

## Evaluation Management Response

### General

Evaluation title:	Final evaluation of the Institutional University Cooperation with Eduardo Mondlane University
Evaluation year:	2018
Authors:	Corina Dhaene (ACE Europe) Katia Taela (independent consultant)
How was this <u>management response</u> developed and validated ?	<p>The initial plan was to discuss the responses of the evaluation management letter during the JSC organized during the closing event on 17, 18 and 19 December 2018. However, given time constraint this was not discussed but the responsibility to draft the document was left to the Management Team of the Desafio Programme.</p> <p>Then the documents (the management letter, the evaluation report and the format for responses) were circulated to the members of the Management Team and to Project Leaders to collect inputs. The responses were consolidated by the Programme Officer and submitted to the vice Rector for Academic Affair for final appreciation.</p>

### Appreciation of evaluation

How has the evaluation report been discussed and used in the programme and the university?

The evaluation report is of utmost importance to the Eduardo Mondlane University and to all Programmes and projects being implemented at UEM. It addresses important aspects related to management of Programme/projects in terms of effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact. Given its importance, the report was discussed not only at level of the IUC Programme but also at the level of the management of the Eduardo Mondlane University and the findings and recommendations were considered valuable as guiding tool for reflexion and developing strategies for improvement. It is important to stress that the good knowledge of the Programme by the reviewers through reading of relevant policy documents of UEM and the self-assessments allowed them to gather and analyse important issues. Also, the evaluators strategically selected key members involved in the implementation of Programme which helped them in gathering important and useful information from different angles.

**What is your general appreciation of the evaluation report?**

**Were there shortfalls or limitations in the process and/outcomes? Are there any additional insights not articulated in the recommendations?**

Comparing to the evaluation of the phase I, this was carefully prepared and performed. Starting from the evaluators themselves, they demonstrated profound knowledge of the programme and the university dynamics which allowed them to bring important and relevant aspects. This transmitted confidence to UEM management and to all interviewed. Second, the evaluators were careful in selecting the right people for interviews, starting from the management level to coordination, Project Leaders and PSU staff. It was interesting and of added value to involve former members of the management team who had long experience and insight in the management of this project.

The evaluation itself, is attempt to analyse the overall institutional development looking at the transition of strategic plans. It looks as well at new developments of the institution in the process of its transformation to become a research led institution. The report makes reference to evaluation reports of other programme such as the Sida/Sarec. This allows for thorough analysis on management of Programmes and projects at UEM.

Regarding to Desafio Programme itself, the report brings important issues also addressed in the self-assessment. That is, the report addresses important information already reported by the coordination and project leaders.

## Management response to recommendations of the evaluation

For every recommendation, please fill out a table:

<p><b>Recommendation 1: Effectiveness</b></p>	<p>Support the emergence of a research <i>culture</i>: hold academic staff accountable for performance in research and publishing (for e.g. by integrating this as condition for promotion), continue with scientific conferences and increase their visibility, stimulate academic staff to read and to prac-</p>
---	--

	tice scientific writing. Supporting this culture starts with leadership and the dean of the faculty.	
<b>Management Response</b> (Agree, partially agree, disagree):	Partially agree	
<b>If recommendation is rejected or partially accepted, report reasons:</b>	Academic staff should be capacitated to be independent in academic activities and not only relying on the leadership to perform their tasks.	
<b>Actions Planned</b>	<b>Implementation stage</b> (not started, underway, completed, cancelled) + <b>timeframe</b> (action finalised):	<b>Actions taken</b>
Continue to promote UEM scientific conferences	Continued action	Bi-annual conference and scientific workshops at the faculty levels.
Continue to promote scientific publications	Continued action	Payment for publication fees and prizes for publication by UEM academic staff.

<b>Recommendation 2: Effectiveness</b>	Resolve the institutional and governance stumble blocks and ensure a pro-active and constructive role for the Scientific Directorate (also with view to sustainability). Given the wish of various faculties to remain semi-autonomous and their proper efforts to develop mechanisms and rules, it might be wise to first map and analyse their experiences and to valorise them before presenting a top-down solution.	
<b>Management Response</b> (Agree, partially agree, disagree):	Agree	
<b>If recommendation is rejected or partially accepted, report reasons:</b>		
<b>Actions Planned</b>	<b>Implementation stage</b> (not started, underway, completed, cancelled) + <b>timeframe</b> (action finalised):	<b>Actions taken</b>
Map the existing experiences	Not started	Regular meetings with the deputy deans for research and postgraduate studies
Scientific report	Continued action	Annual scientific reports

