention identification and analysis methodology and criteria	1.1	10/12/10	Approved 10/16/10
School dropout prevention identification and analysis of 15 programs or interventions ⁶	1.1	11/22/10 (presentation and written summary)	Approved 11/22/10
School dropout prevention identification and analysis draft report (including executive summary, cost estimates, and conclusions)	1.2	3/10/11	Approved 3/28/11
School dropout prevention identification and analysis report	1.2	5/24/11 (COTR); 5/27/11 (AMs)	NA
200 print copies of school dropout prevention ⁷ identification and analysis reports	1.3	6/20/11	NA
50 reports for each pilot country in required language	1.3	August 2011	NA
200 reports distributed to 4 pilot missions in English	1.3	In process	NA
Power point summarizing findings of student dropout prevention identification and analysis	1.4	In process	NA
List of assessment tools for each country	2.1	4/13/11	Approved 4/26/11
List of factors each assessment tool measures	2.1	4/13/11	Approved 4/26/11
4 in-depth country assessment plans ⁸⁹	2.2	4/19/11	Approved 4/19/11
4 in-depth country assessments	2.2	In process	NA
Inventory of existing programs	2.2	5/25/11 (draft); 7/25/11 (final)	Approved 7/28/11
Grade levels and student populations most at risk of dropout identified in each country	2.3	8/19/11 (Cambodia, Timor Leste) 8/25/11 (Tajikistan)	NA
4 in-depth country assessment draft reports	2.3	In process	NA
4 power point presentations	2.4	In process	NA
Risk factors and trends for each of the 4 countries	2.4	In process	NA
4 stakeholder lists	3.1	In process	NA
Areas of collaboration/conflict identified and resolved in each country	3.1	In process	NA
4 SDPP project oversight bodies formed	3.1	In process	NA
1 implementation work plan annually	3.5	5/20/11 ¹⁰	5/31/11

⁶ Thirty-four (34) programs were identified and analyzed.

⁷ Two hundred and fifty (250) reports were printed.

⁸ One plan was submitted, covering all four countries, rather than four country-specific plans.

⁹ Draft and final plans submitted and approved as one.

¹⁰ For Fiscal Year 2011

V. Monitoring and Evaluation

The program and country Monitoring and Evaluation plans will be prepared as the pilot interventions are designed, after the completion of the in-depth country assessments.

VI. Challenges and Actions Taken

Major challenges and actions taken to address them during the year are as highlighted below:

- Delays in formally introducing or re-introducing SDPP to the host country government after approval of the contract and subsequently in establishing official project relations with government in all four countries had negative repercussions on the start-up of the project, including delaying initial visits by SDPP staff to the countries, preventing access to in-country government sources of information (for completion of the literature review and the data trend analysis), which in turn impacted project site selection and delayed the start of the in-depth situation analyses. The most significant implication of these delays is the inability of SDPP to introduce fully-designed interventions in the schools by the original target date of September or October 2011 in order to obtain two full years of data for impact assessment. The shorter available implementation timeframe will necessarily be taken into account as SDPP works to identify, implement, and evaluate interventions with the potential to impact student dropout within the time available.
- Even after formal introduction of SDPP to government by the respective USAID missions, with support as needed by the US Embassy and/or USAID Washington, significant delays were experienced in securing official government recognition (e.g. signing the MOU in Cambodia, signing the LOC in Tajikistan) or government approval of proposed project sites (in India and Tajikistan). In addition, in both India and Tajikistan, the project faced a lack of enthusiasm at high levels of government for the project's approach of conducting research to inform the design of project activities.
- In India, a number of challenges were faced in the process of subcontracting to the project's originally proposed subcontractor, due to their registration status with the government and to tax laws, only uncovered during the subcontracting process, which impose a significant burden on their available budget. Creative and USAID worked together to identify a new subcontractor as well as to understand and accommodate the requirements of the service tax. In addition, SDPP's implementing partner, IDEAL, Creative and USAID worked together to present additional proposals to government and to secure permission to work, taking into account the government's expressed concerns about the project's research design.
- The lack of quality data, absence of data at decentralized levels, lack of access to available data (including, in Cambodia, the requirement to purchase data), and/or inconsistencies in different data sources, presented a challenge in all four countries to finalizing the trend analysis and selecting the most suitable project sites. Field office staff, with support from headquarters, worked hard to access, vet, and analyze data in both conventional and other reasonable but less straightforward means.
- As soon as required government approvals were received, SDPP had to work in all four countries under a very accelerated schedule to conduct the primary research activities prior to the closure of schools, which loomed over the exercise in all four countries. Limited time available for preparations and implementing the research, including translation and back-translation of all the instruments and instructions, recruiting and training skilled and qualified researchers and data entry operators, and completing data collection in the face of logistical challenges in reaching remote schools, all presented a major challenge. The effort to standardize instruments, data entry system, and research methods across the four countries with very different contexts added to the challenge. In order to provide adequate support to the field in carrying out the work and meeting expected standards of quality, all SDPP field staff, supported by HQ teams of two to four persons in each country, worked

