

ResUp MeetUp

Report of the Research Uptake Symposium and Training Exchange (ResUp MeetUp)

February 9-12, 2015
Southern Sun, Nairobi



Table of Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	The Resup Meetup Symposium	2
	2.1 ResUp MeetUp Deliberations	2
	2.2 Emerging Themes from Symposium Deliberations	15
3	The Training Exchange	16
	3.1 Background	16
4	Communication Successes for the Symposium and Training Exchange	18
5	Challenges and Way Forward	21
6	Appendices	22
	6.1 List of Participants	22
	6.2 Symposium Agenda	28



“

The symposium deliberated on various issues and aspects surrounding research uptake, including the theoretical conceptualisation of research uptake, exploration of barriers to research uptake, innovative approaches to research uptake, understanding and measuring impact, and country-level experiences and lessons.

”

1 INTRODUCTION

The ResUp MeetUp (Research Uptake) community is designed to help research uptake and communication professionals keep up-to-date with this rapidly evolving field. The African Institute for Development Policy (AFIDEP), the Institute of Development Studies (UK) and Quaternary Consulting convened the first ResUp MeetUp Symposium and Training Exchange in Nairobi, Kenya, from February 9–12, 2015.

The overarching goal of the forum was to explore issues surrounding the utilisation of research evidence in decision-making by policymakers, programme implementers and communities, among others (i.e. research uptake). Research uptake is an emerging field that is not yet very well understood. As such, the forum sort to explore emerging issues in the processes of research uptake in order to develop a deeper understanding of the evolving concept of research uptake.

The forum comprised two components, i.e. a two-day Symposium on February 9-10, 2015 followed by a two-day Training Exchange on February 11-12, 2015. It attracted 167

participants from 23 countries around the world.

The symposium deliberated on various issues and aspects surrounding research uptake, including the theoretical conceptualisation of research uptake, exploration of barriers to research uptake, innovative approaches to research uptake, understanding and measuring impact, and country-level experiences and lessons.

The purpose of the two-day training exchange was to enable the exchange of different skills among research uptake professionals. The training sessions offered ranged from writing 'issue briefs' to developing data visualisation, using film, planning communication activities, blogging and digital communication, introduction to design, and effective media engagement.

The ResUp MeetUp Symposium and Training Exchange received financial support from the UK Department for International Development and the European Commissions Seventh Framework Programme.



Participants register for the ResUp Meet Up Symposium and Training Exchange at the Southern Sun Hotel, Nairobi on February 9, 2015.

2 THE RESUP MEETUP SYMPOSIUM

2.1 ResUp MeetUp Deliberations

The ResUp MeetUp symposium comprised various sessions summarized below.

Day 1 ▶ Deliberations, Monday February 9, 2015

Opening Session

The opening session for ResUp MeetUp Symposium sought to frame the issue of research uptake in broader development discourses, emphasize its importance, and pose the big questions surrounding the process of research uptake. The purpose was to set the mood and the focus that would drive the deliberations of the symposium for the next two days. The opening session comprised three keynote addresses by Dr. Eliya Zulu, AFIDEP Executive Director; Hon. Dr. James Nyikal, a member of Kenya's parliamentary committee on Health and a former Director of Medical Services in Kenya's Ministry of Health (MoH); and Dr. Nicholas Muraguri, Director of Medical Services, Kenya's MoH (his keynote was read by Dr. Peter Kimuu, Head of Policy, Planning and Health Financing at Kenya's Ministry of Health).

Zulu's keynote address focused on framing key issues in research uptake. He challenged the term research uptake noting that this implies research use by policymakers only, yet research is used by programme implementers, communities, and even researchers themselves. He proposed the term knowledge translation as more broad in capturing research use by different actors, be they senior government officials or communities. He highlighted the different stages of decision-making and the varying research needs at such stages, but noted that generally, research is not optimally used to inform decisions.

Zulu further noted the supply-side and demand-side dichotomy of research use and the important role of knowledge brokers in bridging the two sides. He emphasized the importance of removing barriers to research use on both sides, noting that there has been



Keynote speakers Dr Eliya Zulu, AFIDEP's Executive Director (left) and Hon Dr James Nyikal, MP, addressing participants during the official opening on February 9, 2015.

so much focus on tackling supply-side barriers, but limited focus on addressing demand-side barriers to research use. He indicated that demand-side barriers include lacking institutional support systems and infrastructure, motivation and technical capacity to source, appraise and apply research evidence.

Zulu noted that there are now increasing opportunities for research use in Africa given the increasing demand for accountability from citizens and within governments, and the global frameworks on development such as the post-2015 Sustainable Development Goals framework. He highlighted examples of African leaders who continue to champion evidence use – the Speaker of the Malawi Parliament who committed to championing evidence use within the Malawi parliament, noting that “MPs cannot effectively exercise their oversight role without credible evidence” (July 2014); and the President of the Rwanda Senate who used evidence to demonstrate to policymakers in Rwanda that the country “cannot develop into a middle income country without addressing high population growth and reducing the high child dependency burden) (2012).

Zulu also noted the need to look at ethics in research uptake – warning against overplaying results of knowingly using narrow result that are not comprehensive enough to inform various policies. He concluded by noting that it’s important for knowledge translation professionals to also focus on other critical audiences who can use or enable increased research use, including the parliament, journalists, and civil society organisations.

In his keynote address, Hon. Nyikal emphasized the know-do gap, saying that often people don’t do what they know. He highlighted the lacking structures to link researchers and policymakers in many countries as key barriers to research use. He also noted the lack of relevant research needed to tackle the problems that policymakers are grappling with. He noted that many factors within bureaucratic and legislative processes often make it hard for research evidence to be used such as lengthy policymaking processes and many processes never get completed, red-tape in the bureaucracy, political interests, noting that often propaganda informs policy more than evidence does. He challenged



Many factors within bureaucratic and legislative processes often make it hard for research evidence to be used such as lengthy policymaking processes and many processes never get completed, red-tape in the bureaucracy, political interests, noting that often propaganda informs policy more than evidence does.



scientists to also get involved in lobbying leaders in order to increase chances of their research getting used. He concluded by emphasizing the important role of research champions in bringing changes at institutional level that are needed to enable increased use of evidence.

The keynote address by Dr. Muraguri emphasised the commitment by Kenya’s MoH to research utilisation, highlighting the creation of the Research Division within the MoH and the continued funding to the Kenya Medical Research Institute (KEMRI), which is the Ministry’s research arm. He noted that Research Division within the Ministry has focused on enabling increased research use through its current initiatives, which include the development of the National Health Research Agenda, the formation of the Kenya Health Knowledge Translation Platform, and strengthening of capacity needed within the Ministry to increase research uptake. He noted that the Ministry however faces many challenges in enabling increased use of evidence key among them being limited budgets needed strengthen institutional capacities for increased research use, as well as research-side barriers where researchers are not packaging their research in formats that are easily usable by policymakers. He concluded by noting that he hoped the deliberations of the Symposium would come away with some clear recommendations that Kenya can take in addressing the many barriers to increased use of research evidence in decision-making.

First Parallel Session

Session 1: Research Uptake Engagement Strategies

This session, chaired by Jamie Guthie, featured five presentations including:

- A day in the life of an Uptake and Communication Specialist by Nitasha Nair;
- Emerging policymakers: Constitutional change and access to HIV/SRHR services in Nairobi by Emmy Igyona;
- The relationship paradigm: Using Social Network Analysis (SNA) as a novel method for identifying academic-policy maker networks in Kenya by Nasreen Jessani;
- Rethinking uptake? Do we need to repackage, re-market or re-target by Juliet Braslow; and
- Stakeholder analysis as a research uptake management tool: A case of the Programme for Improving Mental health care (PRIME) by Amit Makan.