<b>Recommendation 3: Efficiency</b>	Create spaces for learning and do not limit project management to reporting against deadlines. Use project management meetings to discuss about what has worked and why and to better document and analyse changes.	
<b>Management Response</b> (Agree, partially agree, disagree):	Partially agree	
<b>If recommendation is rejected or partially accepted, report reasons:</b>	<p>It is true that the Joint Steering Committee meetings served as moment for planning and reporting. But the meetings were as well used to discuss progress in implementation of projects. It was on these meetings that decisions for restructuring the management setting were taken. It was also in these meetings that scholarships of some of students who did not show progress were cancelled due to low progress and decisions were taken to develop more stringent selection guidelines which allowed for integration of new motivated students.</p> <p>The Local Steering Committee meetings were organized every two or three months to follow up on implantation of projects. In these meetings the issue of delays on progress of PhD and Master students was always brought to attention.</p> <p>We recognize the shortfalls during the phase I, where the meetings were mainly for planning and reporting and opportunities to take crucial decision were missed. But this changed in phase II, where the management team participated actively in the follow up of projects. This has contributed significantly in improvement of implementation of projects. As a result positive results started to emerge thanks to this close follow up by UEM management team, supervised by the Vice Rector for Academic Affairs. Unfortunately the limited period of time to the end/close of the programme did not help.</p>	
<b>Actions Planned</b>	<b>Implementation stage</b> (not started, underway, completed, cancelled) + <b>timeframe</b> (action finalised):	<b>Actions taken</b>
Organize a meeting with key members of the Desafio Programme to reflect on what worked and what did not work (learning)	First meeting planned to take place in March 2019	Develop the programme and the format of the meeting and submit to the management of UEM for approval
Expand these reflection meetings to other Programmes and projects.	in the course of 2019	The result of the meeting within the Desafio Programme will help in orientation for this meeting.

<b>Recommendation 4: Efficiency</b>	Be more explicit from the start about the meaning of the concept partnership: what do each of the partners find important, how they wish to be recognised.	
<b>Management Response</b> (Agree, partially agree, disagree):	Agree	
<b>If recommendation is rejected or partially accepted, report reasons:</b>		
<b>Actions Planned</b>	<b>Implementation stage</b> (not started, underway, completed, cancelled) + <b>timeframe</b> (action finalised):	<b>Actions taken</b>
UEM has developed a draft of cooperation policy where expectations and responsibilities of each part in the collaboration are clearly described	A draft of cooperation Policy has been developed	To obtain approval of the cooperation policy by the UEM Council and start implementation

<b>Recommendation 5: Efficiency</b>	Develop further the approaches, rules and guidelines for scientific supervision; increase the involvement of UEM academic staff in the execution of sandwich PhD's.	
<b>Management Response</b> (Agree, partially agree, disagree):	Agree	
<b>If recommendation is rejected or partially accepted, report reasons:</b>		
<b>Actions Planned</b>	<b>Implementation stage</b> (not started, underway, completed, cancelled) + <b>timeframe</b> (action finalised):	<b>Actions taken</b>
Revise existing regulations	underway	First discussion held
Appointment of UEM supervisors for sandwich programs	underway	Local supervisors identified.

<b>Recommendation 6: Efficiency</b>	Develop a more coherent package of support in capacity building to academic staff enrolled in postgraduate programme	
<b>Management Response</b> (Agree, partially agree, disagree):	Partially agree	
<b>If recommendation is rejected or partially accepted, report reasons:</b>	Some activities have been implemented in view of support to academic staff enrolled in PhD and Master Programmes	
<b>Actions Planned</b>	<b>Implementation stage</b> (not started, underway, completed, cancelled) + <b>timeframe</b> (action finalised):	<b>Actions taken</b>
The UEM Centre for Academic Development (CDA) has been providing general competencies for Master students linked to the Faculty of Education.	underway	Extended to all units of UEM community
At this moment the CDA is providing a training of trainers to lecturers of UEM to work as trainers of supervisors	underway	Extended to all units of UEM community
The CDA is also organizing training in general competencies to PhD and Master Students funded by SIDA/SAREC. This training is to be extended to students funded by other Programmes.	underway	Extended to all units of UEM community

<b>Recommendation 7: Sustainability</b>	Take ownership for the Desafio research results, market them better as a 'package' and increase accessibility, continue to develop a multi-disciplinary home-grown research agenda with the academic staff that is part of the Desafio network and engage better with NGO's and research institutes. Clear research lines will also help to better orient academic staff. To start with: good examples/practices for multi-disciplinary research mentioned in this report (and elsewhere at UEM) could be further analysed and documented, using the donor workshop and the scientific conference of the phasing out of Desafio.
<b>Management Response</b> (Agree, partially agree, disagree):	agree

<b>If recommendation is rejected or partially accepted, report reasons:</b>		
<b>Actions Planned</b>	<b>Implementation stage</b> (not started, underway, completed, cancelled) + <b>timeframe</b> (action finalised):	<b>Actions taken</b>
Promote UEM research lines	underway	Workshop conducted in Quelimane
Compile brochure with best practices/examples	Not started	none

<b>Recommendation 8: Impact</b>	Reflect upon and create various venues and channels to influence on policies besides technical assistance and scientific conferences, at the start of the research (not waiting for research results to be ready) and engage from the beginning with decision makers and with other institutions and organisations. Of course, a scientific park is important to increase opportunities to apply research to societal problems, but more 'soft' mechanisms are equally important.	
<b>Management Response</b> (Agree, partially agree, disagree):	agree	
<b>If recommendation is rejected or partially accepted, report reasons:</b>		
<b>Actions Planned</b>	<b>Implementation stage</b> (not started, underway, completed, cancelled) + <b>timeframe</b> (action finalised):	<b>Actions taken</b>
Annual stakeholders meeting	Not started	none
Science fair	Not started	none
UEM open day	Continued activity	Held every year.