together to carry out the research preparations, training, and data collection and entry concurrently in two countries (Tajikistan and Cambodia), immediately followed by Timor Leste and then India.

- In both Timor Leste and India, research teams found fewer than expected dropouts from the sampled schools. A variety of means were used to reach its target respondent numbers, in spite of these challenges (e.g., in Timor Leste, additional schools were added to the sample; in India, grade four dropouts and those who had dropped out of grade five more than two years prior to the study were also added). Working closely with local community leaders and Local Assistants, in particular, provided very effective support in all four countries for achieving the research objectives and addressing the challenges encountered.
- Because of the long lag-time between the initial identification of key staff and the approval of the SDPP contract, some field offices did not have a full complement of staff in place from the beginning of the project, although this was essential to a quick start-up. As recruitment proceeded, the staff deficit was addressed through the use of Creative, STS and Mathematica staff to help with the literature review, start-up and office set-up, hiring consultants, and calling on existing personnel of the partner organizations in-country (CARE, KAPE, and QUEST). Until a waiver was received, these strategies were further complicated by the contract regulation requiring that TCN and local employees and consultant compensation must adhere to the CCN scale.
- All field offices faced challenges in identifying well-qualified staff and/or consultants in a timely way. Some field offices also experienced small but nevertheless important turnover of staff. The requirement to have USAID approval of all staff and consultants has presented challenges, though the issuance in quarter two of the TCN waiver and authorization of the USAID COTR to approve consultants and personnel greatly facilitated necessary approvals in the latter half of the year.
- The extended CLIN2 period put pressure on the CLIN2 budget, which was originally intended to accommodate activities during a period of not more than six months. In addition, costs for setting up the primary research database were higher than budgeted, as the shortened time available for the in-country assessments made locally-developed databases infeasible and required additional HQ-level personnel. Two subcontractors – KAPE and CARE – requested CLIN2 budget revisions, primarily due to the longer-than-expected period. KAPE’s budget was increased to cover the extra costs (and their CLIN3 budget reduced by an equivalent amount); CARE’s CLIN2 budget was revised to accommodate the changed timeframe but was able to be kept at the same bottom line level. Higher database costs required a revision to Mathematica’s CLIN2 budget.
- Despite instructions to the contrary, local data collectors tended to use the “other” response category designation on the situational analysis instruments more often than necessary. Consequently, a large amount of data was recorded in the questionnaires in “other” response categories and needed to be recoded into other existing response categories. These data were first entered individually into Excel spreadsheets by field staff, and were then merged into the data files by Mathematica after field and Creative staff had analyzed and determined where the responses needed to be recoded.
- Calculations to determine the number of intervention and control schools needed in order to provide the required statistical power to demonstrate reductions in the dropout rate have shown that the project will be required to significantly increase the number of schools involved in the project. Plans to expand coverage are being explored in each country, with potential implications for additional government approvals and for increased levels of staffing, budget, and logistics.
- Because of delays in start-up and other unforeseen demands, the project has fallen seriously behind schedule. Interventions anticipated for introduction into the schools in September 2011 in Tajikistan and October 2011 in Cambodia are unlikely to occur until the second quarter of FY2012 or later depending on the intervention. This means that only one full year of interventions will be tracked in these schools before the closeout date in September 2013.