Two of the presentations (Nair and Braslow) highlighted the importance of a number of factors to bear in mind in efforts to have effective research uptake strategies including:

- Understand the context (political, social, cultural, economic) and ensuring it informs the research uptake strategy;
- Include uptake and communication from the conceptualization stage in the research process, and involving all project staff in uptake discussions;
- Understand demand – know the players you're targeting, understand their needs, etc;
- Cater for time scales since knowledge to policy is a long process;
- Distribute responsibility among staff and partners;
- Build capacity at multiple levels from pitching skills of researchers to raising awareness of decision-makers on problems, solutions and trade offs;

- Have a feedback mechanism to enable discussion and reflections on best possible way forward;
- Need for flexibility to adapt to changing circumstances; and
- Importance of prioritizing different uptake activities for different audiences.

Two of the presentations (Jessani and Amit) demonstrated ways of using social network analysis (SNA) and stakeholder analysis (SHA) in understanding different actors in knowledge uptake processes.

It was noted that SNA could assist schools of public health (SPH) on several levels:

- Situating the SPH within the larger academic network of SPHs so as to understand areas of competition as well as collaboration;
- Positioning the SPH in the network of policymakers across government institutions;
- Uncovering the prevalence and distribution of individual academic-policy maker connections;
- Demonstrating the reach of the SPH through individual academic-policy maker connections;
- Identifying and leveraging academic knowledge brokers; and
- Recognizing untapped potential knowledge brokers.

Furthermore, SNA could contribute to national government in the following ways:

- Identifying the location and distribution of academic expertise in a country;
- Leveraging existing relations for the purposes of influencing health systems research and policy decisions;
- Building strategic networks in areas where gaps exist; and
- Understanding shared interests for the purposes of engaging in multidisciplinary and multi-sectoral governmental collaborations.

It was indicated that SHA is an important tool in analysing stakeholder involvement, interests, influence, position of the issue, and the impact the issue has on them. These are important aspects that need to inform research uptake strategies. It was, however, noted that an important limitation of SHA is that it captures data at a given point in time, and so may need to be repeated often.

Session 2: Strengthening capacity for research uptake

This session, chaired by Martin Oluoch, featured four presentations, including:

- Approaching research uptake as an organisational outcome by Anjali Shivshanker;
- Developing institutional capacity for knowledge translation and effective communication in East and Central African schools of public health by Richard Ayah;
- Research Uptake self-assessment tool by Julia Powell; and

- The ‘uptake of uptake’: Challenges and strategies to building an institutional culture of research uptake by Liam Roberts.

The presentations and discussions pointed out important approaches to strengthening capacity for research uptake, including:

- Importance of an institutional approach to capacity building for research uptake – efforts need to have an institution-wide focus that includes engagement of top-leadership in building their skills to use research, but also advocating for the need for top leaders to address institutional barriers to research use; and
- The important role of researchers in research uptake, and ways of increasing their appreciation of research uptake using a self-assessment tool, and consequently their interest in initiatives that will build their capacity to be involved in research uptake processes.

The self-assessment tool, launched at this event, has proved popular. More information about the tool and how to facilitate the assessment is available on the [LANSA website](#).



A speaker presents findings during the Strengthening Capacity for Research Uptake session on February 9, 2015

Session 3: National and regional experiences in research uptake

This session, chaired by Violet Murunga, featured four main presentations including:

- Improving emergency health transport in sub-Saharan Africa by Caroline Visser;
- Assessing impacts of climate change in South Africa's economy by Dominik Etienne;
- Engagement with the state and indigenous institutions by Darisuk Kharlyngdoh; and
- Humanitarian evidence systems mapping in East Africa by Kerry Smith.

These presentations and the ensuing discussions pointed to various key issues surrounding research utilisation including:

- The importance of having a comprehensive knowledge management strategy in-built within research projects;
- The importance of having a clear research uptake framework from the beginning of research projects, and the usefulness of involving highest levels of decision-makers and involvement of local research capacities if the research is led by international players; and
- The challenges of engaging poor and marginalised communities with research evidence, highlighting the language barrier (due to high levels of illiteracy), conflict with prevailing cultural beliefs and norms that may not support the voices of certain groups in the communities (like girls and women), and communities not knowing what to do with research evidence.

First Plenary

Research to Policy: From theoretical frameworks to practical approaches

The plenary session, chaired by Sally Theobald, explored the different types of research uptake frameworks, highlighting their assumptions and implications as well as strengths and weaknesses. The session further explored theoretical approaches to research use tailored to southern organisations based in regions

lacking guidebooks so as to inform and facilitate research use. Four panelists - Nicholas Benequista (London School of Economics, LSE), Rose Oronje (AFIDEP), Han van Dijk (Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research), and Peter da Costa (Hewlett Foundation) - gave presentations on this, which then led to discussions.

Van Dijk talked about research uptake frameworks from a funder's perspective. She noted that the work of her organisation on research uptake is driven by the ODI's RAPID framework that seeks to explain how research gets to inform policy decisions. She said that as funders, they are keen to have a good understanding of the research to policy process and effective ways of enabling increased uptake of research. Specifically, they would really like to understand the role of knowledge translation platforms in enabling researchers to share their findings with end-users and in agenda setting for public issues. Further, they are keen to understand the role of communication strategies, as well as the role of the key professionals involved in research uptake processes including, knowledge brokers and science journalists. She concluded by saying that they were keen on issuing a funding call in this area.

Oronje provided a summary of the research uptake theoretical frameworks, noting that these have evolved from traditional models that perceived the research use process as linear i.e. once research is generated, it brings about policy change, to frameworks that appreciate the complexity and iterative process of research uptake. She noted the later models take into account the reality the research use process is not straightforward, and that research has to compete and interact with many factors in informing decisions. She highlighted some of the later models to include:

- Haney et al 2003 Interceptors and Receptors model of research use;
- RAPID framework (2003) based on ODI's research in developing countries, that highlights the key issues influencing research use as including: context (politics and institutions), evidence (approach and credibility), Links (influence and legitimacy), and external influences; and

- IDS KNOTS 2006 model, which argues that research knowledge and discourses have to interact with the context of policymaking and the interests of actors and their networks in informing policy.

She concluded by highlighting important questions that need to inform the continuing theorizing of research use including:

- What are policymakers' incentives for research uptake?
- What actions are most effective at the policymaker-researcher interface in bringing about research use?
- What role for other actors in research uptake:
 - Policy beneficiaries (the citizens)?
 - Civil society?
- Policymaking is always about power:
 - How is research interacting with this power or assuming this power to bring about change?

da Costa highlighted the role of digital communications and research uptake. He emphasised the importance of context in informing the uptake of digital technologies as tools for increasing research uptake. He gave the example of Twitter, noting that a lot of key policymakers in Africa are not using Twitter, and so the fact that everyone around the world is using Twitter for increasing research uptake does not mean that African professionals also need to do the same. He noted that a deep understanding of the context and the actors being targeted is critical in ensuring effective research uptake strategies.

Benequista talked about the experiences of poor countries which are very resource-constrained and greatly dependent on donors, and what this means for research uptake efforts. He said that this situation is compounded by the lack of guidebooks on research uptake in such contexts. He highlighted the example of the Kenya Institute of Public Policy Research and Analysis (KIPPRA), which is the Kenyan government's policy think tank. He said that for KIPPRA to be effective in enabling increased research uptake, it needs to facilitate a change in the institutional culture of decision-making in public institutions in Kenya, yet

KIPPRA operates with very limited funding. He said institutions like KIPPRA cannot even afford highly qualified and experienced communications experts given the limited budgets they operate on. Yet such institutions need to be able to have strategies that can cope with the fragile context as well as change with the evolving contexts.

He also questioned donors' strict and intensive reporting requirements, which curtail innovation in research uptake strategies as well as take up too much time of implementers. He ended by highlighting the issue of 'whose research counts'. He noted that often donors do not really listen to researchers from poor countries; they tend to listen to well-established western institutions. This, he concluded, compounds the predicament of researchers and research uptake professionals in resource-poor contexts.