VII. Major Activities Planned for Next Quarter

Major activities planned for next quarter (October – December 2011) include:

- Complete training, data collection, data entry, cleaning, and analysis in 32 schools in India.
- Draft country-specific assessment reports, to include primary research results.
- Continue ongoing strengthening of linkages with the MOE and other stakeholder organizations in preparation for the establishment of the coordinating bodies/working groups in each country.
- Conduct design consultation workshops in Cambodia, Tajikistan, Timor Leste, and (time-permitting,) India (to include presentation of key findings of literature review, inventory of polices/programs, and primary research in; working with stakeholders to design, plan, and budget pilot interventions)
- Begin developing overall plan for collecting, evaluating, and validating data for the project (Performance Monitoring Plan), including M&E plans for each pilot country.
- Continue to develop power calculations and other elements of the evaluation design.
- Complete recruitment and orientation of remaining field staff.
- Equip satellite project offices in all four pilot countries; establish field offices in Bihar and Ermera.
- Complete vehicle procurement (Timor Leste).
- Submit remaining requests for personnel approvals to USAID.
- Seek USAID approval for the SDPP website.
- Draft SDPP workplan for year two.

VIII. Accrued Expenditures

Expenditures accrued during the fiscal year, by country and by line item, are as shown in the table below.

Description	Country				TOTAL
	Cambodia	India	Tajikistan	Timor-Leste	
Direct Labor	135,092	141,771	262,211	122,692	661,765
Fringe Benefits	45,772	43,740	78,718	41,315	209,546
Travel and Per Diem	19,722	24,083	82,751	4,804	131,359
ODCs	8,031	7,762	156,238	5,609	177,640
Subcontractor	479,961	169,774	153,424	584,349	1,387,508
Project Activities	516	516	15,587	516	17,136
Overhead	52,668	50,716	100,233	47,652	251,269
G&A	126,099	74,522	144,358	137,179	482,158
Fixed Fee	43,393	25,644	49,676	47,206	165,920
TOTAL	911,255	538,527	1,043,196	991,322	3,484,300

Appendix 1. Media Coverage of SDPP, Fiscal Year 2011

- On December 22nd and 23rd, two local newspapers “Asia Plus” and “Khovar” published an article entitled “United States and Tajikistan collaborate to keep children in school” in both English and Tajik, reporting on USAID’s meeting with the Ministry of Education about the SDPP program.
- An interview with SDPP Tajikistan Country Coordinator Naimova was broadcast on Radioi Ozodi (Radio Freedom) on December 24th in which she informed listeners about the SDPP program in Tajikistan.
- A press release marking the signing of the LOC between Tajikistan’s MOE and USAID was prepared by USAID and Creative, and appeared in numerous local newspapers and websites, including the U.S. Embassy website and Facebook page. See, for example:

<http://news.tj/ru/news/vsemirnyi-bank-dolozhil-rakhmonu-o-pervykh-rezultatakh-ekspertizy-proekta-rogunskoi-ges> (in Russian)

<http://news.tj/ru/news/usaid-pomozhet-minobrazovaniya-tadzhikistana-vernut-detei-v-shkoly> (in Russian)

http://origin-rus.ozodi.org/content/USAID_tajikistan_program_schools/24097755.html (in Russian)

<http://www.pressa.tj/news/v-tadzhikistane-otsev-uchashchihsya-iz-shkol-vzyat-pod-kontrol-minobrazovaniya-i-usaid> (in Russian)

http://www.bbc.co.uk/tajik/institutional/2011/04/110426_zkh_education_usaid.shtml (in Tajik)

http://www.bbc.co.uk/tajik/institutional/2011/05/110511_zkh_usaid_aids_education.shtml (in Tajik)

- Following USAID/Washington Bureau for Legislative and Public Affairs (LPA) approval, Kosal Chea, KAPE’s SDPP Country Coordinator in Cambodia, was interviewed on Radio Free Asia, along with three representatives from the Provincial Offices of Education where the project will operate. The interviews, which aired on June 8, focused on the objectives of SDPP and in particular on the research activities which were underway. The program highlighted the importance of the project in achieving the goal of the government to ensure all students complete their basic education.
- Wide coverage of the newly-approved SDPP program and upcoming research in India was covered in the leading local, Hindi-language newspaper.