Discussions that ensued revolved around the issues of measuring impact of research uptake and the need for donors to understand the complexity of this process and the fact that impact takes time. The need for African governments to fund research was noted as critical in tackling some of the challenges raised. Further, discussions highlighted the important role of donors in enabling uptake through funding, but also their engagement with governments. Finally, the discussions emphasised the importance of relationships between researchers and policymakers in research uptake.

Second Parallel Sessions

Session 1: Exploring the barriers to research uptake

This session, chaired by Robert Terry, featured the four presentations including:

- Putting research into practice: Assessing and addressing barriers to IPTp uptake in Uganda by Badru Gidudu Walimbwa;
- Barriers, challenges and opportunities for enhancing the use of research evidence in decision-making in the health sector in Kenya and Malawi by Violet Murunga;
- Making 'Open Knowledge' open for all by Alan Stanley; and

- » Innovation and uptakes: challenges and process in the Humanitarian Innovation Fund by Lisa Guppy.

The main barriers to research utilization highlighted in the different presentations included:

- » Institutional
 - No framework for guiding data use;
 - Weak linkages and coordination;
 - Inadequate budget;
 - No institutional incentives; and
 - Politics and personal interest.
- » Access
 - No national repository for health research; and
 - Lack of journal subscriptions.
- » Individual
 - Technical skills;
 - Lack of incentives; and
 - Lack of time.
- » Lacking open access journals and research databases; and even for those that are open, many poor countries still can't access due to lacking infrastructure and incentives.

Discussions focused around ways of addressing the highlighted barriers to research utilisation, including the need to advocate for or implement programmes that address the highlighted challenges. Grappling with some of the barriers that seemed too hard to tackle, a participant posed the question: What can we do to encourage journals to allow open access to their content? This question remained unanswered.

Session 2: Approaches to improving research impact

This session, chaired by Anna Mary, featured four presentations:

- » Using serialised radio mini-drama to contribute to increasing knowledge and consumption of orange sweet potato in Uganda by Karen Hampson;

- » Creating conditions for scale-up: Technical assistance as an implementation research uptake strategy by Ian Askew;
- » Measuring how evidence synthesis outputs are used in the maternal, newborn and child health community by Agnes Becker; and
- » Strengthening media's response to urban health issues in Nepal by Sudeep Uprety.

The presentations and the discussions highlighted several important ways of improving the uptake and impact of research including:

- » The important role of radio in promoting uptake of evidence-based interventions especially in rural communities; more importantly, the need to combine radio with mobile phone (SMS) technologies as well as face-to-face mobilization to make it more effective;
- » Media can play an important role in focusing public attention to development issues highlighted by research, but media engagement has to be sustained and well delivered including the development and circulation of media guides and development of meaningful relationships with journalists;
- » The importance of pairing implementation research with provision of technical assistance to enable uptake of lessons coming out of implementation. Challenges with this include donors may not appreciate the need to fund a multi-faceted approach of the research and provision of technical assistance, but also that researchers need to be able to plan and deliver a multi-faced approach; and
- » The need for research uptake professions to intensify their dissemination of research briefs, as well as ensure that such briefs have actionable conclusions/recommendations. A study shared indicated the main reasons why research briefs were not used were that end-users did not know about the briefs, and that the briefs did not have actionable conclusions.

Session 3: Films/multimedia and communications in research uptake

This session, chaired by Jamie Guthie, featured four presentations including:

- Stopping violence before it starts - Ani Lamont;
- Using digital stories in the Participate Initiative - Vivienne Benson;
- A layered approach to engaging in community - Gwendolyn Meyer; and
- Democratising Mental Health: An introduction to PRIME - Amit Makan.

The presentations had two main highlights, namely the use of film in enabling knowledge uptake and the involvement of communities (i.e. research subjects) in conducting research but also in engaging with decision-makers in order to enable its uptake.

The discussions commended the innovativeness of the presenters in enabling research utilization, but also highlighted the thorny issue of ethics when involving research subjects in films or pictures as a way of enabling research use. There was consensus that ethics was an important aspect for research uptake professional to bear in mind even as they focus on innovative ways on enabling research utilization.

Day 2 Deliberations, Feb 10, 2015

Second Plenary

To Synthesize or not to synthesize, that is the question – the role of evidence synthesis in policy formulation

This plenary session, chaired by JPR Ochieng-Odero, explored the utilisation of rigorously synthesised evidence such as the evidence from systematic reviews versus the use of other types of evidences including those from single studies in policy-making. The panelists included: Mike English, GRADE Specialist, Kenya Medical Research Institute (KEMRI) – Wellcome Trust; Suleiman Asman, Country Director, Innovations for Poverty Action, Kenya; Philip Davies, Director of Systematic reviews, 3IE; and Kwame Owino, Chief Executive Officer, Institute of Economic Affairs, Kenya.

English talked about the critical role of rigorously conducted systematic reviews that use the GRADE methodology (such as the Cochrane Library systematic reviews) in informing policy and programme decisions. He observed that people who do not understand the GRADE methodology of conducting systematic reviews have no role in the research uptake process, arguing that this is the only evidence that should inform policy and programme decisions. Asman emphasized the important role of evaluations of interventions in informing policy and programme decisions.

He said that evaluations of interventions show us what works and what doesn't in reducing poverty, thereby generating critical knowledge for policy and programme decisions.

Davies agreed with the earlier presenters by emphasizing the importance of systematic reviews in impact evaluation in showing what works and what doesn't in development efforts. Owino talked about the role of local evidence in informing policy decisions, noting that systematic reviews need to be complemented by local evidence, which captures the contextual uniqueness.

The session generated a number of questions and interesting discussions as summarised below:

- What should policymakers do in the absence of systematic reviews because these are often not readily available when policymakers want policy questions answered?
- Related to the question above was the question, what should research uptake professionals do in the face of bad evidence?



From left: Panelists in this session included Philip Davies, Director of Systematic reviews – 3IE, Kwame Owino, CEO Institute of Economic Affairs (IEA), Suleiman Asman, Country Director, Innovations for Poverty Action, Kenya and Prof. Mike English, GRADE Specialist, Kenya Medical Research Institute (KEMRI) – Wellcome Trust).

- A number of participants challenged the presenters' on their bias towards systematic reviews that take a biomedical approach which often drop qualitative studies as not meeting the rigour required for inclusion in the systematic review exercise. Yet qualitative studies take a different approach in methodology, which still generates credible evidence for informing policy and programme decisions.
- One participant challenged the composition of the panel, which comprised all men; she noted that women do systematic reviews too.

Third Plenary

Technical innovations, media and communications in research uptake

The purpose of the plenary session, chaired by Sophie Marsden, was to demonstrate how various players were employing different technological innovation in enabling research utilization. The innovations included:

- Use of mobile phones in reaching patients with medical information as well as tracking patients interactions with hospitals (Regina Mutuku of Medic Mobile);
- Use of infographics, data visualization and social media to communicate research to policymakers (Davis Adieno, Development Initiatives, Africa);
- Having a comprehensive social media strategy for linking with policymakers and other research organisations (Sangeetha Rajeesh, LANSA, south Asia);
- Use of digital platforms in reaching audiences, but also learning from the public on development issues; (Churchill Otieno, Nation Media Group);
- Visualization of quantitative data as an innovative and impactful way of reaching policymakers with research findings (Jeff Knezovich, Quaternary Consulting); and
- Effective presentation skills (Paul Achar, Jade Communications).

Following the presentations in plenary, participants broke into small groups led by each presenter for further discussion on individual innovations.



Mr Paul Achar, an Executive Speech Consultant discussing with participants on effective speech techniques on February 10, 2015.

World Café

Case Studies and Country Explorations

Participants joined three different world cafés, each of which shared case studies illustrating successes and failures within research uptake. Each café session lasted 30 minutes after which participants reconvened in plenary for reports on café discussions. Each café is summarised below.

Café 1: Research uptake on the worldwide web was moderated by Clara Richards (INASP) and it featured two presentations:

- The role of virtual research in catalysing research uptake in international development by Anna Marry; and
- Learning from the experience of using online dialogue as a tool for knowledge sharing and research by Tom Barker.

Café 2: Research uptake in policy and practice was moderated by Josephine Mbiyu (FUNZO) and it featured two presentations.

- *Dutch Knowledge Platforms and The Broker: hubs for knowledge brokering* by Vanessa Nigten

This is a web-based knowledge platform that helps politicians, decision-makers/ policymakers access research. The broker synthesizes the research information and packages in a way that the leaders can easily understand. The broker has been a hub for these decision-makers when they want to get research information. It is also seen as resource and they can contact/call when they need research in their areas of interest.

- *Murder and evidence: Why is assessing impact at a programme level like trying to prove a murder in the absence of a body* by Hanna Alder

The focus was on measuring research/ implementation impact by developing an M&E framework. It noted the problem with traditional indicators that focus mainly on the output level and little on outcome e.g. number of people downloading electronic material by country and geographical location. This in itself does not show any impact, "so what if the material was downloaded?" Effective ways of documenting impact is by generating a cable of evidence through the process below?

- Output level – Mapping of stakeholders, assessments of outputs, definition of roles for all the players in the process,



Ms Josephine Mbiyu moderating the World Café on Research Uptake in Policy and Practice on February 10, 2015.

documentation of outcome through the stories of change (begin to create a story line that will be followed throughout the implementation process) documented over a period of time;

- Output is assessed independently and quality assured through sharing with stakeholders;
- The stakeholders judge whether this is a true documentation/picture of what is on the ground; and
- Building national/local capacity – this is a continuous process and should be done at every stage. This is mainly to ensure that even at the end of implementation, there are local people who can continue to document the impact thus sustainability.

Key characteristic of a story of change include:

- Shows impact of the project over the project life span;
- Qualitative and quantitative information included;
- Has been vetted by the stakeholders; and
- The story demonstrates maximum impact for maximum value of money.

Café 3: New partners, new opportunities for research uptake was moderated by Rose Oronje (AFIDEP) and it featured two presentations:

- Working in partnership to maximise impact for research: Transform Nutrition Champions by Samantha Reddin; and
- Teaming up for ResUp: Experiences implementing an innovative research utilisation/partnership model by Leigh Wynn.

Wynn talked about a strategy FHI 360 used in ensuring uptake of research on community level family planning (FP) programme. In their strategy, researchers and the users of the research worked together from the beginning of the research project to the end. She highlighted the importance of starting with the end in mind – what do you want the research findings to achieve? She noted that the success of the research project, which saw the Ugandan government take up the intervention to pilot and the WHO take up the evidence to inform its guidelines, can partly be attributed to the strategy they adopted from the beginning on enabling uptake.

Reddin talked about how a project she led on nutrition used nutrition champions to generate a supportive policy environment nutrition

for nutrition issues at policy and programme levels. She noted that the champions they worked with were high-level champions nominated by other stakeholders in the countries where the programme is operating (Kenya and Ethiopia).

Questions and discussions on the café were largely around the second topic (on nutrition champions), which a lot of participants were keen to know if it was an expensive intervention, and how they had measured success. The presenter noted that it's an intervention that requires proper investments to support the champions for it to be successful. On the measurement issue, she noted that the effectiveness of the intervention had not been measured but that she believes it played a role in creating an enabling environment for tackling nutrition issues in the project countries.

Closing Plenary

For the closing session, participants were divided into groups to discuss and chart the way forward on three key issues:

- **Group 1:** Define research uptake and research uptake principles (group was led by Jeff Knezovich);
- **Group 2:** How best do we communicate what has happened here? What's our communications plan for what we've talked about here? (group was led by Vivienne Benson); and
- **Group 3:** Is research uptake a forum, an event, or a process - what is the way forward? (group was led by Nasim Kung'u).

The first group struggled to determine an exact definition of 'research uptake' – and some questioned whether it was necessary.

This struggle represents how broad of a term it is. After significant discussion identifying a few key thoughts about what could go into a definition, the group decided to fall back on DFID's definition: 'Research uptake includes all the activities that facilitate and contribute to the use of research evidence by policy-makers, practitioners and other development actors'. To make that very broad definition slightly more tangible, the final exercise for all participants was to list one 'activity' that they did that they considered a 'research uptake activity'. This list will be published shortly on the ResUp website along with further discussion on the debate that was held.

The third group agreed that the research uptake forum should be a continuous process, with biannual meetings and institution of regional chapters in Africa and Asia that may meet annually through designated meetings or tagging on other on-going meetings. The group also agreed to continue networking and discussing pertinent research uptake issues through existing online discussion groups and networks, including the ResUp discussion group.

The ResUp MeetUp was the first event of its kind to bring together research uptake professionals. It has ignited energy within the research uptake community to maintain connections and relationships that were built at the event. It was an opportunity to discuss and develop key themes that impact all our work. With representation from academia, policy, communications professionals, and many others from across six continents (mainly Europe and Africa), it was a diverse and fruitful event. The second group agreed to make sure all presentations made at the symposium are made available online to make sure the learning continues beyond the end of the event.



Research uptake includes all the activities that facilitate and contribute to the use of research evidence by policy-makers, practitioners and other development actors



Symposium Moments



2.2 Emerging Themes from Symposium Deliberations

A number of important themes emerged from the two-day deliberations of the symposium as summarized below.

Ethics

This has two strands:

- a. There is a need to bring in different experiences and understandings of what is important in research and research uptake. We need to invest in partnerships and capacity strengthening across the entire research cycle that goes beyond the usual suspects of researchers and policy makers; and
- b. How do we ensure that the processes and products created during research uptake have the clearance and consent of the contributors to be used in other spaces.

Measuring Impact

There is a body of research around achieving and measuring impact of research uptake – however, we need collate this information, and question what constitutes as impact and meaningful ways to measure this; if limited timeframe impede understanding and achieving impact. Additionally, we need to acknowledge that projects and work do not exist in vacuums and that we work in fast moving and fluid contexts, there is rarely a linear path when it comes to identifying impact, in this vein, how is it possible to prove attribution?

Contexts and models of research uptake

A one-size-fits-all model of research uptake does not exist, there needs to be an understanding of the context and environment where the project is, and who is delivering the research uptake to ensure that plans are achievable, ethical and have real impact.

Complex skill set shared across fields

Research uptake requires skills across the board, including different professions (i.e. academic and communications working together) from having specific skills, i.e. data visualisation, digital storytelling and social network analysis. It is important to think about training, distributing roles and responsibilities and working collaboratively.

Institutional level

Research uptake needs to be embedded from the outset of a project lifecycle. To achieve high impact, there needs to be an institutional understanding, appreciation and knowledge of the necessity and purpose of research uptake.

Quality of evidence

This also relates to the point of ethics. It is important to have a diverse range of people in deciding what constitutes 'good quality' evidence and research. It also speaks to the fact that we have to be rigorous in research and evidence, and only promote evidence that is sustainable and high quality.

Challenges of funding

There needs to be further funding of research uptake on a broader level. Funders need to reinforce this when identifying opportunities for research and practitioners need to push this agenda more explicitly.

Role of the public/communities in research uptake

The need to also engage the public in research uptake activities was noted as important as they can use the evidence to change behavior, but also hold leaders accountable. Most research uptake efforts are focused on decision-makers and not as much focus is given to the public.

3 THE TRAINING EXCHANGE

3.1 Background

The ResUp MeetUp Training Exchange took place on 11-12 February, immediately following the Symposium. The idea was to involve peer members of the ResUp community to give trainings to each other. In exchange, they could get free training for themselves and for their colleagues.

The fees were split into two parts. There were attendance fees of US\$150 if the participant was not from a DFID-funded consortium. Additionally there were training course fees of US\$50 per half-day session – these were waived for training facilitators and up to five colleagues if they were offering trainings. The structure was designed to encourage participants to offer trainings.