Appendix 2. Country Assessment Timetable

Activity	Tajikistan	Cambodia	Timor Leste	India
Pre-visit training	May 14 <i>(6 team leaders)</i>	May 9-10 <i>(3 focal points and KAPE staff)</i>	June 14, 16 <i>(6 team leaders)</i>	September 23 <i>(7 team leaders, 2 supervisors, SUNAI project manager)</i>
Pre-visits to 30 sampled schools	May 15-21	May 11-12, 18-24	May 23-June 9	September 26-October 1
Data collection training	May 23-28 <i>(24 data collectors, 6 team leaders, plus Creative TJ staff)</i>	May 30-June 4 <i>(38 data collectors, team leaders, data entry clerks, government focal points, and KAPE staff)</i>	June 19-24 <i>(24 enumerators, 7 team leaders, 8 data entry clerks)</i>	Scheduled October
Data collection from 30 schools (35 in Timor Leste)	June 1-10 <i>(6 in Baljuvon, 9 in Temurmalik, 15 in Vose)</i>	June 6-18 <i>(14 in Battambang, 8 each in Pursat and Banteay Meanchey)</i>	27 June – 9 July <i>(10 in Bobonaro, 13 in Ermera, 7 in Liquica)</i> <i>July 15-22 (4 in Bobonaro, 1 in Ermera,</i>	Scheduled October
Data entry training	June 20-22 (8 clerks)	June 13 (8 clerks)	July 2 (7 clerks)	Scheduled October
Data entry	Started June 24	Started June 15	To start in July	Scheduled October

Appendix 3. Materials for In-Country Assessment Training

#	Document	#	Document
1	Registration form	33	Interview guide: Teachers
2	Training program (in-country assessment training plan)	34	Methods: How to interview school personnel (teachers and school administrators)
3	Training agenda overview (purpose and program)	35	Profile card: Teachers (2)
4	SDPP overview	36	Questionnaire: School Administrators
5	Research activity overview (research question and approach)	37	Interview guide: School Administrators
6	Methods and instruments overview	38	Profile card: School Administrators (2)
7	Ethics, etiquette, and confidentiality	39	Questionnaire: Community Groups
8	Confidentiality form	40	Interview guide: Community Groups
9	Team assignments (organization and roles and responsibilities)	41	Methods: Community Groups
10	Field visits overview	42	Profile card: Community Groups (3)
11	How to interview (General)	43	School visit (day of visit)
12	How to interview women and girls	44	Contact list
13	Interview exercise	45	Team Assignments (assigning members to province/district)
14	How to fill out instruments	46	Team schedules
15	Concepts (master slide)	47	Material List
16	Questionnaire: At-risk student	48	Data security
17	Interview guide: At-risk student	49	Questionnaire: Local Education Officer
18	Methods: At-risk student	50	Interview guide: Local Education Officer
19	Profile card: At-risk student (2)	51	Handling instruments
20	Questionnaire: Dropout	52	Policy Handout
21	Interview guide: Dropout		
22	Methods: Dropout		
23	Profile card: Dropout (2)		
24	Questionnaire: Parents/Guardians of at-risk students		
25	Interview guide: Parents/Guardians of at-risk students		
26	Methods: Parents/Guardians of at-risk students		
27	Profile card: Parents/Guardians of at-risk students (2)		
28	Questionnaire: Parents/Guardians of dropouts		
29	Interview guide: Parents/Guardians of dropouts		
30	Methods: Parents/Guardians of dropouts		
31	Profile card: Parents/Guardians of dropouts (2)		
32	Questionnaire: Teachers		