Overall, we had 24 trainings proposed of various durations. We also solicited several that were not offered originally. The organisers vetted the courses to the best of our ability and tried to strike a balance between the different types of courses on offer. In the end we selected 17 different training sessions, ranging from writing 'issue briefs' to developing data visualisation, using film, planning communication activities, several sessions on blogging and digital communication, introduction to design and effective media engagement.

In total, this represents **52 hours of training**. And with 100 registered attendees, that is the equivalent of **roughly 5,000 hours of total training received** (subtracting out trainers' time). List of trainings offered is in Table 1.



Participants at the training exchange session. 17 different training sessions were offered to participants.

Table 1: List of Trainings offered

Sessions 1 & 2 – Data visualisation for research uptake
Session 1 – Developing Digital Stories
Session 1 – DFID’s approach to research uptake: How to develop an uptake strategy
Sessions 1, 2 & 3 – Actionable solutions to distinct problems: Crafting Issue Briefs
Session 2 – Video for health impact
Session 2 – Media engagement skills for working in ‘Southern’ contexts
Session 3 – Key messaging and pitching for impact: How to influence decision makers to take up research
Session 3 – Using WordPress to promote research publications, as an advocacy tool and to engage in ‘open’ approaches to research uptake
Session 3 – Visual Communication using InDesign: Tools and Techniques
Lightening session – Blogging for research impact
Lightening session – Plain English as a pathway to research impact in international development
Lightening session – How to make and implement an institutional communications strategy
Lightening session – Google Analytics for tracking research impact
Session 4 – How to identify and manage opportunities for ‘user-voice’ as part of research uptake strategies
Session 4 – Media skills for (nutrition) advocacy
Session 4 – Social network analysis to understand influence
Session 4 – How to use mapping tools to improve research uptake

4 COMMUNICATION SUCCESSSES FOR THE SYMPOSIUM AND TRAINING EXCHANGE

The ResUp MeetUp was set up to create new and build upon existing relationships with NGOs, government, global and media organisations as a tool for influence and impact. The event intended to reach out to peers (at the event and within the wider community) with the key messages and updates to ensure ongoing engagement within the community, at which communications activities were at the core.

The communications objectives of ResUp MeetUp were to:

- » Build a community of research uptake practitioners;
- » Share lessons and case studies of research uptake with ResUp Community and broadly. Currently, the community congregates around the ResUp MeetUp website and other social media channels (Twitter; LinkedIn and Facebook). Our target audiences included:
 - Research uptake practitioners;
 - Policymakers;
 - NGOs and Civil Society Organisations;
 - Researchers and academics; and
 - Media.

We used several channels to reach our audiences prior (when we were putting out calls for proposals for presentations and trainings), during and after:

- » Mailchimp;
- » Eventbrite;
- » Twitter;
- » Facebook;
- » LinkedIn;
- » ResUp MeetUp website;
- » IDS/AFIDEP website;

- » Existing connections;
- » Survey Monkey;
- » Existing relationships; and
- » Face-to-face conversations.

What worked well?

Twitter

Twitter was used throughout the event, not just by organisers, but also by participants and external members of the ResUp MeetUp community. The hashtag #resupmeetup is still being used by members of the ResUp MeetUp community, and was an excellent way to generate conversation, identify the key themes and engage the wider community beyond the event itself.

There were over 150 tweets and retweets throughout the four-day event by IDS alone. IDS has over 37,000 twitter followers so the potential reach of that is significant. Each original tweet was retweeted at least once, but generally between 5-10 times. With the Twitter activity, it is clear that participants were engaging as much in the room, as they were online.

Storify

The Storify '[Turning research into action at the #resupmeetup](#)' was a live output to pull together the discussions as they were happening. To date, it has had over 600 views, which is one of the most viewed Storifys on the IDS page.

Blogs

The blogging throughout the event, and subsequently has been prolific. While many posts have come from the ResUp MeetUp blog (by organisers and contributors), the majority

were reflections and lessons on external blogs. The blog posts demonstrate the diversity of conversation, and became key topics of conversation within the ResUp MeetUp Community. Most notably, the tweets sharing the blogs had the most reach and highest number of retweets.

ResUp:

- [Research Uptake: Back to Basics](#)
- [People Power in Research Uptake](#)
- [My Big Idea #ResearchUptake](#)
- [Research uptake and impact: Let's not reinvent the wheel!](#)
- [Thinking outside the box: Using digital to tell the story](#)
- [ResUp: Reactions from around the web](#)
- [Research communicators: let's talk politics, shall we?](#)
- [An Open and Honest Discussion on Research Uptake](#)
- [Funding for research uptake](#)

Others:

- [ReBUILD descends on Research Uptake meeting en masse!](#)
- [Some thoughts from Day One of ResUpMeetUp](#)
- [ReBUILD speaks up on Research Uptake; Reflections from the ResUpMeetUp meeting](#)
- [Lisa Guppy – Update from the Resup Meetup Symposium, Nairobi](#)

- [3 Big Issues for Research Uptake](#)
- [Three big questions in research uptake: What, Why, Who?](#)
- [Research \(uptake\) – so what?](#)
- [Research Uptake: from a thorn in the side to a rose by another name?](#)
- [CGIAR leads communications-for-research uptake \(ResUp\) training at Nairobi Symposium](#)
- [Ten lessons from the Res Up Meet Up](#)
- [Reflections from the Resup Meetup, Nairobi, 9-12 February 2015](#)
- [Blogging for Impact](#)
- [Neglected Tropical Diseases: Influence, Impact and Engagement](#)
- [The Question of Ethics in Research Uptake Processes and Products](#)
- [Ethics in #resupmeetup: Six things that people are talking about](#)
- [Can one person have all the skills to do research uptake?](#)
- [ResUp CatchUp: how funders can help research uptake](#)
- [The \(conflicted\) role of researchers as advocates](#)

Media coverage

Eliya Zulu, Executive Director, AFIDEP was published in The Daily Nation prior to the ResUp MeetUp: How research can influence policy decisions

SciDev.net's sub Saharan Africa Desk published Researchers told to get research findings to end users.

Discussions on Twitter

ResUp MeetUp retweeted



Farah Ahmed @farahamds · Feb 10

One of the major learnings from the #resupmeetup is the need to build skills of researchers for uptake #researchuptake

ResUp MeetUp retweeted



Transform Nutrition @TN_NutritionRPC · Feb 10

@paulachar U need to be a credible, likeable presenter & be able to tell stories to illustrate and explain your research #resupmeetup

ResUp MeetUp retweeted



Ruthpearl Ng'ang'a @kenyanwanjiru · Feb 10

Key concerns @ResUpMeetUp: What works? How to ascertain quality of evidence? Measuring impact i.e. contribution vs. attribution? @aphrc

ResUp MeetUp retweeted



Nasreen Jessani @NasreenJessani · Feb 10

@ResUpMeetUp Polarised view: should researchers advocate own results? Yes/No/Maybe? Implications? Everyone treading carefully #researchuptake

ResUp MeetUp retweeted



Nick Hooton @nick_hooton · Feb 10

Should only full systematic review research evidence inform policy? What about real world of decision making? Controversial at #resupmeetup

ResUp MeetUp retweeted



AfricanPolicy Centre @APCPolicy · Feb 10

@ResUpMeetUp There is limited evidence of what works to end poverty - Suleiman Asman IPA.

Up ResUp MeetUp @ResUpMeetUp · Feb 10

It seems a lot easier to get money to have meetings abt #researchuptake than to actually do it says Mike English

ResUp MeetUp retweeted



Pamoja @PamojaUK · Feb 10

#resupmeetup Are we agreed on principle of research uptake? What about evidence that we personally disagree with? What is our moral compass?

ResUp MeetUp retweeted



Eliya Zulu @EliyaZulu · Feb 9

@ResUpMeetUp Rose Oronje - changing way of thinking about issues by policy makers is key outcome of evidence uptake but hard to quantify

ResUp MeetUp retweeted



GlobalRenaissance @Global_Renewal · Feb 9

FYI via @IDS_UK + @MakHPPM: There is need for African #Governments to put money into #CapacityBuilding for research uptake #ResUpMeetUp

ResUp MeetUp retweeted



Sally Theobald @sallytheobald · Feb 9

@EliyaZulu #resupmeetup we need to consider ethics of RU - are we overplaying our results to show impact?

ResUp MeetUp retweeted



Chris Jordan @chrisjords · Feb 9

James Nyikal MP: what's the objective of research? Often doesn't align with policymaker needs. No surprise there's no impact #resupmeetup

5 CHALLENGES AND WAY FORWARD

What were the challenges?

Eventbrite

Due to the nature of the event, whereby participants could separately attend the Symposium and Training Exchange, and that some were exempt from paying to attend different parts of the training exchange, Eventbrite did not support the complex registration process. Many participants were confused as to which tickets they should register for and as a result, much of the communications prior to the event focused on registration and took away from other communications activities.

Small team and timeframe

ResUp MeetUp was coordinated by Vivienne Benson (IDS), Jeff Knezovich (Quaternary Consulting) and Nasim Kung'u (AFIDEP). As we were based in different cities and countries, our interaction was stilted and limited. There was a lack of clarity over roles and responsibilities, which meant there was overlap and in some cases, confusion. Preparation for the ResUp MeetUp began in November (three months before the event), which included putting out

calls for presenters and trainers to deliver presentations and training sessions; inviting panellists for the Symposium; advertising the event with a complete agenda; setting up and supporting the registration process etc.

Future of the ResUp MeetUp network

There was an appetite at the ResUp MeetUp to continue the network. There was also recognition that there are existing networks where we may be able to participate and build upon the new relationships that have been formed during the ResUp MeetUp.

Taking this into account, next steps should focus on a scoping of existing networks, and their specific focuses. We should continue to maintain the ResUp MeetUp network by inviting participants to blog for the ResUp Website and share on social media their experiences of Research Uptake.

As one of the key discussions within the event was around setting the agenda for the future of research uptake, there is a huge amount of scope for the network to continue. However, it would need to be led by champions that have a sole focus to drive the conversation and engage with the network regularly.

6 APPENDICES

6.1 List of Participants

Full name	Job Title	Company	Home Country
Agnes Becker	Communications Officer	London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine	GB
Alan Stanley	Senior Thematic Convenor	Institute of Development Studies	GB
Albert Leny-Otieno	Assistant Editor	SciDev.Net	KE
Alex Gwyther	Communications Manager	UK Collaborative on Development Sciences	GB
Amit Makan	Research Uptake Officer	PRIME, University of Cape Town	ZA
Ani Lamont	Research Uptake Manager	What Works to Prevent Violence Against Women and Girls Global Programme/ DFID	AU
Anjuli Shivshanker	Sr. Coordinator, Evidence to Action	International Rescue Committee	US
Anna Marry	Research Uptake Manager	London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine	GB
Annett Victorero Silventoinen	Communications Associate	UNU-WIDER	
Ariff Almas			
Badru Gidudu Walimbwa	PPA projects Coordinator	Malaria Consortium Uganda	UG
Beena Kharel	Communications and Research Uptake Specialist	International Water Management Institute	NP
Benard Muok	Director of programmes	African Centre for Technology Studies	KE
Bernice Nduta	Regional User Engagement Coordinator	SciDev.Net	KE
Bezawit Tesfaye Fantta	Director, Central Region	Ethiopian Roads Authority	ET
Cannon Awuor Ponge	Director of Research, Policy and Evaluation	African Policy Centre (APC)	KE
Caroline Lumosi	Project Officer	INTASAVE	KE
Caroline Visser	Knowledge & Communications Manager	AFCAP/ASCAP	CH
Chris Jordan	Communications & Uptake Manager	University of Manchester	GB
Christine Ngwawe	Researcher	Amref Health Africa	KE
Christine Wangari	Communications and Projects Officer	ICRISAT	KE
Churchill Otieno	Managing Editor, Convergence and Syndication	Nation Media Group	KE
Cynthia Mauncho	Head of Communication	KEMRI Wellcome Trust Research Programme	KE
Daisy Ouya	Communications Specialist/Science Writer	ICRAF	KE

Full name	Job Title	Company	Home Country
Darisuk Kharlyngdoh	Research Officer	Indian Institute of Public Health-North East (PHFI)	IN
Dashakti Reddy	Women's Protection and Empowerment Research Liaiso	International Rescue Committee	SS
David Guwatudde	Mentor ARCADE-HSSR	Makerere University	UG
Davis Adieno	Capacity Development Manager	Development Initiatives	KE
Davy Orago	Researcher	LVCT Health	KE
Desalegne Tadesse	Communications Officer	International Water Management Institute (IWMI); East Africa & Nile Basin Office	ET
Dinah Wabwoba	Graduate Student	Moi University	KE
Dominik Etienne	Associate Programme Officer	UNU-WIDER	FI
Dzernyuy FAI Collins	Communication Officer	Center for International Forestry Research	CM
Eddie Mwangi	program coordinator	citichanger	KE
Edward Kusewa	project officer	Integrating Diversities for Development	KE
Edwin Maina	Senior Programme Manager	Concern Worldwide	KE
Eliya Zulu	Executive Director	AFIDEP	KE
Emmanuel Toili	Communications Specialist	African Institute for Development Policy	KE
Emmy Kageha Igonya	Post Doctoral/Consultant	VU University	KE
Erick Sakwa		LVCT health	KE
Esther Kimani	Social Media and Web Content editor	ICRAF	KE
Esther Ogara			
Everlyne Obwocha	Research Assistant	African Centre for Technology Studies	KE
F Obi	Research Uptake Officer	HEALTH POLICY RESEARCH GROUP	NG
Farah Ahmed	Research Coordinator for Impacts- Asia	IWMI	IN
Faye Moody	Programme Administrator	Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine	GB
Feng Zhou	Doctor	Institute of Environmental Medicine, Tongji medical college, Huazhong university	CN
FIKIRI FREDRICK MAGAFU	PRINCIPAL RESEARCHER	DISTRICT ROAD RESEARCH CENTRE	TZ
Fiona Napier	Senior consultant	Development Initiatives	KE
Freddie Bwanga	Microbiologist	Makerere University	UG
Fredrick Mariwa	Program Officer	Farm Radio International	KE
Gaye Agesa	Communications Manager	Plan International	KE
Gollo Yattani	Lecturer	St Pauls University	KE

Full name	Job Title	Company	Home Country
Grace Baey	Research and Communications Officer	Asia Research Institute	SG
Gwendolyn Meyer	student/creative practitioner	Sustainability Institute/Mekelle University	ZA
Han van Dijk	Research Uptake Manager	Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO)	NL
Hanna Alder	Project Manager	ODI	GB
Hannah Halder	Project Coordinator - DRUSSA	ACU	GB
Ian Askew	Co-Director, STEP UP Consortium	Population Council	KE
Jackson Mutavi	Monitoring and Evaluation Supervisor	The Centre for Victims of Torture	KE
James Tumwine	PI ARCADE-HSSR	MAKERERE UNIVERSITY	IG
Jamie Guth	Communications Manager	World Health Organization/TDR	CH
Jean Kyula	Programme Associate	IHPMR	KE
Jeff Knezovich	Director	Quaternary Consulting	GB
jithada Baraka	Researcher	Ifakara Health Institute	TZ
Jones Abisi	Policy & Advocacy Coordinator	African Institute for Development Policy	KE
JONES TUMWEBAZE	Accountant ARCADE-HSSR	Makerere University	UG
Josephine Mbiyu	Deputy Director - FUNZO	Intrahealth	KE
Joyce Mbiti	Executive Assistant	African Institute for Development Policy	KE
Julia Powell	Research Uptake Manager	LANSAS/IDS	GB
Julie Irving	Programme Officer (Research Uptake)	Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine	GB
Juliet Braslow	Soils Research Area Coordinator	International Center for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT)	KE
Justus Muhando	GIS Associate	Spatial Collective	KE
Kakaire Kirunda	Communications Specialist	Makerere University School of Public Health	UG
KALYANGO NAKAYAGA JOAN	Mentor - ARCADE-HSSR	Makerere University	UG
Karen Hampson	Sr Program Manager	Farm Radio International	
Kassimu Tani	Research scientist	Ifakara Health institute	TZ
Kate Hawkins	Director	Pamoja Communications	GB
Kate O'Shea	Research Uptake Manager	Department for International Development	GB
Kayleigh Ryan	Research Assistant	Karolinska Institutet	SE
Kellen Karimi			
Kelly Muraya	Health Researcher	KEMRI-Wellcome Trust Research Programme	KE
Kenaw Gebreselassie Hailemichael	Communication & Research Uptake manager	Save the Children/Transform Nutrition	ET