Appendix 4. Agenda: School Dropout Intervention Consultation Workshop

<i>Time</i>	<i>Agenda</i>	<i>Description of Activities</i>	<i>Materials (PPT, Exercise, Handout)</i>
8:30-9:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Registration Coffee, Tea 		Registration Form
9:00-9:45	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcome and introductions Workshop Purpose/Organization 	Opened by national and local MOE reps and USAID, as available	PPT: purpose, organization, agenda
9:45-10:45	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overview of SDPP Dropout Trends Worldwide Dropout Trends in [country] 	Purpose and activities (including contributing to the evidence base) View of dropout worldwide and importance (address research and need for rigor of monitoring and evaluation)	PPT: SDPP Overview PPT: Dropout worldwide status PPT: Trend Analysis Handout: Trend Analysis paper
10:45-11:00	Break		
11:00-13:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What causes dropout in [country]? Causes of Dropout Worldwide Causes of Dropout in [country]: Finding from SDPP Situational Analysis 	“Shout-out” from participants Presentation on worldwide causes Situational Analysis methods and findings	PPT: Dropout causes worldwide PPT: SA Methods and Findings Handouts: Literature review
13:00-14:00	Lunch		
14:00-15:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dropout Prevention Interventions Worldwide: What we know Dropout Prevention Policies and Programs in [country] 	“Shout out” on interventions What we know about dropout prevention (interventions proved, disproved, promising, potential interventions in terms of impact) and the methodology we used to assess the evidence What has been done in-country to address dropout Review key data tables from their country	PPT: Interventions that work or don’t organized by problem area PPT: summary of major policies and programs Handout: Policy and Program Inventory
15:00-16.45	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Group Activity:</i> Identify and Rank Potential Dropout Prevention Interventions 	Outline of considerations and country SA findings (refer to previous slides) Tasks: (1) identify responsive interventions based on SA data and rationale (2) Rank order interventions	PPT: List of considerations (contract constraints and training pre-condition) PPT: Instructions (select top 10, then top 5) Form: for intervention ranking and rationales
(15:45)	Working Break		
16:45-17:45	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plenary: Group Presentations and Discussion Present rankings 		Facilitator Guide
17:45-18:00	Closing	Summary of day “Shout out” on What did you learn? Thanks	

8:30-8:45	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of previous day Today's program 		
8:45-10:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revisit highlights of the SA Design Parameters and Considerations Menu of Interventions 	Contract requirements and constraints Other criteria: (duration, impact, measurability, implementation ease, replication) Menu of Intervention	PPT: summary slide of findings PPT: Constraints and criteria PPT: Menu
10:00-10:45	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Group Activity</i>: Identification and Shortlist of Interventions 	Prioritize interventions based on menu	Instructions Menu Form
10:45-11:00	Break		
11:00-13:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact Evaluation Design (for education interventions) 	Participants will understand why experimental designs are preferred for impact evaluations and how it affects intervention selection. Random Assignment Game	PPT: Not a lot of good evidence on effectiveness of interventions to reduce dropout (internationally); SDPP will contribute to the evidence base. What is an experimental design and what is not? What do experimental designs offer that non-experimental designs do not? What is a counterfactual? Brief demonstration of random assignment.
13:00-14:00	Lunch		
14:00-15:30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of Shortlisted Interventions <i>Group Activity</i>: Advantages and Disadvantages of Possible Interventions 	Listing of potential advantages as well as difficulties of each proposed intervention possible solutions	Criteria Instructions Form
15:30-15:45	Break		
15:45-16:30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plenary: Group Reports on Intervention Advantages and Disadvantages 		Facilitator's guide
16:30-17:30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plenary: Discussion and Prioritization of Interventions 	Revisit guidelines and constraints	
17:30-17:45	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Closing 	Summary of day: What did you learn? Shout out Thanks	

8:30-9:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of previous day Today's program 		
9:00-10:45	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Group Activity</i>: Intervention Conceptualization and Design 	Break into groups and give each group one priority intervention to work on <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Description of activities Resources needed Role of school, community, government Coordination with other partners Etc. 	Instructions Template/Form
10:45-11:00	Break		
11:00-13:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plenary: Group Presentations and Discussion 		Facilitator's guide
13:00-14:00	Lunch		
14:00-16:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact Evaluation Design and Measurement 	Specific research needs: indicators, data source, how to randomize, focus (or not) on at risk population <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Definition of target population: all students or "at-risk" students? If "at-risk" students, how do we define for ease of identification (for intervention and evaluation) Unit of Random Assignment (and tradeoffs) Potential impact of interventions (% change in dropout) Measurement of Impact: Dropout Need for a consistent definition (within grades, between grades, etc.) and data collection strategy. What will be our numerator and denominator? How will we collect our data?	PPT: just a few slides To illustrate the first 4 bullets, we'll pull from our power calculations. Consider working groups (school level versus central level staff) that can think about the different levels of data/records available to track student dropout (eg, national, regional, district, school level) What other information is available at the student level? Performance, etc.?
16:00-16:15	Break		
16:15-17:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Next Steps for Intervention Development 	Next steps: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Technical design groups Who are the experts? Who should we meet with? Questions to ask; more information required	Facilitator's guide
17:00-17.15	Closing	Summary of day: What did you learn? Shout out Thanks	