Full name	Job Title	Company	Home Country
Leigh Wynne	Senior Technical Officer	FHI 360	US
Liam Roberts	Programme Officer	Association of Commonwealth Universities	GB
Lilian Otiso	Director of Services	LVCT Health	KE
Lisa Guppy	Senior research Advisor	ELRHA	GB
MABEL NANGAMI	Senior Lecturer	Moi University	KE
Maeghan Orton	Africa Regional Director	Medic Mobile	
Margaret Kababu	Research Assistant	LVCT health	KE
Martin Oluoch	Consultant	Independent	KE
Maryline Achieng	Research Officer	LVCT Health	KE
Mbarwa Kivuyo	Communications manager	Ifakara Health Institute	TZ
Melissa Julian	Head of Communications	European Centre for Development Policy Management (ECDPM)	BG
Michelle Gathigi	Project Associate	Spatial Collective	
Mike English	Director, Health Services Unit	KEMRI - Wellcome Trust	KE
MIKE WAYAMBA	Procurement Officer	N/A	KE
Millicent Kiruki	Researcher	LVCT Health	KE
Milly Nattimba	Communications Officer	Makerere University	UG
Moses Ng'wono	Journalist	KBC	KE
Mourine Chepkemoi	Research Assistant	African Centre for Technology Studies	KE
NAKAYAGA JOAN KALYANGO	Mentor - ARCADE-HSSR	Makerere University	UG
Nana Ama Nartey	Publications Officer	Ghana Center for Democratic Development	GH
Nasim Kung'u	Research and Knowledge Translation Officer	AFIDEP	KE
Nasreen Jessani	Health Policy and Systems Strengthening Consultant		ZA
Natasha Frosina	Research Fellow / Strategic Partnerships Coordinator	African Centre for Technology Studies	KE
Nicholas Benequista	PhD Researcher	London School of Economics	ET
Nicholas Muraguri	Director of Medical Services	Ministry of Health - Kenya	KE
Nick Hooton	Research, Policy and Practice Advisor	ReBUILD Consortium and Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine	GB
Nitasha Nair	Senior Communications Officer	International Water Management Institute (IWMI), CGIAR	IN
NOU Keosothea	Programme coordinator	CDRI	CM
Nyasha Musandu	Training Manager	CommsConsult / Research to Action (R2A)	ZW
Obadia Okinda Okinda	Assistant Knowledge Manager	Africa Economic Research consortium	KE

Full name	Job Title	Company	Home Country
ODUOR OMOGI	Student	Moi University	KE
Tony Oluka	ELearning Administrator	Makerere University	UG
Paige McClanahan	Communications Consultant	World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF)	KE
Paul Achar	Jade Communications	Jade Communications	KE
Paul Agina	M&E Officer	Amref Health Africa	KE
Peter da Costa	Africa Advisor	William & Flora Hewlett Foundation	
Philip Davies	Deputy Director	3ie - International Initiative for Impact Evaluation	GB
Phillip Amkoya	Data Collector	Spatial Collective	KE
Primož Kovacic	Co-Founder & Director of Operations	Spatial Collective	KE
PRISCAH KAPTICH	GRADUATE STUDENT	MOI-UNIVERSITY	KE
Radhika Menon	Senior Policy and Advocacy Officer	International Initiative for Impact Evaluation (3ie)	IN
Richard Ayah	Lecturer	School of Public Health, University of Nairobi	KE
Richard Mbithi	program officer	Miti mingi conservation center	KE
RISPER MURUNGA	GRADUATE STUDENT	MOI UNIVERSITY	KE
Robert Terry	Manager - Knowledge Management	TDR	CH
Robina Abuya	Conservation Manager	African Wildlife Foundation	KE
Robinson Karuga	Research Manager	LVCT Health	KE
Rogers Amara	Research Assistant	ReBUILD Consortium	SL
Ronald Kananura Muhumuza	Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist	Makerere University School of Public Health	UG
Ronald Muhumuza Kananura	Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist	Makerere University School of Public Health	UG
Rose Oronje	Snr. Policy and Communications Specialist	AFIDEP	KE
Sabine Zinsmeister	Communications Officer	Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO)	NL
Sally Theobald	Reader in Social Science and International Health	Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine	GB
Samantha Reddin	Research Uptake Manager	Transform Nutrition/ Institute of Development Studies	GB
Samar Zuberi	Research Associate	Collective for Social Science Research	
Samuel Okaro	Researcher	Amref health Africa	KE
Sangeetha Rosemarie Rajeesh	Communication & Research Uptake Specialist	LANSA - MSSRF	IN
Sara Quinn	Regional Communications Specialist	International Potato Center CIP	KE
Sarah Ssali		Makerere University	UG

Full name	Job Title	Company	Home Country
Shibaji Bose	Policy Influence Research Uptake	Institute of Health Management Research	IN
Silvia Poggioli	Project Manager Nigeria	Transaid	GB
Simin Deng	Research Officer	COMDIS-HSD China Program	CN
Simon Njuguna	manager	Mescop	KE
Snigdha Ali	LANSa-BRAC Lead Research Uptake for Bangladesh	BRAC	BD
Sophia Wanjiku	Women's Protection and Empowerment Coordinator	International Rescue Committee	KE
Sophie Marsden	Health Systems Programme Officer	Institute of Development Studies	GB
Sreytouch Vong	Research Fellow	Cambodia Development Resource Institute	KH
Steven Adala	Communications Officer	KWTRP	KE
Sudeep Uprety	Research Uptake and Communications Officer	Health Research and Social Development Forum (HERD)	NP
Sulieman Asman			
Susan Onyango	Communication Specialist	World Agroforestry Centre	KE
Thokozani Dlamini	Communications Officer	International Water Management Institute	ZA
Tom Barker	Senior Health & Nutrition Convenor	Institute of Development Studies, UK	GB
Tumwebaze Jones	Accountant ARCADE-HSSR	Makerere University	UG
Twahira Abdalla	Intern	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	KE
Vanessa Nigten	Knowledge Broker	The Broker/ Food & Business Knowledge Platform	NL
Violet Murunga	Snr Research and Knowledge Translation Officer	AFIDEP	KE
VIRGINIA WAINAINA	MEDICAL DOCTOR	MINISTRY OF HEALTH	KE
Vivienne Benson	Communications Officer	Institute of Development Studies	GB
Yotamu Chirwa	Senior Research Fellow	Biomedical research and Training Institute	ZW
Yvonne Opanga	Research Assistant	Moi University	KE
Zilper Audi	Research Uptake Manager	International Centre for Tax and Development	KE

6.2 Symposium Agenda

ResUp MeetUp Symposium Agenda	
9-10 February 2015, Southern Sun - Mayfair Hotel, Nairobi, Kenya	
Day/Time	Sunday 8 February
14:00-18:00	Participant registration, set-up, meet and greet
	Monday 9 February
08:30-09:30	Late participant registration, pre-event networking
09:30-09:45	Opening remarks: DFID representative, IDS representative, AFIDEP representative
09:45-10:00	Keynote address 1: Framing big issues in Research Uptake Dr. Eliya Zulu, PhD (Executive Director, AFIDEP)
10:00-10:15	Keynote address 2: The evidence gap challenge in parliament Dr. James Nyikal, MP (Member of the Parliamentary Committee of Health, Parliament of Kenya)
10:15-10:30	Opening address: Research Uptake Symposium and Training Exchange Dr. Nicholas Muraguri (Director of Medical Services, Ministry of Health, Kenya)
10:30-11:00	Morning Tea
11:00-12:30	Presentations in parallel sessions
	Room 1: Research uptake engagement strategies (Jamie Guth)
	a) A day in the life of an Uptake and Communication Specialist (Nitasha Nair)
	b) Emerging policy makers: constitutional change and access to HIV/SRHR services in Nairobi (Emmy Igyona)
	c) The relationship paradigm: Using Social Network Analysis (SNA) as a novel method for identifying academic-policy maker networks in Kenya (Dr. Nasreen Jessani)
	d) Rethinking uptake? Do we need to repackage, re-market or re-target (Juliet Braslow)
	e) Stakeholder analysis as a research uptake management tool: a case of the Programme for Improving Mental health care (PRIME) (Amit Makan)
	Room 2: Strengthening capacity for research uptake (Martin Oluoch)
	a) Approaching research uptake as an organisational outcome (Anjali Shivshanker)
	b) Developing Institutional capacity for knowledge translation and effective communication in East and Central African schools of public health (Richard Ayah)
	c) Research Uptake self-assessment tool (Julia Powell)
	d) The 'uptake of uptake': Challenges and strategies to building an institutional culture of research uptake (Liam Roberts)
	Room 3: National and regional experiences in research uptake (Violet Murunga)
	a) Improving emergency health transport in sub-Saharan Africa (Caroline Visser)
	b) Assessing impacts of climate change in South Africa's economy (Dominik Etienne)
	c) Humanitarian evidence systems mapping in East Africa (Kerry Smith)
	d) Engagement with the state and indigenous institutions (Darisuk Kharlyngdoh)

12:30-13:30	Lunch
13:30-15:00	Plenary session – Research to Policy: From theoretical frameworks to practical approaches (Chair - Gilbert Kokwaro)
	Panellists will explore different types of research uptake frameworks, highlighting their assumptions and implications as well as strengths and weaknesses. They will also explore approaches tailored to southern organisations based in regions lacking guidebooks so as to inform and facilitate research use.
	a) Nicholas Benequista, London School of Economics (LSE)
	b) Dr. Rose Oronje, AFIDEP
	c) Han van Dijk, Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO)
	d) Peter da Costa, Hewlett Foundation
15:00-15:30	Afternoon tea
15:30-17:00	Presentations in parallel sessions
	Room 1: Exploring the barriers to research uptake (Robert Terry)
	a) Putting research into practice: Assessing and addressing barriers to IPTp uptake in Uganda (Badru Gidudu Walimbwa)
	b) Barriers, challenges and opportunities for enhancing the use of research evidence in decision-making in the health sector in Kenya and Malawi (Violet Murunga)
	c) Making ‘Open Knowledge’ open for all (Alan Stanley)
	d) Innovation and uptakes: challenges and process in the Humanitarian Innovation Fund (Lisa Guppy)
	Room 2: Approaches to improving research impact (Anna Marry)
	a) Using serialised radio mini-drama to contribute to increasing knowledge and consumption of orange sweet potato in Uganda (Karen Hampson)
	b) Creating conditions for scale-up: Technical assistance as an implementation research uptake strategy (Ian Askew)
	c) Measuring how evidence synthesis outputs are used in the maternal, new-born and child health community (Agnes Becker)
	d) Strengthening media’s response to urban health issues in Nepal (Sudeep Uprety)
	Room 3: Films/multi-media and communications in research uptake (Jamie Guth)
	a) Stopping violence before it starts (Ani Lamont)
	b) Using digital stories in the Participate Initiative (Vivienne Benson)
	c) A layered approach to engaging in community (Gwendolyn Meyer)
	d) Democratising Mental Health: An introduction to PRIME (Amit Makan)

Tuesday, 10 February	
08:30-09:00	Recap from deliberations in Day 1 (Jeff Knezovich)
09:00-10:30	Plenary debate - To synthesise or not to synthesise, that is the question – the role of evidence synthesis in policy formulation (Chair Dr. JPR Ochieng-Odero)
	This session aims to explore the utilisation of (rigorously) synthesised evidence in policy making e.g. commonly used methodologies in the medical (Cochrane systematic reviews) and social science fields (Impact Evaluations – 3IE, Randomised Control Trials – JPAL/IPA) etc. Panellists will also illustrate the reality in terms of utilising evidence generated from a single study, or inadequately synthesized evidence; and the impact this may have on policymaking.
	a) Prof. Mike English, GRADE Specialist, Kenya Medical Research Institute (KEMRI) – Wellcome Trust)
	b) Suleiman Asman, Country Dir. Innovations for Poverty Action, Kenya
	c) Philip Davies, Director of Systematic reviews – 3IE
	d) Kwame Owino, CEO, Institute of Economic Affairs, Kenya
10:30-11:00	Morning Tea
11:00-12:30	Plenary (group) discussion - Technical innovations, media and communications in research uptake (Sophie Marsden)
	In this session, panellist will start by illustrating various innovative approaches to research uptake activities – including new frontiers for digital publishing, data visualisation and experimental films. Following presentations of these innovations in plenary, we will break into small groups led by each presenter for further discussion on individual innovations.
	a) Regina Mutuku, Medic Mobile, Africa
	b) Davis Adieno, Engagement & Impact, Development Initiatives, Africa
	c) Sangeetha Rajeeesh, Leveraging Agriculture for Nutrition, South Asia (LANSA)
	d) Churchill Otieno, Managing Editor, Convergence and Syndication, Nation Media Group, Kenya
	e) Paul Achar, Jade Communications, Kenya
	f) Jeff Knezovich, Quaternary Consulting, UK
13:00-14:00	Lunch
14:00-15:30	World café plenary - Case studies and country explorations
	Participants will be able to join two cafes. Each café session will be 30 minutes, and will include two presentations of case studies illustrating successes and failures within research uptake. The group will then reconvene into plenary to share session ideas and findings.

	Café 1: Research uptake on the world wide web (Clara Richards)
	a) The role of virtual research in catalysing research uptake in international development (Anna Marry)
	b) Learning from the experience of using online dialogue as a tool for knowledge sharing and research (Tom Barker)
	Café 2: Research uptake in policy and practice (Josephine Mbiyu)
	a) Dutch Knowledge Platforms and The Broker: hubs for knowledge brokering (Vanessa Nigten)
	b) Murder and evidence: Why is assessing impact at a programme level like trying to prove a murder in the absence of a body (Hanna Alder)
	Café 3: New partners, new opportunities for research uptake (Dr. Rose Oronje)
	a) Working in partnership to maximise impact for research: Transform Nutrition Champions (Samantha Reddin)
	b) Teaming up for ResUp: experiences implementing an innovative research utilisation/ partnership model (Leigh Wynn)
	Plenary discussion – summaries from the café moderators
15:30-16:00	Afternoon tea
16:00-17:00	Closing plenary session: Bringing it all together
	Speakers: Members of the ResUp MeetUp organising committee
17:00-17:15	Closing remarks and vote of thanks
	Conference evaluation, housekeeping
19:00-21:00	Participant dinner - Safari Park Hotel - Nyama Choma Ranch, Thika Road
	Safari cats - evening entertainment (cabaret show)





African Institute for Development Policy (AFIDEP),
Suite #25, 2nd Floor, Royal Offices,
Mogotio Road, Westlands,
P.O. Box 14688-00800, Nairobi, KENYA.
Tel: +254 20 2039-510
Mobile: +254 735 249 499; +254 716 002 059
Email: info@afidep.org
www.afidep.org

Institute of Development Studies (IDS),
University of Sussex,
Brighton BN1 9RE;
Tel: +44 (0)1273 606261;
Fax: +44 (0)1273 621202 IDS